

Research productivity and engagement of faculty

Palmiano, Dariel A. ✉

Central Bicol State University of Agriculture – Calabanga Campus
Ratay, Sta Cruz, Calabanga, Camarines Sur, Philippines (dariel.palmiano@cbsua.edu.ph)

Received: 18 July 2024

Available Online: 15 August 2024

Revised: 13 August 2024

DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2024.24084

Accepted: 15 August 2024

ISSN: 2243-7703

Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS



Abstract

Given that conducting research is one of the four primary mandated functions of state universities, it has grown to be a significant factor in deciding university rankings. The study evaluated the academic members of the College of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, and College of Industrial Technology of the Calabanga Campus of Central Bicol State University of Agriculture for their engagement and productivity in research. Additionally, it analyzed and documented the three-year span, from 2020 to 2022, of faculty research productivity and engagements. A descriptive research design and comprehensive (or total enumeration) sampling were both used in the study. The College of Arts and Sciences provided the largest percentage of productivity contributions across all categories, with the exception of accepted projects. Only 25.6% of the total approved proposals were finished, 12.8% were presented, 5.1 were published, 1.7 were cited, and 5.13 received awards and recognition. The study's findings showed that faculty engagements and productivity in their research fell between very low and low levels.

Keywords: research engagement, research productivity

Research productivity and engagement of faculty

1. Introduction

Instruction, research, and extension are the three core responsibilities of the HEIs. Faculty members are seen as the front-line workers at all HEIs, leading the charge in carrying out the aforementioned fundamental duties (Quitoras & Abuso, 2021). Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have a responsibility to disseminate knowledge, produce new knowledge, share that knowledge with the society, and create products that would improve people's quality of life (Vinluan, 2012). Meanwhile, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) expects universities and colleges to produce high-quality research that advances higher learning and national development and maintains the international comparability of the Philippine education system, specifically in the Asian region (Tarrayo et al., 2021). The UNESCO World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st Century said that higher education institutions (HEIs) should advance, generate, and distribute knowledge through research. They should offer pertinent expertise as part of their community service to help societies develop in terms of their cultures, society, and economies (Gomba & Pacolor, 2014).

Research is one of the primary pillars on which a university education is founded. Therefore, it is the duty of an organization to foster a culture that supports high-quality research findings, engagement, and participation in research activities, as well as to promote and advance research in the social sciences, humanities, and the creative arts, among others, in order to highlight the importance and effectiveness of research, including the translation of research findings into practice (Gomba & Pacolor, 2014). Research is crucial and cannot be undervalued in a university setting (Usang et al., 2007). It is so important and fundamental that it determines the standard of any higher education institution, serves as a major criterion for academic staff promotions, exposes academic staff to new information and encourages the exchange of sociocultural ideas with others, and creates more opportunities for networking and collaboration among scholars around the globe (Akuegwu, 2006; Usang et al., 2007).

In addition, Georghiou (2015) listed a number of ways that research has an impact and adds value, including: 1) expanding the body of knowledge that is useful; 2) developing skilled workers; 3) developing new scientific instruments and methodologies and working with users to use them; and 4) collaborating in research projects and networks with users. The quality of student and teacher learning can also be enhanced and improved by supporting faculty members' ability for research (Nasser-Abu Alhija & Alhija, 2017). Moreover, a driving motivation in promoting research within the institution could be the desire to establish the university as a leader in academic excellence and innovation. By fostering a strong research culture, the institution can enhance its reputation, attract top faculty and students, secure competitive funding, and contribute meaningful solutions to societal challenges. Additionally, promoting research aligns with the university's mission to advance knowledge, improve teaching quality, and prepare students for successful careers, making research a core component of its overall development strategy.

