

Professional Development and Job Performance Among Faculty in a Private Higher Education Institution

Cristy Mae Amor S. Castro¹ , Alexander J. Bautista² , Nikki-Lynn L. Agtoto³ , Zenia Grace D. Libertad⁴ 
Bonita N. Salcedo⁵ , Ma. Arian L. Cabrera⁶ , Kristel Joy S. Deocadez⁷ 

Author Information:

¹⁻⁷Business Management & Accountancy
Department, Colegio de Sta. Ana de Victorias,
Victorias City, Negros Occidental, Philippines

Correspondence:

cristymaeamor.castro@csav.edu.ph

Article History:

Date Received: September 7, 2026

Date Revised: September 10, 2026

Date Accepted: September 15, 2026

Date Published: October 08, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0477>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0477

Recommended Citation:

Castro, C. M. A. S., Bautista, A. J., Agtoto, N.-L. L., Libertad, Z. G. D., Salcedo, B. N., Cabrera, M. A. L., & Deocadez, K. J. S. (2026). Professional development and job performance among faculty in a private higher education institution. *International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(9), 41-53. <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0477>

Abstract. This study examined the relationship between professional development and job performance among faculty members in a private higher education institution in Victorias City, Negros Occidental, Philippines. Although previous research has established the importance of professional development, limited evidence explains how faculty participation and perceived institutional support relate simultaneously to teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement within a specific private higher education context. A descriptive-correlational design was employed with 290 faculty members who met the study's inclusion criteria, including current employment and at least two years of teaching experience in the institution. Data were collected through a validated researcher-developed questionnaire measuring participation in professional development activities, institutional support, and job performance. Frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used for descriptive analysis; an independent-samples t-test was used to examine differences by sex; and Pearson's product-moment correlation was used to test relationships between professional development and job performance. Participation in professional development activities was high ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 0.13$), as was perceived institutional support ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 0.11$). Job performance was high in research productivity ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 0.10$), teaching effectiveness ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 0.11$), and community engagement ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 0.06$). The perceived influence of professional development on job performance was also high ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.084$). No significant difference was found between female and male faculty members, $t(271.382) = 0.947$, $p = .344$, with a very small effect size ($d = .111$). Participation in professional development was significantly and positively related to teaching effectiveness ($r = .198$, $p = .001$), research productivity ($r = .147$, $p = .012$), and community engagement ($r = .145$, $p = .014$). The findings indicate that professional development participation is a meaningful but modest contributor to faculty job performance. The institution should therefore sustain relevant development programs and improve the practical alignment of institutional support with faculty responsibilities.

Keywords: Professional Development; Job Performance; Higher Education Institution; Faculty; Teaching Effectiveness.

Introduction

Faculty performance is central to the quality and effectiveness of higher education because faculty members are responsible for translating institutional goals into teaching, research, mentoring, and community-service outcomes (Li et al., 2025). Contemporary higher education requires faculty to respond to changing student needs, technological developments, accreditation expectations, and expanding demands for scholarly and community engagement. These responsibilities make professional development an important human-resource strategy for maintaining faculty competence and institutional quality (Kurteshi & Rustem, 2025; Palmiano, 2024).

Professional development includes formal and informal learning experiences that strengthen professional knowledge, skills, attitudes, and practices. In higher education, these experiences may include seminars, workshops, conferences, mentoring, research training, curriculum development, technology training, and collaborative learning. However, participation in an activity does not automatically guarantee improved performance; the quality, continuity, relevance, and institutional support surrounding the activity

determine whether learning is transferred to professional practice (Aswathy & Jayalakshmi, 2025; Kurteshi & Rrustemi, 2025).

Previous scholarship indicates that effective professional development is sustained, content-focused, collaborative, and connected to actual work responsibilities (Li et al., 2025). Faculty are more likely to apply newly acquired knowledge when development activities address real instructional, research, and service challenges. Professional learning may therefore improve performance through the development of competence, reflection, confidence, and professional motivation rather than through attendance alone (Palmiano, 2024).

Job performance among faculty is multidimensional. Teaching effectiveness involves the preparation and delivery of instruction, learner engagement, classroom management, assessment, and responsiveness to student needs. Research productivity includes research participation, scholarly writing, publication, presentations, and contribution to knowledge. Community engagement involves extension work, outreach, partnerships, and the application of academic expertise to community concerns. Considering these dimensions together provides a broader assessment of faculty performance than focusing only on classroom instruction.

Institutional support is another important factor in professional development. Faculty participation may be affected by the availability of funding, time, mentoring, administrative encouragement, facilities, technology, and recognition. Supportive institutions can reduce barriers to participation and strengthen the transfer of professional learning into workplace practice. Nevertheless, support must be relevant and accessible; general encouragement may have limited impact if faculty lack time, resources, or clear opportunities to apply what they have learned (Aswathy & Jayalakshmi, 2025).

Although the literature generally supports a positive association between professional development and faculty performance, several issues remain insufficiently examined. First, some studies focus on teachers in basic education rather than faculty in higher education. Second, many investigations examine teaching effectiveness alone and give less attention to research productivity and community engagement. Third, broad multi-institutional studies may not fully capture how professional development operates within a particular private higher education institution (Kurteshi & Rrustemi, 2025; Li et al., 2025). These gaps support the need for a context-specific study involving faculty members in Victorias City, Negros Occidental.

