Communication Practices and Engagement Level of University Stakeholders: Basis for Enhancement Program

Orpha S. Saguibo
Isabela State University-Echague, Isabela
orpha.saguibo@isu.edu.ph

Abstract

Effective organizational communication is essential in fostering engagement in instruction, research, and extension, particularly within higher education institutions. This study evaluated the effectiveness of the communication practices of Isabela State University using a descriptive–correlational design and mixed-method approach. The study surveyed 380 students, 262 faculty members, and 217 non-teaching personnel utilizing a reliable and validated structured questionnaire to assess communication effectiveness in terms of clarity, conciseness, coherence and consistency and to measure engagement in instruction, research and extension activities. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Kruskal–Wallis test and Kendall's tau correlation, while qualitative responses from an open-ended item underwent thematic analysis.

Findings revealed that effectiveness of communication practices and engagement levels were rated high across all indicators. No significant differences emerged among stakeholder groups indicating consistency in communication effectiveness. Significant positive correlation was found between communication effectiveness and instruction, research and extension engagement. These results highlight the interconnectedness of communication practices and institutional operations. Qualitative findings further identified aspects for improvement such as standardized protocols, improved coordination, and user-friendly platforms among others which were integrated in the developed enhancement program.

The study concludes that while communication practices are generally effective, identified aspects for improvement are needed to address recurring issues and enhance engagement. Recommendations focus on establishing communication management committee, regular communication satisfaction surveys and implementing the developed enhancement program to support the institutional operations and mandates.

Keywords*: Communication Practices, Communication Effectiveness, Stakeholder Engagement, Higher Education Institutions, Communication Intervention Program*

INTRODUCTION

Communication is essential for universities to design and implement engagement programs that promote collaboration and improve student outcomes. Effective communication among faculty, administrators, students, and external partners aligns institutional goals, builds community, and supports

shared responsibility (Chretien-Winey, 2022; Misra, 2021). Clear communication enhances stakeholder participation, educational practices, and holistic student development, while also influencing institutional effectiveness, engagement, retention, and learning environments (Braxton, 2019). Conversely, communication breakdowns can lead to misunderstandings, disengagement, and program inefficiencies (Wilkinson et al., 2020). The quality of managerial communication is closely linked to organizational performance, underscoring the need for strong communication frameworks (Buljat & Ivankovic, 2019).

Theoretical perspectives such as Freeman's stakeholder theory (2022) and Cornelissen's corporate communication principles emphasize transparent and inclusive communication to strengthen stakeholder relationships and support collective decision-making. Digital technologies—including collaboration platforms, social media, and online learning tools—facilitate real-time interaction, knowledge sharing, and broader participation in governance and program implementation (Smith et al., 2020; Sminia, 2021).

Despite these benefits, challenges remain due to differing priorities, hierarchical structures, and varied communication preferences. Ineffective communication contributes to burnout, reduced job satisfaction (Dohrmann et al., 2019), and resistance to change and innovation (García-Avilés, 2020). Gaps caused by limited participation, one-way communication, cultural differences, or skill deficits weaken engagement efforts.

This study examines the effectiveness of current communication practices and engagement levels among faculty, non-teaching staff, and students at Isabela State University (ISU), identifies areas for improvement, and proposes a communication intervention program to strengthen engagement across institutional thrusts.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a non-experimental descriptive design using a mixed-methods approach across nine ISU campuses to examine communication practices and stakeholder engagement. Respondents comprised 262 faculty members, 217 non-teaching staff, and 380 students selected through stratified proportional sampling, with sample sizes determined using the Krejcie and Morgan formula at a 95% confidence level. Purposive sampling was used for the qualitative phase.

Data were gathered through a structured survey assessing the effectiveness of university communication practices in terms of clarity, conciseness, coherence, and consistency, as well as stakeholder engagement in instruction, research, and extension. The instrument was pilot-tested, expert-validated, and showed good to excellent reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.86–0.99). Surveys were administered both online and in print to increase participation. Ethical standards were upheld through informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and secure data handling.

Descriptive statistics, including means and descriptive ratings, summarized communication effectiveness and engagement levels. Due to non-normal data distribution, the Kruskal–Wallis H test was used to determine group differences, while Kendall's tau assessed relationships between communication effectiveness and engagement. Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis involving coding, theme development, review, and interpretation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Effectiveness of the Existing Communication Practices as Assessed by the Faculty, Non-teaching Staff and Students of ISU in terms of Clarity.

Clarity	Mean	Description
1. The information communicated by the university/campus is easy to understand.	3.39	Highly effective
2. University/campus announcements are written in clear and plain language.	3.39	Highly effective
3. Instructions provided in university/campus emails are easy to follow.	3.42	Highly effective
4. The purpose of university/campus communications is always clear to me.	3.43	Highly effective
5. University/campus messages avoid unnecessary jargon and technical terms.	3.36	Highly effective
6. Important points in university/campus communications are highlighted and easy to identify.	3.40	Highly effective
7. Visual aids (e.g., charts, graphs) in university/campus communications enhance my understanding.	3.42	Highly effective
8. The language used in university/campus communications is appropriate for all audiences.	3.40	Highly effective
9. University/campus communications clearly define any acronyms or abbreviations used.	3.44	Highly effective
10. The subject lines of university/campus emails accurately reflect the content.	3.43	Highly effective
11. University/campus websites and portals are easy to navigate and understand.	3.37	Highly effective
12. Verbal communications from university staff are clear and comprehensible.	3.38	Highly effective
13. University/campus communications provide clear instructions for accessing further information.	3.42	Highly effective
14. Updates and changes are clearly communicated in a timely manner.	3.41	Highly effective
15. FAQs provided by the university/campus effectively clarify common questions and concerns.	3.39	Highly effective

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Effective; 2.50 – 3.24 – Effective; 1.75 – 2.49 - Ineffective; 1.00 – 1.74 – Highly Ineffective

Table 1 evaluates ISU's communication practices in terms of clarity, with mean scores ranging from 3.37 to 3.44, all rated as highly effective. High ratings for clear announcements, appropriate language, properly formatted emails, verbal communication, and visual aids indicate that messages are effectively conveyed to faculty, non-teaching personnel, and students. These results suggest that the university prioritizes simple, jargon-free language and effective communication strategies, enhancing understanding across stakeholders.

Table 2. Effectiveness of the Existing Communication Practices as Assessed by the Faculty, Non-teaching Staff and Students of ISU in terms of Conciseness.

Conciseness	Mean	Description
1. The information provided by the university/campus is brief and to the point.	3.38	Highly effective
2. University/campus communications avoid unnecessary details.	3.41	Highly effective
3. Lengthy messages are rarely needed to understand key points	3.41	Highly effective
4. Emails from the university/campus are concise and informative.	3.42	Highly effective
5. Announcements from the university/campus are delivered in a succinct manner.	3.38	Highly effective
6. The university/campus website presents information in a concise format.	3.43	Highly effective
7. University/campus newsletters are concise and easy to read.	3.42	Highly effective
8. Important updates from the university/campus are communicated briefly.	3.39	Highly effective
9. University/campus reports summarize key information effectively.	3.39	Highly effective
10. Meetings held by the university/campus are well-structured and brief.	3.40	Highly effective
11. The university/campus social media posts convey messages succinctly.	3.40	Highly effective
12. Handouts and printed materials from the university are concise.	3.46	Highly effective
13. The university's official communications prioritize brevity.	3.43	Highly effective
14. University/campus presentations are concise and focused on main points.	3.40	Highly effective
15. Annual reports summarize achievements and plans without unnecessary elaboration	3.42	Highly effective

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Effective; 2.50 – 3.24 – Effective; 1.75 – 2.49 - Ineffective; 1.00 – 1.74 – Highly Ineffective

Table 2 evaluates ISU's communication practices in terms of conciseness, with mean scores ranging from 3.38 to 3.46, all rated as highly effective. The highest-rated item was "University printed materials and handouts" (M=3.46), followed by official websites' information emphasizing conciseness (M=3.43), indicating that briefness is valued across multiple channels.