Research productivity evaluation provides a starting point for choices on tenure and promotion, research funding distribution, higher education reform initiatives, and more recently, as a measure of institution excellence (Moed, 2005). Research productivity has grown to be a key indicator of how much academic institutions contribute to knowledge creation. It is regarded as one of the indicators of the institution's quality, faculty members' career success, interest in institutional rankings, and prestige seeking. The term is linked to two concepts: (a) exploration, which denotes a meticulous analysis of phenomena in order to uncover new realities; and (b) efficiency, which denotes its creation provided in a short amount of time (Alghanim & Alhamali, 2011; Fawzi & Al-Hattami, 2017; & Batool et al., 2018;). According to Suson et al. (2020) with the onset of internationalization, a HEI's research productivity is crucial for its survival and long-term growth.

Studying faculty research productivity is justified because it is now a prerequisite for things like achieving academic success (especially in terms of tenure, faculty promotion, and salary increases), professional advancement, departmental and institutional prestige, university rankings, and academic performance at the university level (Creamer, 1998; Kotlik et al., 2002; & Jung, 2012). Although it has been rising over the past several years, the research output of higher education institutions in the Philippines still lags behind that of our Southeast Asian neighbors (British Council, 2015). Among the 131 economies, the Philippines improved to take 50th place and ranked in 80+ metrics broken down into innovation inputs and outputs (Cornell University et al., 2020). Moreover, on the basis of the Scopus statistics from April 2020, the Philippines was rated sixth among the ASEAN region's ten-member states. The country has 38,024 documents in the Scopus database and 34,839 of which are citable. The country recorded a total of 571,112 total citations with 55,765 self-citations. An average of 15.02 citations per document was recorded with an h-index of 246 (*Scimago Journal & Country Rank*, 2020). In terms of knowledge and technology outputs, the Philippines is ranked 26th overall, 29th in business sophistication, 57th in creative outputs, 63rd in infrastructure, 86th in market sophistication, 86th in human capital and research, and 91st in institutions. These results show that the country still has to strengthen its human capital and research, as it is rated below average (Rogayan & Corpuz, 2022).

In sum, as an increasingly research-based university and as a university with the vision of becoming an agricultural research university of global standards, the Central State University of Agriculture is under pressure to build research capacity, optimize research performance, and demonstrate academic and achievement in relation to quality research outcomes. This study was therefore conceptualized to investigate the research productivity and engagement of faculty at Central Bicol State University of Agriculture-Calabanga Campus. Specifically, the study aimed to assess the faculty's research accomplishments over the past three years and the extent of their involvement in research activities. By examining these aspects, the study sought to identify areas for improvement and provide insights that could enhance the research culture within the university.

2. Methodology

A descriptive research design was adopted for this study, which is typically used to describe characteristics of a population or phenomenon being studied without manipulating any variables (Nassaji, 2015). Descriptive research allows for a thorough and detailed examination of the subjects under investigation, providing a clear picture of the situation as it exists (Creswell, 2014). In this study, document analysis was employed to examine the research productivity and engagement of faculty members at Central Bicol State University of Agriculture-Calabanga Campus across three time periods: 2020, 2021, and 2022. The inquiry focused on the research output of 48 faculty members in 2020, 48 faculty members in 2021, and 50 faculty members in 2022, with a particular emphasis on the faculty's engagement in mandated research activities.

A comprehensive sampling method, also known as total enumeration, was utilized, where all faculty members involved in research were included in the analysis. This approach ensures that the findings are representative of the entire population being studied. The faculty members considered in this study were from the College of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, and College of Industrial Technology, providing a broad perspective on research productivity and engagement across different academic disciplines within the university.

Written request from the campus research coordinator was sought to gain access to the data. In the data analysis, the faculty research productivity was assessed using a variety of factors, including the number of approved proposals, completed research projects, research presentations, publication counts, citation counts, awards received by the faculty, and the number of faculty members who attended trainings, workshops, fora, and colloquia. The presentation of research productivity listed the quantities or frequencies and the percentage rate for each variable in relation to the number of approved proposals. This was done to determine the approximate percentage of annually approved proposals that are finished, presented, published, cited, and awarded.