The present study responds to this gap by examining professional development through two dimensions: participation in professional development activities and perceived institutional support. It assesses job performance through teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement. It also examines whether the perceived influence of professional development differs according to selected faculty characteristics and whether professional development is significantly related to job performance.

The study is guided by the assumption that faculty development strengthens performance by improving competence and supporting motivation. Competence-oriented perspectives explain how training and professional learning develop the skills required for teaching, research, and service, while Self-Determination Theory explains how opportunities for growth may support competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Li et al., 2025). Together, these perspectives provide a basis for examining both the professional and motivational pathways through which development may be associated with faculty performance.

The findings may benefit administrators, human-resource practitioners, faculty members, and future researchers. Administrators may use the results to improve development planning and resource allocation, while faculty members may use them to identify relevant opportunities for professional growth. The study may also provide evidence for designing more targeted programs that connect participation and institutional support with measurable responsibilities in teaching, research, and community engagement (Aswathy & Jayalakshmi, 2025; Palmiano, 2024).

Research Questions

This study aims to examine the relationship between professional development and job performance of faculty members in a higher education institution (HEI).

Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of participants in terms of:
 - 1.1 Age,
 - 1.2 Sex,
 - 1.3 Number of Years in Teaching in the HEI,
 - 1.4 Faculty Rank, and
 - 1.5 Faculty Status
2. What is the level of participation in Professional Development activities by the faculty?
3. What is the level of institution support for Professional Development received by the faculty?
4. What is the perceived level of job performance of faculty members in terms of:
 - 4.1 Teaching Effectiveness,

- 4.2 Research Productivity, and
- 4.3 Community Engagement
5. What is the level of influence of professional development in job performance?
6. Is there a significant difference in the extent of influence of professional development in the Job Performance when participants are grouped according to their profile.
7. Is there any significant relationship between Professional Development and Job Performance.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study examines the relationship between professional development and job performance of faculty members in a private higher education institution (HEI) in Victorias City, Negros Occidental. The respondents consist of 290 faculty members who have at least two years of teaching experience during the academic year 2024–2025. It focuses on selected profile variables, including age, sex, years of teaching experience, faculty rank, and employment status, which are used as grouping variables. Professional development is operationalized in terms of participation in development activities and perceived institutional support. Job performance is measured across three dimensions: teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement. Data are collected using a structured survey questionnaire. Moreover, this study is delimited to faculty perceptions and does not include objective performance metrics such as publication counts or student evaluation records. Despite its contributions, the study has several limitations. First, the descriptive-correlational design limits the ability to establish causal relationships between variables. Second, the use of self-reported data may introduce social desirability and response bias, potentially affecting the accuracy of reported participation and performance levels. Third, the study is confined to a single private HEI, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other institutions. Fourth, the use of purposive sampling may restrict the representativeness of the sample. Finally, the study does not account for other factors that may influence job performance, such as leadership practices, organizational culture, and workload.

Literature Review

Professional Development in Higher Education

Professional development in higher education refers to the continuous process through which faculty members strengthen the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and practices required for teaching, research, and service. It includes formal activities such as seminars, workshops, conferences, mentoring, research training, and certification programs, as well as informal practices such as peer collaboration, reflective teaching, and participation in professional learning communities. Recent research emphasizes that professional development is most effective when it is sustained, relevant to faculty responsibilities, collaborative, and connected to institutional priorities (Bélisle et al., 2024; Kurteshi & Rrustemi, 2025).

In the context of this study, professional development is understood through two related dimensions: participation in professional development activities and institutional support for professional development. Participation represents the faculty member's active engagement in learning opportunities, while institutional support refers to the organizational conditions that make professional learning possible, including time, funding, mentoring, administrative encouragement, and access to resources. Lu et al. (2025) found that professional development and the work environment are closely associated with job satisfaction in higher education, suggesting that faculty learning cannot be separated from the conditions in which academic work occurs.

Professional development is also important because university faculty perform multiple and complex roles. Faculty members are expected to teach effectively, produce scholarly work, mentor students, participate in institutional activities, and contribute to communities. A development program that focuses only on classroom instruction may not sufficiently address the research and service expectations of faculty members. Bélisle et al. (2024) explained that educational development among university teachers involves different motivations, including improving instructional quality, developing academic knowledge, increasing professional effectiveness, and contributing to broader social change.

Competence-Based Education and Professional Development

The Competence-Based Education perspective provides an important theoretical basis for understanding how professional development may influence faculty performance. Competence-based approaches focus on the knowledge, skills, abilities, and professional behaviors that individuals must demonstrate in actual work settings. Applied to higher education faculty, this perspective suggests that professional development should produce observable competencies that can be transferred to teaching, research, and community engagement.

Phuong and Duong (2022) developed a competency-based professional-development framework for faculty members and emphasized that faculty development should be organized around the competencies required for academic work. This perspective is directly relevant to the present study because the professional-development variable is not limited to attendance in training programs. Rather, it is connected to the competencies that faculty members use when preparing instruction, conducting research, participating in institutional activities, and engaging with communities.