Table 3. Effectiveness of the Existing Communication Practices as Assessed by the Faculty, Non-teaching Staff and Students of ISU in terms of Coherence.

Coherence	Mean	Description
1. The information provided by the university/campus is logically organized.	3.39	Highly effective
2. University/campus communications are structured in a way that is easy to follow.	3.43	Highly effective
3. Each part of the university/campus messages relates well to the others.	3.37	Highly effective
4. The interrelations between different elements of information within university/campus communications are clearly articulated and well-structured.	3.43	Highly effective
5. The university/campus communications present information in a sequence that makes sense.	3.40	Highly effective
6. The university/campus' communications are seldom assessed as confusing or inconsistent.	3.44	Highly effective
7. University/campus communications follow a clear and consistent format.	3.45	Highly effective
8. The main points in the university/campus' communications are easy to identify and understand.	3.39	Highly effective
9. The flow of information in university/campus communications is smooth and logical.	3.44	Highly effective
10. The university/campus uses headings and subheadings effectively to organize information.	3.38	Highly effective
11. University communications effectively use bullet points and lists to enhance clarity.	3.40	Highly effective
12. The transitions between different sections of university/campus communications are clear and logical.	3.44	Highly effective
13. Each communication from the university/campus clearly states its purpose, making it easy to identify.	3.41	Highly effective
14. The university/campus ensures that each communication piece builds on the previous information logically.	3.37	Highly effective
15. The summary and conclusions in university/campus communications clearly reflect the main points discussed.	3.41	Highly effective

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Effective; 2.50 – 3.24 – Effective; 1.75 – 2.49 - Ineffective; 1.00 – 1.74 – Highly Ineffective

Table 3 presents the evaluation of ISU's communication practices in terms of coherence, with mean scores ranging from 3.37 to 3.45, all rated as highly effective. These results indicate that university communication is generally logical, structured, clear, and consistent. High scores for logical organization, easy-to-follow structure, and smooth information flow suggest that messages are simple and coherent.

Table 4. Effectiveness of the Existing Communication Practices as Assessed by the Faculty, Non-teaching Staff and Students of ISU in terms of Consistency.

Consistency	Mean	Description
1. The university/campus consistently communicates important updates on time.	3.45	Highly effective
2. Regular and predictable communications are consistently provided by the university/campus.	3.39	Highly effective
3. The format of university/campus communications remains consistent across different messages.	3.40	Highly effective
4. The university/campus uses a consistent tone and style in its communications.	3.39	Highly effective
5. Information provided by the university/campus is consistently accurate.	3.42	Highly effective
6. The frequency of university/campus communications is steady and reliable.	3.41	Highly effective
7. Communications from different university/campus departments/offices are consistent in their messaging.	3.38	Highly effective
8. The university/campus can be relied upon to provide consistent follow-ups to previous communications.	3.39	Highly effective
9. There is a consistent point of contact for university/campus communications.	3.34	Highly effective
10. The university/campus maintains consistency in the branding of its communications.	3.42	Highly effective
11. The university/campus' communication channels are consistently recognized as effective.	3.36	Highly effective
12. The university/campus consistently informs me about changes or updates in policies.	3.39	Highly effective
13. It can be trusted that the information from the university will remain consistent and not change unexpectedly.	3.45	Highly effective
14. The university provides consistent guidelines for communication within the institution.	3.40	Highly effective
15. There is a sense of consistency in the communication expectations set by the university/campus.	3.38	Highly effective

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Effective; 2.50 – 3.24 – Effective; 1.75 – 2.49 - Ineffective; 1.00 – 1.74 – Highly Ineffective

Table 4 shows that ISU's communication practices are rated as highly effective in terms of consistency, with mean scores ranging from 3.34 to 3.45. The university performs strongly in providing timely information (M=3.45) and accurate communication (M=3.42), reinforcing stakeholder trust. Furthermore, high and stable communication frequency (M=3.39–3.41) and uniform tone, style and branding (M=3.39–3.42) reflect professionalism and readability. Consistent follow-up procedures (M=3.39), clear points of contact, and reliable interdepartmental communication (M=3.38) further minimize misunderstandings and support a positive institutional reputation.

Table 5. Faculty's Level of Engagement in terms of Instruction.

Instruction	Mean	Description
1. I feel actively involved in the planning and delivery of instructional activities.	3.38	Highly Engaged
2. I am encouraged to participate in professional development opportunities related to teaching.	3.38	Highly Engaged
3. I regularly collaborate with colleagues to improve instructional practices.	3.40	Highly Engaged
4. I find that the university/campus provides adequate resources to support my instructional activities.	3.38	Highly Engaged
5. I have access to current and relevant teaching materials and technologies.	3.38	Highly Engaged
6. I find that the university/campus offers ample training and support to help me integrate technology into my teaching.	3.41	Highly Engaged
7. I receive constructive feedback on my teaching from peers and supervisors.	3.43	Highly Engaged
8. I am involved in curriculum development and review processes.	3.43	Highly Engaged
9. I am satisfied with the opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching collaborations.	3.41	Highly Engaged
10. I find that the university/campus recognizes and rewards innovative teaching practices.	3.45	Highly Engaged
11. I am encouraged to use student feedback to improve my teaching methods.	3.41	Highly Engaged
12. I participate in workshops and seminars focused on enhancing instructional skills.	3.41	Highly Engaged
13. I find that the university/campus supports my efforts to employ diverse and inclusive teaching strategies.	3.40	Highly Engaged
14. I have the opportunity to mentor and guide students outside of formal class time.	3.39	Highly Engaged
15. I feel that my instructional efforts are valued and appreciated by the university/campus administration.	3.43	Highly Engaged

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Engaged; 2.50 – 3.24 – Moderate-High Engaged; 1.75 – 2.49 – Moderate-Low Engaged; 1.00 – 1.74 – Low Engaged

The findings in table 5 indicate strong participation among faculty respondents in various instructional activities, as shown by high mean scores across professional development, collaboration, resource access, technology integration, and curriculum development. The highest ratings such as receiving constructive feedback, involvement in curriculum matters, and recognition of innovative teaching, all exceed mean values of 3.40. These results suggest that the institution effectively fosters an environment supportive of active engagement in teaching-related tasks.

Table 6. Faculty's Level of Engagement in terms of Research.