The number of research projects that resulted in projects, policies, or products, the number of research

projects that resulted in creative works, patented innovations, and the number of funded researches were excluded from the analysis because there were no records readily available at the time the study was conducted. The percentages derived in each variable, including the research engagements of professors with and without mandated functions, were examined in Part Two of the research productivity study. The following codes were used to characterize the percentages of faculty research engagements and productivity: 0-25, Very Low (VL); 100-76, Very High (VE); 75-51, High (H); 50-26, Low (L); and 100-76, Very High (H). To ascertain if faculty members with mandated functions were more involved, the percentage difference in faculty research involvement between those with and without mandatory functions was computed.

3. Results

3.1. Faculty research productivity. As indicated in Table 1, there were a total of 117 approved proposals, 63 of which were contributed by the College of Education, 50 of the College of Arts and Sciences, and 4 of the College of Industrial Technology. Therefore, more than half (53.8%) of the approved proposals were contributed by the faculty of the College of Education. It could be noted also that the largest number of approved proposals were recorded in 2021. The results, however, on the completed researches, revealed that majority (or 60%) of the completed researches were from the Colleges of Arts and Sciences. In addition, the College of Education shared the 40%, however, the College of Industrial Technology did display no accomplishment in this area. Based on the number, 2021 had the largest, while 2020, the lowest with 13 and 6 respectively.

On research presentations, 8 or 53% were from the College of Arts and Sciences and 7 or 46.7, from the College of Education. Overall, there were 15 paper presentations, 11 of which were presented in 2022, one in 2021 and three in 2020. As to publication counts, only the College of Arts and Sciences had records of consistent publications from 2020 to 2022. There were 6 research outputs published and three of which were in 2020, two in 2022, and one in 2021. In terms of citation counts, again only the College of Arts and Sciences had records of citations in their published researches. These were in 2021 and 2022. Lastly, in terms of the award received, most (83.3%) were contributed by the faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences. Only one award was won by the College of Education. These awards were received in years 2020 (1) and 2022 (5).

Table 1

Faculty research productivity

Variables	Colleges	2020	2021	2022	Total	%
A. Approved Proposals	College of Education	6	31	26	63	53.8
	College of Arts and Sciences	6	31	13	50	42.7
	College of Industrial Technology	0	3	1	4	3.4
	Total	12	65	40	117	100.0
B. Completed Researches	College of Education	2	4	6	12	40.0
	College of Arts and Sciences	4	9	5	18	60.0
	College of Industrial Technology	0	0	0	0	0.0
	Total	6	13	11	30	100.0
C. Research Presentation	College of Education	1	0	6	7	46.7
	College of Arts and Sciences	2	1	5	8	53.3
	College of Industrial Technology	0	0	0	0	0.0
	Total	3	1	11	15	100.0
D. Publication Counts	College of Education	0	0	0	0	0.0
	College of Arts and Sciences	3	1	2	6	100.0
	College of Industrial Technology	0	0	0	0	0.0
	Total	3	1	2	6	100.0
E. Citation counts	College of Education	0	0	0	0	0.0
	College of Arts and Sciences	0	1	1	2	100.0
	College of Industrial Technology	0	0	0	0	0.0
	Total	0	1	1	2	100.0
F. Awards Received	College of Education	0	0	1	1	16.7
	College of Arts and Sciences	1	0	4	5	83.3
	College of Industrial Technology	0	0	0	0	0.0
	Total	1	0	5	6	100.0

3.2. *Research productivity percentage.* The research productivity percentage along different variables is shown in Table 2. The percentages were calculated against the number of proposals approved from 2020 to 2022. The approved proposals had served as the point of reference of the percentages on completed, presented, published, cited and researches which received awards. As indicated, 50% of the approved proposals were completed in 2020, 20 percent in 2021 and 27.5% in 2022. Thus, on this category, the research percentage productivity was 25.6%. On research presentations, the highest percentage were in 2022 with 27.5%, then followed closely by 2020 with 25%, and lastly by 2021, with only 3.1%. In terms of research publications, only three of the 12 approved researches were published in 2021, one of the 65 in 2021, and two of the 40 in 2022. These data resulted to only 5.1 percent of the research productivity in this category. On citation counts, remarkably no accomplishments were documented in 2020, and one was recorded in 2021 as well as one in 2022. For the awards received, only six of the completed researches received awards, 5 were won in 2022 and the other one in 2020.