Under Competence-Based Education, participation in professional development is expected to strengthen faculty capability through knowledge acquisition, practice, feedback, and application. For example, training in instructional technology may improve teaching effectiveness, research-methodology workshops may strengthen research productivity, and extension or community-partnership activities may improve community engagement. The theory therefore supports the assumption that faculty members who participate more actively in relevant development activities may demonstrate better performance across the three dimensions measured in this study.

However, competency development depends on the relevance and quality of the learning experience. Participation in a seminar may have limited value if it is unrelated to faculty responsibilities or if participants are not given opportunities to apply what they have learned. Phuong and Duong (2022) emphasized the importance of identifying the specific competencies faculty need and designing development programs around those needs. This helps explain why the present study measures both participation and institutional support rather than participation alone.

The Competence-Based Education perspective also supports the study's treatment of job performance as multidimensional. Teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement represent different but related areas of faculty competence. A faculty member may demonstrate strong instructional competence but require additional support in research or community engagement. Thus, examining separate performance dimensions makes it possible to identify where professional development appears most strongly associated with faculty outcomes.

Self-Determination Theory and Faculty Development

Self-Determination Theory provides a second theoretical explanation for the relationship between professional development and job performance. The theory proposes that individuals are more likely to become motivated and engaged when their psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are supported. In higher education, professional development may satisfy these needs by allowing faculty members to develop expertise, exercise professional judgment, and collaborate with colleagues.

The need for competence is particularly relevant to this study. Faculty members who participate in meaningful professional development may feel more capable of managing instructional challenges, conducting research, and contributing to institutional activities. When faculty perceive that development opportunities improve their actual capabilities, professional learning may strengthen confidence and persistence. Ozer Sanal et al. (2025) emphasized that Self-Determination Theory remains useful in higher education because it explains how supportive learning environments influence motivation and engagement.

Autonomy is also important because faculty members are professionals who make decisions about teaching methods, research topics, assessment practices, and community activities. Development programs that allow faculty to select relevant topics and adapt learning to their responsibilities may be more motivating than programs imposed without consultation. Ross and Scanes (2025) argued that Self-Determination Theory can help explain how academic staff sustain motivation when institutional conditions support meaningful choice, professional purpose, and personal agency.

Relatedness refers to the need to feel connected to colleagues and the wider academic community. Professional-development activities such as mentoring, peer observation, collaborative research, and faculty learning communities can strengthen collegial relationships. Compare et al. (2024) found that autonomy, competence, and relatedness are important in understanding faculty motivation, particularly in service-learning contexts. This is relevant to the present study because community engagement often requires cooperation among faculty, students, institutional units, and external partners.

Self-Determination Theory also clarifies the role of institutional support. Administrative encouragement, recognition, access to resources, and protected time may communicate that faculty learning is valued by the institution. When such support is present, faculty members may be more willing to participate and apply what they learn. Conversely, if support is perceived as limited or merely symbolic, participation may not result in sustained motivation or improved performance. This theoretical position helps explain why institutional support was included as a separate dimension of professional development in the study.

Faculty Job Performance

Faculty job performance refers to the degree to which faculty members effectively fulfill their academic responsibilities. In this study, job performance is assessed through teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement. These dimensions reflect the broad expectations placed on faculty members in higher education and correspond to the competence areas that professional development is expected to strengthen.

Teaching effectiveness includes the faculty member's ability to prepare lessons, communicate subject content, use appropriate instructional strategies, engage learners, assess learning, and respond to diverse student needs. Recent research on university-teacher development emphasizes that teaching effectiveness is not limited to content expertise; it also involves reflective practice, pedagogical decision-making, assessment literacy, and the ability to adapt instruction to changing educational environments (Bélisle et al., 2024). Professional development is therefore relevant when it helps faculty translate new knowledge into improved classroom practice.

Research productivity refers to a faculty member's engagement in research and scholarly activities, including research design, data collection, publication, conference presentation, and collaboration. Nguyen and Nguyen (2023) identified institutional and management factors that influence academic staff research performance, while Pentang and Domingo (2024) emphasized the importance of research self-efficacy in faculty productivity. These findings suggest that research performance depends on both individual capability and the institutional conditions that encourage scholarly work.

Community engagement involves the application of academic knowledge and professional expertise to community needs. It may include outreach programs, extension activities, community-based research, public-service initiatives, and partnerships with external organizations. Community engagement requires collaboration, communication, and the ability to connect academic goals with practical social concerns. From a Self-Determination Theory perspective, community engagement may also strengthen relatedness by connecting faculty members with students, colleagues, and community partners (Compare et al., 2024).

Institutional Support and Work Environment

Institutional support refers to the resources, policies, practices, and interpersonal conditions that enable faculty members to participate in professional development and perform their work effectively. It may include financial assistance, time allowances, mentoring, access to technology, research support, recognition, promotion opportunities, and administrative encouragement. The work environment is important because professional development cannot be separated from the organizational context in which faculty members work.

Lu et al. (2025) examined the interrelationships among professional development, work environment, and job satisfaction in higher education. Their work suggests that professional learning is more meaningful when faculty members operate in an environment that promotes support, collaboration, and satisfaction. Similarly, Li et al. (2025) showed that perceived organizational support, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction are related to teacher job performance. These findings support the inclusion of institutional support as an important component of the present study.