Research	Mean	Description
1. I am actively involved in conducting research projects within the university/campus	3.38	High Engaged
2. I find that the university/campus provides sufficient resources, such as funding and facilities, to support my research activities.	3.40	High Engaged
3. I regularly collaborate with colleagues on research projects.	3.42	High Engaged
4. I have access to the necessary research tools and technologies at the university/campus.	3.40	High Engaged
5. I find that the university/campus encourages interdisciplinary research initiatives.	3.37	High Engaged
6. I receive adequate administrative support for my research endeavors.	3.41	High Engaged
7. I frequently attend research seminars and workshops organized by the university/campus.	3.39	High Engaged
8. I believe that the university/campus offers training programs to help enhance my research skills.	3.42	High Engaged
9. I have opportunities to publish my research findings through university/campus-supported platforms.	3.39	High Engaged
10. The university/campus recognizes and rewards outstanding research achievements.	3.40	High Engaged
11. I feel motivated to pursue innovative research topics due to the university/campus support.	3.36	High Engaged
12. The university/campus research policies and guidelines are clear and helpful.	3.38	High Engaged
13. I have opportunities to present my research at national and international conferences.	3.42	High Engaged
14. The university/campus facilitates connections with industry partners for applied research.	3.45	High Engaged
15. The feedback and reviews I receive on my research are constructive and beneficial.	3.40	High Engaged

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Engaged; 2.50 – 3.24 – Moderate-High Engaged; 1.75 – 2.49 – Moderate-Low Engaged; 1.00 – 1.74 – Low Engaged

Table 6 shows a high level of faculty respondent involvement in university research activities, with mean scores ranging from 3.36 to 3.45. These results indicate strong participation in conducting research, accessing resources such as funding and facilities, and collaborating with colleagues.

Table 7. Faculty's Level of Engagement in terms of Extension.

Extension	Mean	Description
1. I am actively involved in the university/campus community outreach programs.	3.37	Highly Engaged
2. I regularly participate in extension activities organized by the university/campus.	3.37	Highly Engaged
3. The university/campus provides ample opportunities for me to engage in community service.	3.41	Highly Engaged
4. I feel that my contributions to extension activities are valued by the university/campus.	3.41	Highly Engaged

5. The university/campus effectively communicates opportunities for extension activities.	3.37	Highly Engaged
6. I am encouraged to participate in extension activities by my department/program.	3.45	Highly Engaged
7. Extension activities at the university/campus align with my personal and professional interests.	3.43	Highly Engaged
8. I receive adequate support and resources to participate in extension programs.	3.41	Highly Engaged
9. The university/campus recognizes and rewards involvement in extension activities.	3.38	Highly Engaged
10. I collaborate with other stakeholders (e.g., faculty, staff, students) in extension projects.	3.40	Highly Engaged
11. The university/campus extension programs have a positive impact on the community.	3.41	Highly Engaged
12. I am aware of the goals and objectives of the university/campus extension programs.	3.41	Highly Engaged
13. I have received training or orientation on how to effectively participate in extension activities.	3.38	Highly Engaged
14. My involvement in extension activities has enhanced my skills and knowledge.	3.40	Highly Engaged
15. I would recommend participating in the university/campus' extension activities to others.	3.41	Highly Engaged

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Engaged; 2.50 – 3.24 – Moderate-High Engaged; 1.75 – 2.49 – Moderate-Low Engaged; 1.00 – 1.74 – Low Engaged

Table 7 shows generally high participation in university extension activities, with mean scores ranging from 3.37 to 3.45. This reflects a strong culture of community engagement among faculty. Faculty respondents also feel that their contributions are valued (M = 3.41), reinforcing motivation for continued involvement. Johnson et al. (2020) emphasize that both intrinsic motivation and recognition encourage sustained engagement

Table 8. Students' Level of Engagement in Instruction.

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. I feel actively involved in my learning and academic activities.	3.52	Highly Engaged
2. The university/campus provides clear and structured guidelines for academic requirements.	3.48	Highly Engaged
3. I regularly collaborate with classmates and faculty to improve my learning experience.	3.47	Highly Engaged
4. I find that the university/campus provides adequate resources, such as libraries and online tools, to support my studies.	3.40	Highly Engaged
5. I have access to up-to-date learning materials and technologies.	3.56	Highly Engaged
6. The university/campus offers ample training and support to help students integrate technology into their learning.	3.38	Highly Engaged
7. I receive constructive feedback from professors and mentors to improve my academic performance.	3.42	Highly Engaged
8. I am involved in discussions about curriculum development and academic improvements.	3.52	Highly Engaged
9. I am satisfied with the opportunities for interdisciplinary learning and collaborations.	3.39	Highly Engaged

10. The university recognizes and rewards students for outstanding academic performance.	3.42	Highly Engaged
11. I am encouraged to use faculty and peer feedback to improve my academic skills.	3.34	Highly Engaged
12. I participate in workshops and seminars focused on academic and personal development.	3.45	Highly Engaged
13. The university supports my efforts to employ diverse and inclusive learning strategies.	3.57	Highly Engaged
14. I have opportunities to seek guidance and mentorship from faculty outside of class hours.	3.43	Highly Engaged
15. I feel that my academic efforts are valued and appreciated by the university/campus administration.	3.33	Highly Engaged

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Engaged; 2.50 – 3.24 – Moderate-High Engaged; 1.75 – 2.49 – Moderate-Low Engaged; 1.00 – 1.74 – Low Engaged

Table 8 presents student engagement levels across 15 instructional support indicators, showing consistently high mean scores and strong positive perceptions. The highest rating indicating support for diverse and inclusive learning strategies (M = 3.57), reflects appreciation for flexible, student-centered approaches.

Feedback-related indicators also scored high such as students appreciated constructive feedback (M = 3.42), recognition of achievements (M = 3.42) and participation in seminars and workshops (M = 3.45), reflecting the role of development opportunities in sustaining engagement. Forsythe and Johnson (2017) highlight feedback's role in improving academic strategies, while Picton and Kahu (2021) stress how centralized support services promote belonging and resilience.

Table 9. Students' Level of Engagement in Research.

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. I am actively encouraged to engage in research activities within the university/campus.	2.45	Moderate-Low Engaged
2. The university provides sufficient resources, such as funding and facilities, to support student research.	2.49	Moderate-Low Engaged
3. I regularly collaborate with faculty and peers on research projects.	2.54	Moderate-High Engaged
4. I have access to the necessary research tools and technologies to conduct studies.	2.70	Moderate-High Engaged
5. The university/campus promotes interdisciplinary research initiatives for students.	2.66	Moderate-High Engaged
6. I receive adequate guidance from faculty on how to conduct effective research.	2.79	Moderate-High Engaged
7. I frequently attend research seminars and workshops organized by the university/campus.	3.14	Moderate-High Engaged
8. The university/campus offers training programs to help enhance my research skills.	2.60	Moderate-High Engaged
9. I have opportunities to publish my research findings through university/campus-supported platforms.	2.56	Moderate-High Engaged
10. The university/campus recognizes and rewards outstanding student research achievements.	2.61	Moderate-High Engaged

11. I feel motivated to pursue innovative research topics due to the university/campus' support.	2.62	Moderate-High Engaged
12. The university/campus' research policies and guidelines are clear and accessible to students.	2.61	Moderate-High Engaged
13. I have opportunities to present my research at national and international conferences.	2.66	Moderate-High Engaged
14. The university/campus facilitates connections with industry partners to support student research.	2.59	Moderate-High Engaged
15. The feedback I receive on my research is constructive and helps me improve.	2.63	Moderate-High Engaged

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Engaged; 2.50 – 3.24 – Moderate-High Engaged; 1.75 – 2.49 – Moderate-Low Engaged; 1.00 – 1.74 – Low Engaged

Table 9 shows a moderate level of student engagement in research, indicating that the university has established a supportive foundational environment for participation. Mid-range scores suggest that research is visible and accessible within students' academic experience, reflecting institutional structures that promote awareness and entry-level involvement. The highest-rated indicator is attendance at research seminars and workshops (M = 3.14), showing that well-organized and clearly communicated research events attract strong student participation. Moderately high ratings for faculty guidance (M = 2.79), access to research tools (M = 2.70), and promotion of interdisciplinary projects (M = 2.66) highlight the importance of mentorship, equipment availability and diverse research pathways.