Table 2

Research productivity percentage along different variables against approved proposals

Variables	2020	2021	2022	Total
A. Approved Proposals	12	65	40	117
B. Completed Researches	6	13	11	30
% Rate	50.0	20.0	27.5	25.6
C. Research Presentation	3	2	11	15
% Rate	25.0	3.1	27.5	12.8
D. Research Publication	3	1	2	6
% Rate	25.0	1.5	5.0	5.1
E. Citations	0	1	1	2
% Rate	0.0	1.5	2.5	1.7
F. Awards Received	1	0	5	6
% Rate	8.33	0.00	12.50	5.13

3.3. *Research engagements of faculty without research mandated function.* Table 3 shows the results of the document analysis on the faculty research engagement without mandated research functions. The findings demonstrated that, similar to those from the other two colleges, the levels of research engagements among faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences were all very low during the study period. This is except for the College of Education in 2022, which received a rating of 29.4, or low-level engagement. Unexpectedly, between 2020 and 2022, there was a noticeable no faculty research engagement at the College of Industrial Technology. The College of Arts and Sciences faculty scored the highest overall (22.9), according to their total engagement ratings. The most active year for research engagement over the studied timeframe was found to be 2022.

Table 3

Research engagement of permanent faculty without research mandated function

Colleges	2020	Level	2021	Level	2022	Level	Total	Level
College of Arts and Sciences	18.8	VL	25.0	VL	25.0	VL	22.9	VL
College of Education	17.6	VL	5.9	VL	29.4	L	17.6	VL
College of Industrial Technology	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
Total	12.1	VL	10.3	VL	20.1	VL	13.5	VL

Note: 100–76, Very High (VE); 75–51, High (H); 50–26, Low (L); 0–25, Very Low (VL)

3.4. *Research engagements of faculty with research mandated function.* Table 4 indicates the level of research engagement of faculty with research mandated function, that is, those with Associate Professorial and Professorial ranks. According to data, from 2020 to 2022, faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences regularly displayed high levels of research activities. The research engagement of College of Education, on the contrary, were low (33.3, 16.7) in the years 2020 and 2021, but high (66.7) in 2022. The faculty of the College of Industrial Technology's research engagements remained incredibly low throughout the study period, except for 2021, when they had low level (26.7) engagements. Overall, the data indicate that in 2022 (38.9), faculty research engagement was at its peak, while in 2020, it was at its lowest.

Table 4*Research engagement of permanent faculty with research mandated function*

Colleges	2020	Level	2021	Level	2022	Level	Total	Level
College of Arts and Sciences	50.0	H	50.0	H	50.0	H	50.0	H
College of Education	33.3	L	16.7	L	66.7	H	38.9	L
College of Industrial Technology	0.0	VL	26.7	L	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
Total	27.8	L	31.1	L	38.9	L	29.6	L

Note: 100–76, Very High (VE); 75–51, High (H); 50–26, Low (L); 0–25, Very Low (VL)

3.5. *Number of Approved Proposals.* The College of Education was the college with the highest overall research productivity (Table 5), with 83.9 percent of approved proposals from faculty members with mandated functions. Surprisingly, the college of education experienced a productivity rate of 100% in 2021, indicating exceptionally strong research productivity in this aspect. The college has kept up this output level even in 2021 (66.7%). However, their productivity was poor (33.3%) in 2020. Furthermore, the College of Arts and Sciences' research production was only very high (96.8%) in 2021, very low (19.4%) in 2020, and low (50.0%) in 2022. Overall, the college's level of research production (41.9%) was low. Additionally, over the course of the study period, the outcomes at the College of Industrial Technology were constantly very poor. In general, it was only the college of education that had very high research productivity (83.9%) when it comes to the number of approved proposals and only in 2021 that the colleges had high level (38.9%) of research productivity. However, taken as a whole, the college still has a poor level of research productivity.