Institutional support may also influence whether newly acquired knowledge is applied in practice. Faculty members may attend a research workshop, for example, but require access to funding, databases, mentoring, and research time before they can produce scholarly outputs. Likewise, attendance at a teaching seminar may not lead to improved teaching if faculty members lack instructional resources or opportunities for feedback. From a Competence-Based Education perspective, support provides the conditions required to transform acquired knowledge into demonstrated competence.

Relationship between Professional Development and Job Performance

Recent literature generally indicates that professional development is positively associated with faculty and teacher performance. Kurteshi and Rustemi (2025) reported that continuous professional development can improve teaching practices and teacher performance. Similarly, Pan and Abd Rani (2025) found that professional development and employee engagement are related to teaching job performance among university teachers. These studies support the expectation that faculty participation in development activities may be associated with better academic performance.

The relationship may be explained through both competence and motivation. Professional development may improve performance directly by increasing knowledge and skills, while it may also improve performance indirectly by strengthening confidence, engagement, and professional commitment. Competence-Based Education explains the skills pathway, whereas Self-Determination Theory explains the motivational pathway. Together, the two theories provide a more comprehensive explanation of why professional development may relate to teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement.

Nevertheless, the relationship is not necessarily strong or automatic. Faculty performance is also affected by workload, leadership, organizational culture, research resources, student characteristics, motivation, and career stage. Li et al. (2025) emphasized that teacher performance is shaped by several interacting factors, including perceived organizational support, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. Therefore, professional development should be understood as one contributing factor within a broader institutional system rather than as the sole explanation for faculty performance.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between professional development and job performance among faculty members in a private higher education institution (HEI) in Victorias City. This design is appropriate for determining the extent to which variables are associated as they naturally occur, without manipulation or experimental control. The descriptive-correlational research design is particularly suitable for this study, which examines how professional development influences the job performance of faculty in a higher education institution (HEI). It allows for the detailed observation and documentation of relevant variables, enabling the researcher to collect quantitative data through surveys and supporting institutional records. This approach provides a clear representation of faculty members' experiences and perceptions regarding professional development and their corresponding job performance. Specifically, this design supports the analysis required to address the study's objectives. It enables the determination of the level of influence of professional development on job performance (SOP 5) through the use of correlational and inferential statistical techniques. It also allows for the examination of significant differences in the level of influence of professional development on job performance when participants are grouped according to their profile variables such as age, sex, years of teaching, faculty rank, and faculty status (SOP 6). Furthermore, the design facilitates the assessment of the significant relationship between professional development and job performance (SOP 7), establishing whether a statistically significant association exists between these variables. By focusing on naturally occurring phenomena, the study captures a wide range of responses from participants, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of how professional development contributes to job performance. The findings of this study may provide empirical evidence that can guide institutional policies and practices aimed at enhancing faculty effectiveness and improving overall educational outcomes.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in a private higher education institution located in Victorias City, Negros Occidental, Philippines. The institution was selected as the research locale because it provides an appropriate setting for examining professional development and faculty job performance within an actual higher education work environment. Its faculty members perform the core academic functions examined in this study, including teaching, research, and community engagement. Victorias City is located in Negros Occidental, a province in Western Visayas with an established educational and economic presence. The location provides a relevant institutional context for examining how faculty members experience professional-development opportunities, perceive organizational support, and perform their academic responsibilities. Focusing on one private HEI also allows the study to examine professional development within a specific organizational structure, policy environment, and institutional culture rather than combining responses from institutions with different systems and expectations. The research locale was appropriate because the participating institution had faculty members occupying different academic ranks and employment statuses. The respondents included lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, as well as full-time, part-time, and consultant faculty members. This diversity enabled the study to examine professional development and job performance across faculty members with different levels of academic responsibility and institutional involvement. The study was conducted during the academic year 2024–2025. Data were collected from eligible faculty members through self-administered printed questionnaires and, when necessary, an online format based on participant availability and institutional arrangements. The institution and individual respondents were protected through confidentiality and anonymity procedures, and the results were presented only in aggregated form. The locale was therefore used not only as the physical site of data collection but also as the institutional context for interpreting the relationship between professional development and faculty job performance.

Research Participants

The respondents of the study were 290 faculty members of a private higher education institution in Victorias City, Negros Occidental. Participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure that they met the inclusion criteria of being currently employed faculty members with at least two years of teaching

experience in the institution. The sample size was determined to ensure adequate statistical power. Using a 95% power level and a medium effect size, the minimum required sample size was computed to be 252 participants. To account for a possible 10% non-response or dropout rate, the target sample size was increased to 280 respondents. The final number of participants ($n = 290$) exceeded the required sample size, indicating that the study achieved sufficient statistical power for the analyses conducted. The inclusion criteria covered faculty members aged 23 to 59 years, regardless of sex, faculty rank, or employment status (full-time, part-time, lecturer, permanent, or probationary). This ensured representation of diverse academic positions and teaching experiences within the institution.