However, lower ratings for feeling actively encouraged to conduct research (M = 2.45) and perceiving sufficient research resources (M = 2.49) point to gaps in communication and accessibility.

Table 10. Students' Level of Engagement in Extension.

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. I am actively involved in the university/campus' community outreach programs.	2.66	Moderate-High Engaged
2. I regularly participate in university/campus-organized extension or community service activities.	2.75	Moderate-High Engaged
3. The university/campus provides opportunities for students to engage in meaningful community service.	2.47	Moderate-Low Engaged
4. I feel that my contributions to extension activities are recognized and valued.	2.46	Moderate-Low Engaged
5. The university/campus effectively communicates opportunities for students to engage in outreach programs.	2.63	Moderate-High Engaged
6. I am encouraged by my professors and department to participate in extension activities.	2.49	Moderate-Low Engaged
7. The university/campus' extension programs align with my personal and academic interests.	2.67	Moderate-High Engaged
8. I receive adequate support and resources to participate in community engagement initiatives.	2.77	Moderate-High Engaged
9. The university/campus acknowledges and rewards student involvement in extension activities.	2.60	Moderate-High Engaged
10. I collaborate with faculty, non-teaching staff, and fellow students in community outreach projects.	2.47	Moderate-Low Engaged
11. The university's extension programs have a significant impact on the communities they serve.	2.37	Moderate-Low Engaged

12. I am well-informed about the goals and objectives of the university/campus' community service programs.	2.76	Moderate-High Engaged
13. I have received training or orientation on how to effectively participate in extension activities.	2.61	Moderate-High Engaged
14. My involvement in extension activities has enhanced my leadership, teamwork, and problem-solving skills.	2.60	Moderate-High Engaged
15. I would recommend participating in the university's extension activities to my fellow students.	2.64	Moderate-High Engaged

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Engaged; 2.50 – 3.24 – Moderate-High Engaged; 1.75 – 2.49 – Moderate-Low Engaged; 1.00 – 1.74 – Low Engaged

Table 10 shows varied levels of student engagement in extension activities across 15 indicators, ranging from moderate-low to moderate-high. This suggests that while many extension mechanisms are present and recognized, several areas still require improvement to strengthen participation and deepen community impact. A key strength lies in student participation and institutional support. Students report moderately high engagement in university-led outreach activities (M = 2.75) and adequate logistical and resource support (M = 2.77).

Students also report moderately high engagement between extension programs and their academic or personal interests (M = 2.67), as well as clarity of program goals (M = 2.76).

Table 11. Non-teaching Staff's Level of Engagement in Instruction.

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. I feel actively involved in supporting instructional activities within the university/campus.	3.34	Highly Engaged
2. I receive encouragement to attend capacity-building activities that improve my effectiveness in assisting instructional needs.	3.31	Highly Engaged
3. I actively work with faculty and staff to enhance administrative and instructional support services.	3.52	Highly Engaged
4. I find that the university provides adequate resources to help me effectively support teaching and learning.	3.68	Highly Engaged
5. I have access to the tools and resources I need to effectively assist faculty and students in instructional processes.	3.48	Highly Engaged
6. I find that the university/campus offers training to help me integrate technology into my tasks.	3.32	Highly Engaged
7. I receive constructive feedback that helps me improve the support I provide to teaching and learning.	3.72	Highly Engaged
8. I am included in discussions related to improvements in instructional and administrative processes.	3.67	Highly Engaged
9. Interoffice collaboration helps me contribute effectively to teaching and learning.	3.34	Highly Engaged
10. The university/campus values innovative ideas that enhance instructional support services.	3.37	Highly Engaged
11. I am encouraged to provide feedback that helps enhance institutional efficiency.	3.44	Highly Engaged
12. I participate in workshops and seminars to improve my administrative and support skills.	3.71	Highly Engaged

13. I find that the university/campus promotes inclusive and diverse work practices.	3.63	Highly Engaged
14. I have chances to mentor students regarding administrative processes related to their academic needs.	3.33	Highly Engaged
15. My role in supporting instructional services is appreciated by the administration.	3.32	Highly Engaged

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Engaged; 2.50 – 3.24 – Moderate-High Engaged; 1.75 – 2.49 – Moderate-Low Engaged; 1.00 – 1.74 – Low Engaged

Table 11 presents the engagement level of non-teaching staff in instructional support, revealing consistently high engagement across all indicators with mean scores ranging from 3.31 to 3.72. This suggests that non-teaching personnel actively contribute to sustaining instructional processes across the university. High engagement is observed in areas such as receiving constructive feedback, accessing institutional resources, and participating in discussions related to instructional improvements.

Table 12. Non-teaching Staff's Level of Engagement in Research.

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. I am actively involved in supporting research activities within the university/campus.	3.25	Moderate-High Engaged
2. I find that the university/campus provides sufficient resources, such as funding and facilities, to assist research initiatives.	3.69	Highly Engaged
3. I regularly collaborate with researchers and faculty to facilitate research projects.	3.29	Highly Engaged
4. I have access to the necessary tools and administrative support for research-related activities.	3.28	Highly Engaged
5. I find that the university/campus encourages interdisciplinary collaboration in research.	3.28	Highly Engaged
6. I receive adequate administrative support for processing research-related tasks.	3.31	Highly Engaged
7. I frequently assist in organizing research seminars and workshops.	3.29	Highly Engaged
8. I believe that the university offers training programs to help me enhance my research-related skills.	3.69	Highly Engaged
9. I am involved in supporting the publication and dissemination of research findings.	2.49	Moderate-Low Engaged
10. The university recognizes and values contributions made by non-teaching staff in research activities.	3.27	Highly Engaged
11. I feel motivated to support innovative research initiatives due to the university/campus encouragement.	3.32	Highly Engaged
12. The university/campus research policies and guidelines are clear.	3.28	Highly Engaged
13. I help facilitate research collaborations between the university/campus and external partners.	2.90	Moderate-High Engaged
14. The university/campus provides opportunities for me to engage in professional networking related to research.	2.82	Moderate-High Engaged
15. I find that the feedback and guidance provided to research support staff are constructive and helpful.	2.97	Moderate-High Engaged

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Engaged; 2.50 – 3.24 – Moderate-High Engaged; 1.75 – 2.49 – Moderate-Low Engaged; 1.00 – 1.74 – Low Engaged

Table 12 shows that non-teaching staff demonstrate moderate-low to high engagement in research support activities, with mean scores ranging from 2.49 to 3.69, reflecting variability depending on the nature of research-related tasks. High engagement is observed in areas such as access to resources, participation in training programs, collaboration with researchers, administrative support for research tasks, organization of research seminars, and interdisciplinary research support.