Table 5*Research productivity as to the number of approved proposals*

Colleges	2020	Level	2021	Level	2022	Level	Total	Level
College of Arts and Sciences	19.4	VL	96.8	VH	50.0	L	41.9	L
College of Education	19.4	VL	100.0	VH	66.7	H	83.9	VH
College of Industrial Technology	0.0	VL	10.7	VL	0.0	VL	3.6	VL
Total	12.9	VL	69.2	H	38.9	L	43.1	L

Note: 100–76, Very High (VE); 75–51, High (H); 50–26, Low (L); 0–25, Very Low (VL)

3.6. *Completed researches out of the approved proposals.* The productivity of faculty research, as measured by the number of studies conducted after accepted proposals, is shown in Table 6. Except for one result for the College of Arts and Sciences in 2020, which revealed a high level of research productivity (66.7%), the productivity levels of the three colleges only range between low and very low levels. To be more specific, the two other time periods in the College of Arts and Sciences, 2021 and 2022, both displayed low rates of research productivity—30.0% and 38.5%, respectively. Productivity levels were low for the College of Education in 2020 (33.3%) and extremely low in 2021 (12.9%) and 2022 (23.1%). Over time, none of the faculty members at the College of Industrial Technology had finished the approved research projects. On the whole, in two periods, 2021 (20.0%) and 2022 (20.0%) respectively, the campus had very low research productivity rate and in 2020 (50.0%), it had low. The College of Arts and Sciences led all of the colleges in terms of research productivity (low; 45.0%), followed by the College of Education (very low; 23.1), and the College of Industrial Technology (very low; 0.0). Therefore, just 30.0% of the approved research projects were finished, which is indicating a low productivity level.

Table 6*Research productivity as to the number of completed researches out of the approved proposals*

Colleges	2020	Level	2021	Level	2022	Level	Total	Level
College of Arts and Sciences	66.7	H	30.0	L	38.5	L	45.0	L
College of Education	33.3	L	12.9	VL	23.1	VL	23.1	VL
College of Industrial Technology	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
Total	50.0	L	20.0	VL	20.0	VL	30.0	L

Note: 100–76, Very High (VE); 75–51, High (H); 50–26, Low (L); 0–25, Very Low (VL)

3.7. *Papers presented out of the completed researches.* The researchers from the College of Arts and

Sciences were successful in presenting all of their finished research throughout the two time periods of 2020 and 2022, according to data on the number of papers presented from the completed research (Table 8). However, none of the papers they finished in 2021 have ever been presented. In the College of Education, the percentage of papers presented in 2022 had been remarkable, except for 2020 and 2021 results which recorded only 25%. The College of Industrial Technology's research productivity has stayed constantly zero. Overall, 2022 had the highest productivity rate in this area, while 2021 had the lowest. Comparatively, the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Education, and College of Industrial Technology all had low to extremely low research productivity in terms of paper presentation.

Table 7.

Research productivity as to the number of papers presented out of the completed researches

Colleges	2020	Level	2021	Level	2022	Level	Total	Level
College of Arts and Sciences	100.0	VH	0.0	VL	100.0	VH	75.0	H
College of Education	25.0	VL	25.0	VL	100.0	VH	41.7	L
College of Industrial Technology	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
Total	50.0	L	25.0	VL	100.0	VH	52.6	L

Note: 100–76, Very High (VE); 75–51, High (H); 50–26, Low (L); 0–25, Very Low (VL)

3.8. *Awards received out of the papers presented.* As indicated in the results, only the research papers from the College of Arts and Sciences in 2020 and 2022 had received awards for best papers and best presenters (Table 8). Fifty percent of the total number of papers presented in 2020 obtained awards and recognitions, while 66.7 percent for 2022. The values for the two colleges suggest that none of the papers presented won. On the average, their productivity as shown in percentage values were only 16.7 percent in 2020, zero, in 2021, and 22.2 in 2022.