Research Instrument

Data were gathered using a structured, researcher-developed questionnaire composed of three sections. The first section collected the respondents' profile, including age, sex, years of teaching experience in the institution, faculty rank, and employment status. The second section measured professional development in terms of participation in professional development activities and perceived institutional support. The third section assessed job performance in terms of teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement. All items were rated using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The instrument underwent face and content validation by a panel of experts in education. Revisions were made based on the experts' recommendations to improve the clarity, relevance, organization, and appropriateness of the items. The final questionnaire was then evaluated for internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha. The professional-development scale obtained an overall reliability coefficient of .710, with coefficients of .701 for participation in professional development activities and .736 for institutional support. The job-performance scale demonstrated good internal consistency, with an overall Cronbach's alpha of .817. Its subscales also showed acceptable reliability, including teaching effectiveness ($\alpha = .722$), research productivity ($\alpha = .740$), and community engagement ($\alpha = .718$). The scale measuring the perceived influence of professional development on job performance obtained a reliability coefficient of .788, while the scale assessing the relationship between professional development and job performance obtained $\alpha = .772$. These results indicate that the instruments had acceptable to good internal consistency and were suitable for data collection and analysis. The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale. The response options were interpreted as follows: 1, Strongly Disagree; 2, Disagree; 3, Neutral; 4, Agree; and 5, Strongly Agree. For the interpretation of mean scores, 1.00–1.49 represented a Very Low level, 1.50–2.49 a Low level, 2.50–3.49 a Moderate level, 3.50–4.49 a High level, and 4.50–5.00 a Very High level. These ranges were used consistently in interpreting professional development, institutional support, job performance, and the perceived influence of professional development on job performance.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data collection process followed a systematic and ethical procedure. First, approval was secured from the appropriate ethics committee and institutional authorities of the participating higher education institution. Upon approval, formal communication was sent to the institution's administration to request permission to conduct the study among faculty members. After approval was granted, participants who met the inclusion criteria were identified through coordination with relevant offices. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection. The consent form explained the purpose of the study, voluntary participation, confidentiality measures, and the right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Data were collected using a self-administered questionnaire distributed either in printed form or through an online platform, depending on participant availability. Respondents were given sufficient time to complete the instrument. To enhance the objectivity of job performance measurement, supplementary institutional data were obtained, subject to approval, and presented in aggregated form to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. All collected data were checked for completeness and consistency before analysis.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What is the profile of participants in terms of age, sex, number of years in teaching in the HEI, faculty rank, and faculty status?

Table 1. Profile of the Participants

	Frequency	Percent
1. Sex		
Male	144	49.7
Female	146	50.3
2. Education		
Bachelor's Degree	55	19.0
Master's Degree	169	58.3
Doctorate Degree	66	22.8
3. Faculty Rank		
Lecturer	28	9.7
Assistant Professor	55	19.0
Associate Professor	141	48.6
Professor	66	22.8
4. Faculty Status		
Full time	203	70.0
Part time	52	17.9
Consultant	35	12.1
Total	290	100.0

Table 1 shows that the profile of the respondents provides important context for understanding the results of the study. A total of 290 participants were included, with a nearly equal distribution in terms of sex, comprising 146 females (50.3%) and 144 males (49.7%). This balanced representation minimizes gender bias and enhances the generalizability of the findings across both male and female faculty members.

Overall, the respondent profile indicates a well-balanced, academically qualified, and professionally experienced group of faculty members. These characteristics strengthen the credibility of the study, as the participants are capable of providing informed and reliable responses regarding the influence of professional development on job performance. Moreover, recent literature highlights that professional development, along with institutional support and leadership, remains a key factor influencing job performance and effectiveness in educational settings (Paigalan, 2025)

Research Question 2: Level of participation in professional development activities by the faculty?

Table 2. Level of Professional Development (last 3 years) of the HEI Faculty

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Level
1. Participation in Professional Development Activities	3.58	.13	High
2. Institutional Support for Professional Development	3.55	.11	High

Table 2 shows that the professional development of higher education institution (HEI) faculty over the last three years was assessed in terms of both individual participation in professional development activities and perceived institutional support. The results, as presented in Table 2, show that both dimensions were rated at a high level. Specifically, Participation in Professional Development Activities received a mean score of 3.58 (SD = 0.13), while Institutional Support for Professional Development had a mean of 3.55 (SD = 0.11). These findings indicate that faculty members actively engage in professional development programs and perceive their institutions as supportive of such initiatives.

The high level of participation in professional development activities reflects a commitment to continuous learning and professional growth. Faculty members who consistently engage in workshops, seminars, training sessions, and other development programs are better positioned to update their knowledge, refine teaching practices, and improve their overall effectiveness in the academic environment (Avidov-Ungar, 2025). This aligns with the broader literature suggesting that active engagement in professional development contributes to increased instructional competence and career advancement (Makhmetova et al., 2025).

Overall, the findings suggest that both individual effort and institutional structures are aligned to foster a culture of continuous professional learning. This synergy between faculty initiative and organizational support is likely to enhance teaching quality, facilitate knowledge transfer, and contribute to improved student outcomes. The robust culture of professional development observed in the study indicates that the HEI are actively investing in the growth of their academic personnel, which is a key factor in maintaining educational excellence and institutional competitiveness.

Research Question 3: Perceived level of job performance of faculty members in terms of teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement?