Table 13. Non-teaching Staff's Level of Engagement in Extension.

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. I am actively involved in the university's community outreach programs.	2.42	Moderate-Low Engaged
2. I regularly participate in extension activities organized by the university/campus.	2.47	Moderate-Low Engaged
3. The university provides ample opportunities for non-teaching staff to engage in community service.	3.22	Moderate-High Engaged
4. I feel that my contributions to extension activities are recognized and valued.	2.43	Moderate-Low Engaged
5. The university/campus effectively communicates opportunities for non-teaching staff to engage in extension programs.	3.21	Moderate-High Engaged
6. I am encouraged to participate in extension activities by my department or unit.	3.26	Highly Engaged
7. The university/campus' extension activities align with my professional and personal interests.	3.29	Highly Engaged
8. I receive adequate support and resources to participate in community engagement programs.	3.28	Highly Engaged
9. The university/campus acknowledges and rewards non-teaching staff for their involvement in extension activities.	3.26	Highly Engaged
10. I collaborate with faculty, students, and external stakeholders in community outreach projects.	3.26	Highly Engaged
11. The university/campus' extension programs have a meaningful impact on the community.	3.31	Highly Engaged
12. I am well-informed about the goals and objectives of the university/campus' extension initiatives.	3.35	Highly Engaged
13. I have received training or orientation on how to effectively participate in extension programs.	3.35	Highly Engaged
14. My involvement in extension activities has enhanced my professional skills and knowledge.	3.33	Highly Engaged
15. I would recommend participation in the university/campus' extension activities to my colleagues.	3.32	Highly Engaged

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 - Highly Engaged; 2.50 – 3.24 – Moderate-High Engaged; 1.75 – 2.49 – Moderate-Low Engaged; 1.00 – 1.74 – Low Engaged

Table 13 shows non-teaching staff engagement in extension activities, ranging from Moderate-Low (M = 2.42–2.47) to Highly Engaged (M = 3.26–3.35). High engagement is seen in understanding program goals (M = 3.35), receiving training (M = 3.35), and recommending participation to colleagues (M = 3.32), reflecting a positive culture where clarity, training, and peer encouragement foster involvement. Other

highly rated areas include professional rewards (M = 3.33), departmental encouragement (M = 3.26), alignment with personal/professional interests (M = 3.29), support/resources availability (M = 3.28), collaboration with stakeholders (M = 3.26), and perception of community impact (M = 3.31). Some indicators show moderate engagement, including institutional communication and opportunities (M = 3.21–3.22), direct involvement in outreach (M = 2.42), participation in university-organized activities (M = 2.47), and recognition of contributions (M = 2.43).

Table 14. Difference in the Effectiveness of Communication Practices in the University/Campus in Terms of Clarity According to the Group of Respondents.

Clarity	Faculty		Student		Non-Teaching		Chi-Square	Sig
	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1. The information communicated by the university/campus is easy to understand.	3.39	HE	3.39	HE	3.37	HE	0.04^{ns}	0.98
2. University/campus announcements are written in clear and plain language.	3.35	HE	3.41	HE	3.4	HE	1.52^{ns}	0.47
3. Instructions provided in university/campus emails are easy to follow.	3.39	HE	3.43	HE	3.44	HE	0.61^{ns}	0.74
4. The purpose of university/campus communications is always clear to me.	3.48	HE	3.43	HE	3.36	HE	3.01^{ns}	0.22
5. University/campus messages avoid unnecessary jargon and technical terms.	3.35	HE	3.37	HE	3.36	HE	0.28^{ns}	0.87
6. Important points in university/campus communications are highlighted and easy to identify.	3.37	HE	3.39	HE	3.44	HE	1.82^{ns}	0.40
7. Visual aids (e.g., charts, graphs) in university/campus communications enhance my understanding.	3.41	HE	3.38	HE	3.49	HE	3.34^{ns}	0.19
8. The language used in university/campus communications is appropriate for all audiences.	3.36	HE	3.44	HE	3.39	HE	2.74^{ns}	0.25
9. University/campus communications clearly define any acronyms or abbreviations used.	3.47	HE	3.45	HE	3.41	HE	1.31^{ns}	0.52
10. The subject lines of university/campus emails accurately reflect the content.	3.41	HE	3.46	HE	3.41	HE	2.29^{ns}	0.32
11. University/campus websites and portals are easy to navigate and understand.	3.37	HE	3.35	HE	3.4	HE	1.65^{ns}	0.44
12. Verbal communications from university staff are clear and comprehensible.	3.4	HE	3.36	HE	3.4	HE	0.60^{ns}	0.74
13. University/campus communications provide clear instructions for accessing further information.	3.45	HE	3.45	HE	3.33	HE	3.93^{ns}	0.14
14. Updates and changes are clearly communicated in a timely manner.	3.42	HE	3.39	HE	3.41	HE	0.48^{ns}	0.79
15. FAQs provided by the university/campus effectively clarify common questions and concerns.	3.36	HE	3.40	HE	3.42	HE	0.63^{ns}	0.73

M=Mean; D=Description; HE = Highly effective; ^{ns}Not Significant

Table 14 presents faculty, student, and non-teaching staff perspectives on the clarity of the university's communication practices. Across all indicators, communication was rated as highly effective (M = 3.33–3.49), indicating that announcements, emails, websites, and verbal exchanges are generally clear and comprehensible.

Table 15. Difference in the Effectiveness of Communication Practices in the University in Terms of Conciseness According to the Group of Respondents.

Conciseness	Faculty		Student		Non-Teaching		Chi-Square	Sig
	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1. The information provided by the university/campus is brief and to the point.	3.39	HE	3.37	HE	3.39	HE	0.13^{ns}	0.94
2. University/campus communications avoid unnecessary details.	3.42	HE	3.39	HE	3.44	HE	0.57^{ns}	0.75
3. Lengthy messages are rarely needed to understand key points	3.44	HE	3.40	HE	3.37	HE	0.51^{ns}	0.78
4. Emails from the university/campus are concise and informative.	3.41	HE	3.42	HE	3.42	HE	0.22^{ns}	0.90
5. Announcements from the university/campus are delivered in a succinct manner.	3.41	HE	3.37	HE	3.37	HE	1.04^{ns}	0.59
6. The university/campus website presents information in a concise format.	3.37	HE	3.46	HE	3.43	HE	3.98^{ns}	0.14
7. University/campus newsletters are concise and easy to read.	3.49	HE	3.41	HE	3.34	HE	7.81*	0.02
8. Important updates from the university/campus are communicated briefly.	3.43	HE	3.36	HE	3.41	HE	1.26^{ns}	0.53
9. University/campus reports summarize key information effectively.	3.38	HE	3.37	HE	3.43	HE	2.80^{ns}	0.25
10. Meetings held by the university/campus are well-structured and brief.	3.44	HE	3.41	HE	3.31	HE	6.30*	0.04
11. The university/campus social media posts convey messages succinctly.	3.41	HE	3.38	HE	3.42	HE	0.30^{ns}	0.86
12. Handouts and printed materials from the university are concise.	3.40	HE	3.48	HE	3.51	HE	5.60^{ns}	0.06
13. The university's official communications prioritize brevity.	3.41	HE	3.42	HE	3.47	HE	1.59^{ns}	0.45
14. University/campus presentations are concise and focused on main points.	3.41	HE	3.43	HE	3.33	HE	2.98^{ns}	0.23
15. Annual reports summarize achievements and plans without unnecessary elaboration	3.48	HE	3.35	HE	3.45	HE	6.19*	0.04

M=Mean; D=Description; HE = Highly effective; ^{ns}=Not Significant

Table 15 presents faculty, students, and non-teaching staff perceptions of the university's communication conciseness. Overall, communication across channels was rated as highly effective (M = 3.31–3.51), indicating messages are brief, focused, and easy to process. Chi-square analysis shows no

significant differences for most indicators, suggesting that all groups perceive university communication as equally concise.