Table 8

Research productivity as to the number of awards received out of the papers presented

Colleges	2020	Level	2021	Level	2022	Level	Total	Level
College of Arts and Sciences	50.0	L	0.0	VL	66.7	H	38.9	L
College of Education	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
College of Industrial Technology	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
Total	16.7	VL	0.0	VL	22.2	VL	13.0	VL

Note: 100–76, Very High (VE); 75–51, High (H); 50–26, Low (L); 0–25, Very Low (VL)

Publications out of the completed researches. On the publication of completed researches, 75% of the completed researches in 2020 from the College of Art and Sciences were published, 25 percent in 2021, and 33.3 percent in 2022. Remarkably, not single completed research from other colleges has been published. As a result, even on average, research productivity as measured by the number of publications was incredibly low. The percentage was just 25 in 2020, 8.3 in 2021, and 11.1 in 2022. With the exception of the College of Arts and Sciences, none of the colleges achieved anything, scoring a total of 0% along publication.

Table 9

Research productivity as to the number of publications out of the completed researches

Colleges	2020	Level	2021	Level	2022	Level	Total	Level
College of Arts and Sciences	75.0	H	25.0	VL	33.3	L	44.4	L
College of Education	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
College of Industrial Technology	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
Total	25.0	VL	8.3	VL	11.1	VL	14.8	VL

Note: 100–76, Very High (VE); 75–51, High (H); 50–26, Low (L); 0–25, Very Low (VL)

Papers cited out of the papers published. Only in 2021 was a very high level of research production attained in terms of citation counts. This was in the College of Arts and Sciences. The remainders in all colleges and periods were very low. Productivity in the aggregate was 0% in 2020, 33.3 % in 2021, and 6.7 % in 2020. These findings suggest that research productivity is at a very low to extremely low level. With the exception of the College of Arts and Sciences, which was still performing below average by college, all had zero productivity

percentages.

Table 10

Research productivity as to the number of papers cited out of the papers published

Colleges	2020	Level	2021	Level	2022	Level	Total	Level
College of Arts and Sciences	0.0	VL	100.0	VH	20.0	VL	40.0	L
College of Education	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
College of Industrial Technology	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL	0.0	VL
Total	0.0	VL	33.3	L	6.7	VL	13.3	VL

Note: 100–76, Very High (VE); 75–51, High (H); 50–26, Low (L); 0–25, Very Low (VL)

4. Discussion of Results

Despite strong encouragement from regulatory agencies and educational institutions in the Philippines for teachers to participate in research projects, the response has been notably lacking. This reluctance may be rooted in faculty members' preference to stay within their comfort zones, primarily focusing on teaching. For many, teaching represents a familiar and secure domain, where they can leverage their established expertise and routines. Venturing into research, on the other hand, requires stepping into uncharted territory, which demands a different set of skills, time investment, and a readiness to face challenges such as funding scarcity, publication pressures, and the possibility of failure. This apprehension is further exacerbated by the fact that research culture in many universities is still in its infancy, lacking the institutional support systems and resources needed to foster a robust research environment (Quitoras & Abuso, 2021).

Studies by Ayala and Garcia (2013) and Salazar-Clemeña and Almonte-Acosta (2007) corroborate this, showing that only a small proportion of faculty members at higher education institutions (HEIs) are actively engaged in research. This is particularly concerning in state universities, where research productivity remains low. The limited engagement in research activities can be attributed to various factors, including insufficient incentives, lack of recognition, and the absence of a well-established research culture that prioritizes and rewards scholarly output. In state colleges and universities, where teaching and extension activities often dominate, research can easily be sidelined unless there is a concerted effort to integrate it as a core component of faculty responsibilities.

The extremely low research productivity identified in these studies suggests that faculty members with mandated research responsibilities may not be giving adequate attention to this aspect of their roles. Alternatively, this low productivity could be indicative of significant challenges that faculty members face in engaging in research. These challenges often stem from an unfavorable research environment within HEIs, characterized by heavy teaching workloads, which leave little time for research, a lack of funding, and limited opportunities for faculty to participate in research-related training or seminars. Without proper training and exposure, faculty members may feel ill-equipped to undertake research projects, further perpetuating a cycle of low productivity.