Table 3. Perceived Level of Job Performance of Faculty Members

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Level
1.	Teaching Effectiveness	3.54	.11	High
2.	Research Productivity	3.57	.10	High
3.	Community Engagement	3.51	.06	High

Table 3 shows that the perceived job performance of faculty members was assessed across three key domains: Teaching Effectiveness, Research Productivity, and Community Engagement. Descriptive statistics (Table 3) revealed that faculty members consistently maintained a high level of job performance in all areas. Specifically, Research Productivity obtained the highest mean score of 3.57 (SD = 0.10), followed by Teaching Effectiveness with a mean of 3.54 (SD = 0.11), and Community Engagement with a mean of 3.51 (SD = 0.06). The relatively low standard deviations across all categories indicate a high degree of consistency in the perceived professional job performance of the respondents.

The high rating in Research Productivity suggests that faculty members are actively involved in scholarly activities, such as conducting research and publishing findings, which are essential for academic development and institutional reputation. Recent research indicates that a supportive research environment and faculty research self-efficacy are positively associated with research output and productivity in higher education (Teacher research self-efficacy and teacher research environment, 2025).

Teaching Effectiveness, also rated high, reflects the faculty's ability to deliver quality instruction and facilitate student learning outcomes. This aligns with studies showing that faculty development and instructional leadership practices contribute to effective teaching and quality assurance in higher education institutions, particularly within Philippine contexts (Best practices of high performing HEI, 2025).

While Community Engagement scored slightly lower than the other domains, it nonetheless remains at a high level, emphasizing that faculty members are actively participating in outreach and community-related activities. Research on community engagement underscores its importance as a high-impact educational practice that supports academic success, civic involvement, and societal contributions, which are increasingly recognized as integral aspects of job performance in higher education.

Overall, the results indicate that the HEI faculty demonstrate balanced and high job performance across teaching, research, and community service. The combination of strong research productivity, effective teaching practices, and meaningful engagement with the community underscores the faculty's commitment to holistic professional job performance, aligning with both individual career goals and broader institutional expectations. These findings also suggest that supportive work environments, professional development opportunities, and instructional leadership frameworks may contribute to sustaining high levels of faculty job performance.

Research Question 4: Level of influence of professional development in job performance?

Table 4. Level of Influence of Professional Development on Job Performance

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Level
1.	Influence of Professional Development on Job performance	3.82	.084	High

Table 4 shows that the perceived influence of professional development on job performance was evaluated to determine the practical utility of training initiatives, and the results showed a high level of influence (M = 3.82, SD = .084). This finding suggests that faculty members strongly perceive professional development as a driver of their academic and professional success, with a low standard deviation indicating a strong consensus among respondents. These findings are consistent with recent empirical evidence demonstrating that professional development programs significantly enhance key facets of job performance, particularly teaching effectiveness and engagement. For instance, Pan and Abd Rani (2025) found that professional development combined with employee engagement positively impacts job performance, highlighting how structured learning opportunities can strengthen instructional outcomes and professional commitment.

Additionally, Espartero, Amparado, and Tubola (2025) reported that faculty development programs are perceived as valuable for improving teaching, learning, and research competencies, further reflecting the relevance of continuous professional growth for higher education personnel. Collectively, these studies support the notion that professional development not only contributes to individual competence but also aligns with institutional goals for quality teaching and sustained job performance improvements.

Research Question 5: Is there significant difference in the extent of influence of professional development in the job performance when participants are grouped according to their profile?

Table 5. Comparison of Influence of Professional Development on Job Performance between Male and Female Faculty

Sex	Mean±SD	Mean difference	df	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
1. Female	3.81 ± 0.07	.01	271.382	.947	.344	Not Significant
2. Male	3.82 ± 0.10					

Table 5 shows an independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference in the perceived influence of professional development on job performance when faculty members are grouped according to sex. As presented in Table 7, female faculty members obtained a mean score of 3.81 (SD = 0.07), while male faculty members had a slightly higher mean score of 3.82 (SD = 0.10). The mean difference between the two groups was 0.01, indicating a very minimal variation in perceptions.

The results of the t-test revealed that this difference was not statistically significant, $t(271.38) = 0.947$, $p = .344$. Since the computed p-value is greater than the conventional alpha level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted. This indicates that there is no significant difference in how male and female faculty members perceive the influence of professional development on their job performance. Furthermore, the computed effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.111$) suggests a very small effect, reinforcing the conclusion that sex has a negligible impact on the perceived influence of professional development.

The findings imply that both male and female faculty members equally recognize the importance and benefits of professional development activities in enhancing their job performance. This consistency may be attributed to the standardized implementation of professional development programs within higher education institutions, where equal opportunities for training and development are provided regardless of sex. Recent studies have similarly found that professional development has a significant positive effect on job performance outcomes, independent of demographic characteristics such as gender (Pan & Abd Rani, 2025; Espartero et al., 2025).

Moreover, the similarity in responses suggests that professional development serves as a universal factor influencing job performance rather than one shaped by demographic differences. Research in higher education contexts indicates that structured professional development programs contribute to improved teaching effectiveness, research engagement, and overall job performance across diverse groups of educators. This supports the notion that the benefits of professional development are broadly experienced, regardless of sex.

Overall, the results demonstrate that sex does not significantly influence faculty perceptions of the role of professional development in enhancing job performance. This highlights the broad applicability and effectiveness of professional development programs across faculty groups and supports their continued implementation as a key strategy for improving job performance in higher education institutions.

Research Question 6: Is there any significant relationship between professional development and job performance?