Table 16. Difference in the Effectiveness of Communication Practices in the University in Terms of Coherence According to the Group of Respondents.

Coherence	Faculty		Student		Non-Teaching		Chi-Square	Sig
	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1. The information provided by the university/campus is logically organized.	3.41	HE	3.41	HE	3.33	HE	2.47^{ns}	0.29
2. University/campus communications are structured in a way that is easy to follow.	3.48	HE	3.44	HE	3.35	HE	5.53^{ns}	0.06
3. Each part of the university/campus messages relates well to the others.	3.32	HE	3.42	HE	3.33	HE	3.83^{ns}	0.15
4. The interrelations between different elements of information within university/campus communications are clearly articulated and well-structured.	3.40	HE	3.44	HE	3.43	HE	1.67^{ns}	0.43
5. The university/campus communications present information in a sequence that makes sense.	3.38	HE	3.42	HE	3.39	HE	2.04^{ns}	0.36
6. The university/campus' communications are seldom assessed as confusing or inconsistent.	3.45	HE	3.42	HE	3.43	HE	0.19^{ns}	0.91
7. University/campus communications follow a clear and consistent format.	3.45	HE	3.44	HE	3.45	HE	1.05^{ns}	0.59
8. The main points in the university/campus' communications are easy to identify and understand.	3.40	HE	3.36	HE	3.41	HE	0.44^{ns}	0.80
9. The flow of information in university/campus communications is smooth and logical.	3.45	HE	3.44	HE	3.44	HE	0.32^{ns}	0.85
10. The university/campus uses headings and subheadings effectively to organize information.	3.38	HE	3.39	HE	3.35	HE	1.13^{ns}	0.57
11. University communications effectively use bullet points and list to enhance clarity.	3.40	HE	3.43	HE	3.35	HE	1.59^{ns}	0.45
12. The transitions between different sections of university/campus communications are clear and logical.	3.52	HE	3.40	HE	3.41	HE	4.55^{ns}	0.10
13. Each communication from the university/campus clearly states its purpose, making it easy to identify.	3.43	HE	3.36	HE	3.46	HE	3.05^{ns}	0.22
14. The university/campus ensures that each communication piece builds on the previous information logically.	3.34	HE	3.41	HE	3.34	HE	1.76^{ns}	0.41
15. The summary and conclusions in university/campus communications clearly reflect the main points discussed.	3.44	HE	3.38	HE	3.41	HE	1.18^{ns}	0.55

M=Mean; D=Description; HE = Highly effective; ^{ns}=Not Significant

Table 16 presents faculty, student, and non-teaching staff evaluations of the university's communication coherence. All indicators were rated as highly effective (M = 3.32–3.52), indicating that information is generally logical, well-structured, and organized. Chi-square analysis shows no significant differences among groups, suggesting a shared perception of coherence across faculty, students, and non-teaching staff. High ratings for formats, headings, bullet points, and transitions indicate that messages are easy to follow and free from major inconsistencies.

Table 17. Difference in the Effectiveness of Communication Practices in the University in Terms of Consistency According to the Group of   Respondents.

Consistency	Faculty		Student		Non-Teaching		Chi-Square	Sig
	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1. The university/campus consistently communicates important updates on time.	3.46	HE	3.43	HE	3.47	HE	0.51^{ns}	0.78
2. Regular and predictable communications are consistently provided by the university/campus.	3.40	HE	3.42	HE	3.34	HE	5.23^{ns}	0.07
3. The format of university/campus communications remains consistent across different messages.	3.44	HE	3.37	HE	3.41	HE	1.55^{ns}	0.46
4. The university/campus uses a consistent tone and style in its communications.	3.38	HE	3.43	HE	3.34	HE	2.57^{ns}	0.28
5. Information provided by the university/campus is consistently accurate.	3.43	HE	3.42	HE	3.42	HE	0.06^{ns}	0.97
6. The frequency of university/campus communications is steady and reliable.	3.42	HE	3.40	HE	3.41	HE	0.17^{ns}	0.92
7. Communications from different university/campus departments/offices are consistent in their messaging.	3.34	HE	3.37	HE	3.43	HE	2.96^{ns}	0.23
8. The university/campus can be relied upon to provide consistent follow-ups to previous communications.	3.42	HE	3.41	HE	3.32	HE	5.49^{ns}	0.06
9. There is a consistent point of contact for university/campus communications.	3.33	HE	3.35	HE	3.35	HE	0.56^{ns}	0.76
10. The university/campus maintains consistency in the branding of its communications.	3.44	HE	3.43	HE	3.40	HE	0.75^{ns}	0.69
11. The university/campus' communication channels are consistently recognized as effective.	3.38	HE	3.36	HE	3.33	HE	0.25^{ns}	0.88
12. The university/campus consistently informs me about changes or updates in policies.	3.40	HE	3.36	HE	3.43	HE	2.34^{ns}	0.31
13. It can be trusted that the information from the university will remain consistent and not change unexpectedly.	3.47	HE	3.43	HE	3.45	HE	0.89^{ns}	0.64
14. The university provides consistent guidelines for communication within the institution.	3.42	HE	3.40	HE	3.39	HE	0.17^{ns}	0.92
15. There is a sense of consistency in the communication expectations set by the university/campus.	3.35	HE	3.42	HE	3.35	HE	2.17^{ns}	0.34

M=Mean; D=Description; HE = Highly effective; ^{ns}=Not Significant

Table 17 presents faculty, student, and non-teaching staff evaluations of the university's communication consistency. All items were rated as highly effective (M = 3.32–3.47), indicating that communication is steady, reliable, and uniform across platforms. Chi-square analysis shows no significant differences among groups, suggesting that all stakeholders experience similar reliability in communications.