Enhancing research productivity is, therefore, not just an institutional goal but a crucial factor in the professional growth of faculty members. Engaging in research allows educators to stay at the forefront of their fields, contribute to the advancement of knowledge, and bring new insights into their teaching practices. It also plays a pivotal role in the overall development of HEIs, helping to elevate the institution's academic standing, secure accreditation, and attract funding. The persistent low research productivity in Philippine state universities, as highlighted by Valencia (2004), Vinluan (2012), and Regadio and Tullao (2015), underscores the need for more strong support systems to foster research activities. These could include providing dedicated research time, offering financial support for research projects, and creating a culture that values and rewards research achievements.

For teachers, the practical implication is that there is a pressing need to step beyond the confines of teaching and actively engage in research. This engagement is not only essential for their professional growth but also contributes significantly to the institution's academic reputation and accreditation. By participating in research,

teachers can enhance their subject matter expertise, bring cutting-edge knowledge into the classroom, and serve as role models for students, inspiring them to pursue research themselves. For students, the implications are equally significant. A strong research culture among faculty enriches the educational experience, providing students with access to the latest research findings, opportunities to engage in research projects, and exposure to a scholarly community that values inquiry and innovation. This can improve the university's reputation, which in turn enhances students' academic and career prospects, making them more competitive in a globalized job market.

Despite the challenges, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) in the Philippines has been steadfast in its efforts to compel HEIs to produce research outputs. CHED's Memorandum Order No. 46 Series of 2012 emphasizes the role of universities in nation-building through the creation of new knowledge and skills via research and development (Quitoras & Abuso, 2021). However, for the Philippines to achieve better research outcomes, it is essential for universities to internationalize their research efforts, which means engaging with global research networks, publishing in internationally recognized journals, and addressing global issues through research. This internationalization requires a strategic approach, including providing necessary support through well-equipped research centers, offering training and incentives to faculty members, and fostering partnerships with international institutions.

Wa-Mbaleka (2015) highlights several challenges preventing faculty from publishing, including limited time, lack of training on publication processes, fear of rejection, lack of interest, faculty laziness, limited funds, and lack of institutional support. Overcoming these challenges requires a multifaceted approach. Faculty members must be encouraged and supported to balance their teaching responsibilities with research activities, ensuring that they fulfill their roles as both educators and scholars. This might involve reducing teaching loads for those engaged in research, providing mentoring and training programs to build research skills, and creating a more supportive institutional environment that recognizes and rewards research achievements. While, Quimbo and Sulabo (2014) note that while the demands of teaching are high, it is crucial for faculty to prioritize research if they are to advance their careers and contribute meaningfully to the academic community. By addressing these challenges and fostering a more research-oriented culture, Philippine universities can enhance their research output, contribute to global knowledge, and fulfill their mission of nation-building through education and research.

Lastly, this study also has significant implications for the university highlighting the need for a strong research culture at the university, which enhances faculty growth, boosts institutional reputation, and attracts funding. It emphasizes the importance of providing resources like research funding, training, and dedicated time, while promoting collaboration. A strong research culture not only advances faculty and institutional goals but also enriches student learning, aligning with the university's mission to contribute to societal development.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

The following conclusions are made based on the study's findings: The university's research production is extremely low during the full covered period, 2020 to 2022, in practically all areas. Very few research papers were written, published, presented, cited, and awarded. The College of Arts and Sciences is the most productive college. The results of this study have significant policy and directive consequences that will promote research output and strengthen the university's research culture.

From the aforesaid, the following are recommended: (1) introduce innovative research programs that could help accelerate the production and publication of research like rigid trainings, lectures, and workshops specifically in making full blown research proposals and writing of quality research; (2) send faculty to conferences of their discipline to inculcate the in-depth importance of research and becomes updated of the new trends in their field, in order for them to be encouraged and engaged in the call for proposals and other related research activities; (3) continue to promote among faculty publications of journal articles to refereed journals

indexed in WoS, Scopus, ASEAN citation index, and those which are CHED-recognized; (4) implement the grants of incentives particularly in the deloading scheme in order for the faculty researchers to strengthen their urge to publish their research output in different accredited/recognized and reputable journals/publications; (5) give continuous attention, effort and support and at the same time explore potential linkages (national and international) to establish more feasible research collaboration for joint projects and funding; (6) seriously take the policy among faculty holding associate professorial and professorial rank to prioritize their involvement in research in order for the faculty researchers to be more productive.