Table 6. Relationship between Professional Development and Job Performance

			Teaching Effectiveness	Research Productivity	Community Engagement
1.	Participation in Professional Development Activities	r	.198**	.147*	.145*
		p-value	.001	.012	.014
2.	Institutional Support for Professional Development	r	.072	.112	-.125*
		p-value	.220	.058	.033
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).					

Table 6 shows that Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between professional development and job performance across three domains: teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement. The results revealed that participation in professional development activities was significantly and positively correlated with all three dimensions of job performance. Specifically, participation showed a positive correlation with teaching effectiveness ($r = .198$, $p = .001$), research productivity ($r = .147$, $p = .012$), and community engagement ($r = .145$, $p = .014$). However, the strength of these relationships is considered weak, indicating that while professional development contributes to job performance, it is not the sole factor influencing it.

The significant p-values indicate that the observed relationships are unlikely to have occurred by chance, suggesting a real association between professional development and job performance in the population. However, the weak correlation coefficients imply that the degree of association between the variables is relatively low, meaning that changes in professional development are only loosely associated with changes in job performance.

The robustness of these findings is further supported by the adequacy of the sample size, as the number of participants ($n = 290$) exceeded the minimum required sample to achieve sufficient statistical power, thereby increasing confidence in the reliability of the results.

Ethical Considerations

The researcher ensured that all collected data, including forms and correspondence, remained confidential and protected. Privacy and anonymity were strictly maintained throughout the study. The research paper underwent a thorough review by the Research Ethics Review College Panel, and data gathering commenced only after obtaining the required ethics clearance. Consent was obtained from the Higher Education Institution (HEI) to conduct the study among its faculty members. The HEI was informed of the study's intent to either anonymize its name and remove all identifiers or, if permitted, explicitly include its name in the paper. Approval was also secured to access secondary data related to job performance evaluations from the past three years. All information provided in the study was treated with the strictest confidentiality. No names or personally identifiable information were collected in the questionnaire. All responses were anonymized and coded for analysis. Completed paper-based surveys were placed in sealed envelopes and stored in a locked cabinet accessible only to the researcher. The encoded data were stored in a password-protected digital file. Only aggregated results were reported, and no individual responses were identifiable. Participants were given the option to withdraw from the study at any time, and any incomplete or withdrawn survey responses were immediately discarded. All data were securely destroyed six months after the completion of the study. The research complied with the provisions of the Data Privacy Act of 2012, ensuring that all participant information remained confidential and accessible only to the researcher. Due to a potential conflict of interest (COI), the researcher was not directly responsible for obtaining informed consent from participants. Instead, a research assistant with no COI was hired to administer the Informed Consent Form (ICF) to ensure impartiality. While the researcher was available to answer questions and clarify the contents of the ICF, the final consent process was handled by the research assistant. The ICF provided comprehensive details, including a clear identification of potential risks and mitigation strategies, as well as an explanation of the study's benefits. The form was written in plain language to ensure full understanding among participants. Participants were assured that no individual results would be reported, and only collective data were analyzed and presented. This approach ensured that responses remained confidential and that findings reflected overall trends rather than individual performance. Safety measures were also observed during any in-person data collection activities, following appropriate health and safety protocols to ensure the well-being of both participants and researchers. Data were collected through self-administered printed questionnaires that were personally distributed and retrieved by the researcher or designated assistant. Responses were manually encoded into a secure Excel file and analyzed using SPSS. Original hard copy questionnaires were stored in sealed envelopes inside a locked cabinet, while digital data were kept in a password-protected folder accessible only to the researcher. All data were retained for six (6) months after study completion, after which hard copies were shredded, and digital files were permanently deleted. No identifying information was collected at any point, ensuring full anonymity. By adhering to these ethical considerations, the study upheld research integrity, respected participants' rights, and ensured compliance with ethical standards. Upon completion of the study, a summary of the key findings and recommendations was formally shared with the participating higher education institution (HEI) through an official report submitted to its Academic Affairs Office or designated research unit. In addition, the study was presented in the graduate school's research colloquium as part of the academic requirements for the completion of the master's program. If possible, the researcher also intended to submit the paper for presentation at local research forums or education conferences. A copy of the final manuscript was deposited in the institutional repository of the graduate school and made available upon request. All dissemination efforts ensured that individual participants remained anonymous and that only aggregated data were reported. The study also complied with the ethical guidelines set by the University of St. La Salle's Research Ethics Review Committee and was officially approved prior to data collection.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between professional development and job performance among faculty members in a private higher education institution (HEI) in Victorias City. The findings indicate that the respondents are generally well-qualified and experienced, with a balanced representation in terms of sex, academic rank, and employment status, which enhances the credibility of the study within