Table 18. Relationship Between Respondents' Evaluation of Communication Effectiveness in Terms of Clarity and Engagement Level

Clarity	Instruction		Research		Extension	
	Corr	Sig	Corr	Sig	Corr	Sig
1. The information communicated by the university/campus is easy to understand.	0.01^{ns}	0.63	0.06*	0.05	0.03^{ns}	0.23
2. University/campus announcements are written in clear and plain language.	0.03^{ns}	0.28	0.08*	0.01	0.05^{ns}	0.07
3. Instructions provided in university/campus emails are easy to follow.	0.06*	0.03	0.03^{ns}	0.24	0.11*	0.00
4. The purpose of university/campus communications is always clear to me.	0.06*	0.03	0.05*	0.07	0.09*	0.00
5. University/campus messages avoid unnecessary jargon and technical terms.	0.14*	0.00	0.09*	0.00	0.10*	0.00
6. Important points in university/campus communications are highlighted and easy to identify.	0.09*	0.00	0.13*	0.00	0.07*	0.01
7. Visual aids (e.g., charts, graphs) in university/campus communications enhance my understanding.	0.12*	0.00	0.05^{ns}	0.09	0.08*	0.01
8. The language used in university/campus communications is appropriate for all audiences.	0.04^{ns}	0.14	0.05^{ns}	0.06	0.07*	0.02
9. University/campus communications clearly define any acronyms or abbreviations used.	0.10*	0.00	0.08*	0.01	0.05^{ns}	0.08
10. The subject lines of university/campus emails accurately reflect the content.	0.06*	0.02	0.07*	0.02	0.11*	0.00
11. University/campus websites and portals are easy to navigate and understand.	0.11*	0.00	0.08*	0.00	0.13*	0.00
12. Verbal communications from university staff are clear and comprehensible.	0.08*	0.00	0.04^{ns}	0.14	0.02^{ns}	0.56
13. University/campus communications provide clear instructions for accessing further information.	0.05^{ns}	0.09	0.07*	0.02	0.06*	0.03
14. Updates and changes are clearly communicated in a timely manner.	0.10*	0.00	0.14*	0.00	0.12*	0.00
15. FAQs provided by the university/campus effectively clarify common questions and concerns.	0.05^{ns}	0.09	0.08*	0.01	0.10*	0.00

^{ns}*Not Significant* *Significant*

Table 18 highlights the positive impact of clear university communication on engagement in instruction, research, and extension. Clear instructions, transparent message purpose, avoidance of jargon,

emphasis on key points, and use of visual aids were significantly correlated with higher engagement across all areas. Clarity in instructions (Corr.=0.06–0.14, $p<0.05$), visual aids, accurate subject lines, and user-friendly websites were associated with increased instructional engagement, supporting findings that well-organized and comprehensible communication promotes participation.

Table 19. Relationship Between Respondents' Evaluation of Communication Effectiveness in Terms of Conciseness and Engagement Level

Conciseness	Instruction		Research		Extension	
	Corr	Sig	Corr	Sig	Corr	Sig
1. The information provided by the university/campus is brief and to the point.	0.05^{ns}	0.07	0.05^{ns}	0.08	0.07^*	0.01
2. University/campus communications avoid unnecessary details.	0.14^*	0.00	0.07^*	0.01	0.10^*	0.00
3. Lengthy messages are rarely needed to understand key points	0.06^*	0.03	0.07^*	0.01	0.08^*	0.01
4. Emails from the university/campus are concise and informative.	0.01^{ns}	0.65	0.08^*	0.01	0.04^{ns}	0.13
5. Announcements from the university/campus are delivered in a succinct manner.	0.05^{ns}	0.06	0.03^{ns}	0.31	0.04^{ns}	0.20
6. The university/campus website presents information in a concise format.	0.10^*	0.00	0.09^*	0.00	0.13^*	0.00
7. University/campus newsletters are concise and easy to read.	0.04^{ns}	0.18	0.03^{ns}	0.24	0.07^*	0.02
8. Important updates from the university/campus are communicated briefly.	0.09^*	0.00	0.11^*	0.00	0.10^*	0.00
9. University/campus reports summarize key information effectively.	0.07^*	0.02	0.07^*	0.01	0.09^*	0.00
10. Meetings held by the university/campus are well-structured and brief.	0.04^{ns}	0.18	0.04^{ns}	0.14	0.05^{ns}	0.06
11. The university/campus social media posts convey messages succinctly.	0.11^*	0.00	0.07^*	0.02	0.09^*	0.00
12. Handouts and printed materials from the university are concise.	0.08^*	0.01	0.15^*	0.00	0.07^*	0.01
13. The university's official communications prioritize brevity.	0.03^{ns}	0.31	0.03^{ns}	0.28	0.02^{ns}	0.45
14. University/campus presentations are concise and focused on main points.	0.03^{ns}	0.29	0.08^*	0.01	0.07^*	0.02
15. Annual reports summarize achievements and plans without unnecessary elaboration	0.09^*	0.00	0.06^*	0.04	0.10^*	0.00

^{ns}Not Significant *Significant

Table 19 highlights the significant role of conciseness in university communication for enhancing engagement in instruction, research, and extension. The correlations (0.06–0.15, $p < 0.05$) indicate that brief, focused messages promote participation among faculty, students, and non-teaching staff.

Table 20. Relationship Between Respondents' Evaluation of Communication Effectiveness in Terms of Coherence and Engagement Level.

Coherence	Instruction		Research		Extension	
	Corr	Sig	Corr	Sig	Corr	Sig
1. The information provided by the university/campus is logically organized.	0.10*	0.00	0.08*	0.01	0.07*	0.02
2. University/campus communications are structured in a way that is easy to follow.	0.04^{ns}	0.13	0.09*	0.00	0.09*	0.00
3. Each part of the university/campus messages relates well to the others.	0.06*	0.03	0.08*	0.01	0.04^{ns}	0.13
4. The interrelations between different elements of information within university/campus communications are clearly articulated and well-structured.	0.09*	0.00	0.09*	0.00	0.05*	0.06
5. The university/campus communications present information in a sequence that makes sense.	0.04^{ns}	0.16	0.04^{ns}	0.18	0.05*	0.11
6. The university/campus' communications are seldom assessed as confusing or inconsistent.	0.06*	0.03	0.01^{ns}	0.70	0.04*	0.13
7. University/campus communications follow a clear and consistent format.	0.09*	0.00	0.09*	0.00	0.11*	0.00
8. The main points in the university/campus' communications are easy to identify and understand.	0.09*	0.00	0.13*	0.00	0.10*	0.00
9. The flow of information in university/campus communications is smooth and logical.	0.07*	0.02	0.06*	0.02	0.07*	0.02
10. The university/campus uses headings and subheadings effectively to organize information.	0.02^{ns}	0.50	0.09*	0.00	0.07*	0.02
11. University communications effectively use bullet points and lists to enhance clarity.	0.03^{ns}	0.29	0.07*	0.02	0.06*	0.03
12. The transitions between different sections of university/campus communications are clear and logical.	0.03^{ns}	0.25	0.07*	0.02	0.13*	0.00
13. Each communication from the university/campus clearly states its purpose, making it easy to identify.	0.12*	0.00	0.08*	0.01	0.09*	0.00
14. The university/campus ensures that each communication piece builds on the previous information logically.	0.05^{ns}	0.06	0.08*	0.00	0.10*	0.00
15. The summary and conclusions in university/campus communications clearly reflect the main points discussed.	0.10*	0.00	0.09*	0.00	0.09*	0.00

^{ns}Not Significant *Significant

Table 20 highlights the significant relationship between coherent university communication and engagement in instruction, research, and extension activities. The results indicate that participation improves when messages are logically organized, clear, and structured. Correlation coefficients (0.06–0.12, $p < 0.05$) show that instructional engagement increases with coherent communication.

Table 21. Relationship Between Respondents' Evaluation of Communication Effectiveness in Terms of Consistency and Engagement Level

Consistency	Instruction		Research		Extension	
	Corr	Sig	Corr	Sig	Corr	Sig
1. The university/campus consistently communicates important updates on time.	0.11*	0.00	0.11*	0.00	0.13*	0.00
2. Regular and predictable communications are consistently provided by the university/campus.	0.04^{ns}	0.15	0.08*	0.00	0.05^{ns}	0.06
3. The format of university/campus communications remains consistent across different messages.	0.05^{ns}	0.07	0.08*	0.01	0.04^{ns}	0.22
4. The university/campus uses a consistent tone and style in its communications.	0.04^{ns}	0.20	0.08*	0.01	0.05^{ns}	0.09
5. Information provided by the university/campus is consistently accurate.	0.07*	0.01	0.05^{ns}	0.09	0.08*	0.00
6. The frequency of university/campus communications is steady and reliable.	0.03^{ns}	0.37	0.04^{ns}	0.19	0.10*	0.00
7. Communications from different university/campus departments/offices are consistent in their messaging.	0.04^{ns}	0.15	0.05^{ns}	0.11	0.08*	0.01
8. The university/campus can be relied upon to provide consistent follow-ups to previous communications.	0.07*	0.01	0.08*	0.01	0.05^{ns}	0.11
9. There is a consistent point of contact for university/campus communications.	0.12*	0.00	0.10*	0.00	0.11*	0.00
10. The university/campus maintains consistency in the branding of its communications.	0.04^{ns}	0.19	0.07*	0.01	0.14*	0.00
11. The university/campus' communication channels are consistently recognized as effective.	0.13*	0.00	0.11*	0.00	0.15*	0.00
12. The university/campus consistently informs me about changes or updates in policies.	0.10*	0.00	0.11*	0.00	0.10*	0.00
13. It can be trusted that the information from the university will remain consistent and not change unexpectedly.	0.06*	0.04	0.04^{ns}	0.15	0.09*	0.00
14. The university provides consistent guidelines for communication within the institution.	0.10*	0.00	0.05^{ns}	0.07	0.14*	0.00
15. There is a sense of consistency in the communication expectations set by the university/campus.	0.09*	0.00	0.06*	0.05	0.08*	0.00

^{ns}*Not Significant* *Significant*

Table 21 highlights the relationship between consistent university communication and engagement in instruction, research, and extension activities. The results show that regular, reliable communication significantly enhances participation across all areas. Correlation coefficients (0.06–0.13, $p < 0.05$) indicate that consistent updates, timely information, and follow-ups improve engagement in instructional activities.

Aspect of The University's Communication Practices That Needs Improvement

Among students, key themes included timely information dissemination, effective orientation and briefing mechanisms, clarity of messages, student-centered communication practices, and opportunities for broader stakeholder participation.

Faculty highlighted the need for consistent and coherent institutional messaging, complete and clear information, standardized guidelines, improved digital communication systems, and more effective use of meetings.

Non-teaching staff emphasized the importance of institutional support for professional development, inclusive and relevant communication, capacity-building through training and orientations, efficient interoffice communication, stronger interdepartmental collaboration, and clear, standardized operational protocols.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The findings of this study indicate that Isabela State University's communication practices in instruction, research, and extension are generally effective, as reflected by high mean ratings across all assessed indicators. Communication within the university is clear, relevant, and supportive of academic and institutional activities, and stakeholders—including students, faculty members, and non-teaching personnel—share similar experiences regarding these practices. Effective instructional communication is positively associated with higher levels of engagement in research and extension activities, with clarity, coherence, and accuracy facilitating collaboration, mentoring, productivity, and participation in community initiatives. Moreover, engagement in research significantly influences engagement in extension activities, suggesting that strong internal and external collaborations, mentoring structures, and resource sharing contribute to more meaningful and productive outcomes. Despite these strengths, challenges remain in the areas of timeliness, consistency, clarity, and inclusiveness, which hinder optimal engagement and highlight areas for targeted improvement. Stakeholders further recognize the need for standardized communication procedures, improved coordination among units, user-friendly platforms, and enhanced transparency mechanisms to strengthen communication across the university's core functions.

In response to these findings, it is recommended that the university establish a communication management committee or designate focal persons in each office to streamline coordination and minimize inconsistencies. Regular communication satisfaction surveys, feedback channels, and monitoring systems should be implemented to evaluate the effectiveness of communication practices and guide continuous improvement. Finally, the developed Communication Intervention Program should be applied across all units, complemented by a standardized communication framework and manual to ensure clarity, accuracy, consistency, and timely dissemination of information throughout the university.

REFERENCES

Anderson, T., & Roberts, M. (2020). The role of motivation in university–community partnerships: A case study. Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship, 15(2), 97–112.

Antiado, D. F. A., Jr., Cañete, F. G., Reblando, J. R. P., & Tawadrous, M. I. (2020). Managing professional development activities for non-teaching staff for professional growth. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8(7), 3280–3285.

Asirit, L. B. L., & Hua, J. H. (2023). Converging perspectives: Assessing AI readiness and utilization in Philippine higher education. Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends, 2(3), 1-50.

Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: A systematic evidence map. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17, Article 2.

Bowman, J. D. (2019). Making the most of visual aids. Edutopia.

Braxton, J. M. (Ed.). (2019). The role of the classroom in college student persistence. New Directions for Teaching and Learning.

Buljat, M., & Ivankovic, M. (2019). The correlation between managerial communication and organizational performance. Economic and Social Development: Book of Proceedings, 198-207.

Chretien-Winey, L. (2022). Strategic communication in higher education: Engaging stakeholders for institutional success. Journal of University Communications, 14(3), 45-59.

Cornelissen, J. (2020). Corporate communication: A guide to theory and practice (7th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dohrmann, S., Klerings, I., & Wagner, G. (2019). Communication breakdown and burnout in academic settings: A systematic review. International Journal of Stress Management, 26(4), 345-359.

Forsythe, A., & Johnson, S. (2017). Thanks, but no-thanks for the feedback. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 42(6), 850–859.

Freeman, R. E. (2022). Stakeholder theory: State of the art. In The Cambridge Handbook of Stakeholder Theory (pp. 1-18). Cambridge University Press.

García-Avilés, J. A. (2020). Innovation resistance: The interplay between communication and organizational change. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 33(5), 877-890.

Johnson, P., Williams, K., & Lee, M. (2020). Motivation and recognition in university extension programs. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 24(2), 45-62.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30(3), 607-610.

Larkin, B., & Richardson, I. (2021). Best practices in university-community communication. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 49(1), 78-95.

Misra, K. (2021). Aligning goals through communication: A framework for higher education institutions. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 49(4), 682-699.

Picton, C., & Kahu, E. R. (2021). 'I knew I had the support from them': understanding student support through a student engagement lens. Higher Education Research & Development, 41(6), 2034–2047.

Sminia, H. (2021). Digital governance: The role of technology in university stakeholder engagement. Studies in Higher Education, 46(8), 1623-1635.

Smith, J., Brown, T., & Davis, L. (2020). Digital tools for collaborative governance in higher education. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 23(2), 112-125.

Wilkinson, S., Baughan, C., & Hinton, L. (2020). The cost of miscommunication: Disengagement in higher education programs. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 44(7), 891-905.