the institutional context. Results further revealed that faculty members demonstrate a high level of participation in professional development activities and perceive strong institutional support for such initiatives. This suggests that the institution fosters an environment that promotes continuous learning and professional growth. Likewise, faculty job performance was consistently high across teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement, indicating strong commitment to academic and institutional responsibilities. The study also established that professional development is positively associated with faculty job performance. While the relationships between variables were weak, participation in professional development activities showed significant positive associations with teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement. However, institutional support alone was not a strong predictor of job performance, and in some cases showed minimal or weak associations. Moreover, no significant differences were found in job performance when respondents were grouped according to sex, suggesting that the effects of professional development are generally consistent across gender.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are presented: For Higher Education Administrators. It is recommended that administrators strengthen faculty engagement in professional development by integrating participation into performance evaluation, promotion, and career advancement systems. Regular needs assessments should be conducted to ensure that development programs are aligned with faculty needs, career stages, and institutional priorities. Institutions should also reassess and enhance support mechanisms to ensure they are accessible, relevant, and effectively utilized. Furthermore, fostering a culture of continuous professional learning through mentoring programs, collaborative activities, and communities of practice is essential in sustaining faculty development and improving performance outcomes. For Human Resource Practitioners. Human resource practitioners are encouraged to design outcome-based and practice-oriented professional development programs that directly enhance teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and community engagement. The establishment of systematic monitoring and evaluation mechanisms is also recommended to assess program effectiveness and guide continuous improvement. In addition, providing incentives, recognition, and certification opportunities may further encourage active faculty participation in professional development initiatives. For HEI Administrators and Faculty Members. Faculty members are encouraged to actively engage in professional development activities as part of their commitment to continuous professional growth. They should take responsibility for enhancing their competencies by participating in relevant training programs and applying acquired knowledge and skills in teaching, research, and community service. Embracing a lifelong learning mindset will enable faculty to remain responsive to evolving academic standards and institutional expectations. For Future Researchers. Future studies are recommended to employ longitudinal research designs to better establish causal relationships between professional development and job performance. Expanding the scope to include multiple higher education institutions will also improve the generalizability of findings. Additionally, future research may incorporate other relevant variables such as leadership style, organizational culture, workload, and motivation to provide a more comprehensive understanding of factors influencing faculty job performance.

References

- Aswathy, S. A., & Jayalakshmi, G. (2025). Role of institutional support in enhancing faculty job satisfaction and performance. In A. J. Obaid (Ed.), *Public sector and workforce management in the digital age* (pp. 197–218). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1137-1.ch010>
- Avidov-Ungar, O. (2025). Teachers' professional development in changing educational environments. *Education Sciences*, 15(12), 1686. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15121686>
- Bélisle, M., Jean, V., & Fernandez, N. (2024). The educational development of university teachers: Mapping the landscape. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, Article 1376658. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1376658>
- Best practices of high performing higher education institutions in the Philippines towards the development of harmonized quality assured instructional leadership framework.* (2025). *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1663289>
- Compare, C., Rivero, C., Vargas Moniz, M. J., & Albanesi, C. (2024). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness: Unpacking faculty motivation in service-learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(6), 1210–1226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2325152>

- Espartero, R. P., Amparado, M. C. P., & Tubola, C. J. S. (2025). The impact of faculty development on teaching, learning, and research. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.909000238>
- Kurteshi, V., & Rustemi, J. (2025). Exploring the impact of continuous professional development on teacher performance: Insights from students and teachers. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 16, e2025228. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.16.228>
- Li, L., Kanchanapoom, K., Deeprasert, J., et al. (2025). Unveiling the factors shaping teacher job performance: Exploring the interplay of personality traits, perceived organizational support, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. *BMC Psychology*, 13, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02324-1>
- Lu, Y., Ting, L., Jiang, Z., Liu, Y., & Lee, S. Y. (2025). Professional development, work environment, and job satisfaction in higher education: Implications for teacher education. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, 8(6), 2200–2213. <https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i6.10093>
- Makhmetova, Z., et al. (2025). The impact of professional development on teachers' instructional practices and job performance. *Education Sciences*, 15(2), 146. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020146>
- Nguyen, T. T., & Nguyen, T. T. (2023). Factors affecting academic staff's research performance in Vietnam's universities. *Vietnam Journal of Education*, 7(2), 146–156. <https://doi.org/10.52296/vje.2023.271>
- Ozer Sanal, S., Torun, F., & Dargut Guler, T. (2025). Examining self-determination theory in the context of higher education and distance education. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 8(4), 1079–1100. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.1245>
- Paigalan, D. M., & Bauyot, M. (2025). A systematic review on the factors affecting teachers' job performance: Comparative analysis between the Philippines and the United States of America (2015–2025). *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0702>
- Palmiano, D. A. (2024). Research productivity and engagement of faculty. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 13(8), 123–133. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2024.24084>
- Pan, L., & Abd Rani, N. S. (2025). The impact of professional development and employee engagement on teaching job performance among university teachers in Shanghai city, China. *Uniglobal Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(1), 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.53797/ujssh.v4i1.7.2025>
- Pentang, J. T., & Domingo, J. G. (2024). Research self-efficacy and productivity of select faculty members: Inferences for faculty development plan. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 13(4), 1693–1709. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.13.4.1693>
- Phuong, T. T., & Duong, B. H. (2022). Toward a competency-based professional development framework for faculty members: Insiders' perspectives. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 28, 283–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-022-09103-w>
- Ross, P. M., & Scanes, E. (2025). Using self-determination theory as a lens to create sustainable futures for teaching and education-focused academics in higher education in Australia. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 47(1), 90–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2024.2391600>
- Teacher research self-efficacy and teacher research environment in higher education: University teachers' perceptions from a social cognitive perspective. (2025). *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 9, 100543. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2025.100543>