Acknowledgement - The researcher would like to extend his sincere gratitude to everyone who assisted and contributed to the completion of this work. Special thanks to the research office for making this endeavor possible and for providing the necessary support.

6. References

- Akuegwu, B. A., Udida, L. A., & Bassey, U. U. (2006). Attitude towards quality research among lecturers in Universities in Cross River State–Nigeria. In *30th Annual National Conference of the Nigerian Association for Educational Administration and Planning held at the Faculty of Education Hall, Enugu State University of Science and Technology*.
- Alghanim, S. A., & Alhamali, R. M. (2011). Research productivity among faculty members at medical and health schools in Saudi Arabia. Prevalence, obstacles, and associated factors. *PubMed*, 32(12), 1297–1303. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22159387>.
- Ayala, C. J. & Garcia, B. H. (2013). Research Productivity and Utilization in Higher Education Institutions in the CALABARZON Region. *MSEUF Research Studies*, 15(1).
- Batool, A., Hussain Ch., A., & Ahmad, S. (2018). Identification of Institutional Factors of Research Productivity of Public Universities Teachers. In *Journal of Educational Research* (Vol. 21, Issue 2, pp. 13–15). <https://jer.iub.edu.pk/journals/JER-Vol-21.No-2/2.pdf>.
- Nguyen, T. V., & Pham, L. T. (2015). *Research Performance in South-East Asia*. https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/5.4_research_performance_seasia.pdf.
- Androschuk, G. (2021). Global innovation index 2020: who will finance innovations. *Law And Innovations*, 1 (33), 7–13. [https://doi.org/10.37772/2518-1718-2021-1\(33\)-1](https://doi.org/10.37772/2518-1718-2021-1(33)-1).
- Creamer, E. G. (1998). Assessing Faculty Publication Productivity: Issues of Equity. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 26(2).
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fawzi, H., & Al-Hattami, A. (2017). Faculty Production of Research Papers: Challenges and Recommendations Digital Textbook for Arabian Gulf States View project Faculty Production of Research Papers: Challenges and Recommendations. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 7(2).
- Georghiou, L. (2015). *Value of Research: Policy Paper by the Research, Innovation, and Science Policy Experts (RISE)*. https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/system/files/ged/60_-_rise-value_of_research-june15_1.pdf.
- Gomba, F. E., & Pacolor, E. T. (2014). Transforming research and development culture from a technical-vocational based institution to a research university: Samar State University, Philippines case. *Countryside Development Research Journal*, 2(1), 143–151.
- Jung, J. (2012). Faculty Research Productivity in Hong Kong across Academic Discipline. *Higher Education Studies*, 2(4), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v2n4p1>.
- Kotrlík, J. W., Bartlett, J. E., Higgins, C. C., & Williams, H. A. (2002). Factors associated with research productivity of agricultural education faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 43(3).
- Manuel, R., Guido, D., & Orleans, A. V. (2020). Philippine Research Productivity in Education Research: A Comparative Performance in Southeast Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(4), 76–90. www.apjmr.com.

- Meng, H., & Gao, D. (2019). An intellectual interaction between international research students and Western educators in the internationalization of Australian research education. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 29(2), 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-019-00457-1>.
- Moed, H. (2005). *Citation Analysis in Research Evaluation*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Citation-Analysis-in-Research-Evaluation-Moed/00be12552ede0d2c4b5064f845941d06906a7257>.
- Nasser-Abu Alhija, F. M., & Majdob, A. (2017). Predictors of Teacher Educators' Research Productivity. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(11). Retrieved from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol42/iss11/3>.
- Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and descriptive research: Data type versus data analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(2), 129–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815572747>.
- Quimbo, M. a. T., & Sulabo, E. C. (2013). Research productivity and its policy implications in higher education institutions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(10), 1955–1971. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.818639>.
- Quitoras, M. C. L., & Abuso, J. E. (2021). Best Practices of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) for the Development of Research Culture in the Philippines. *Pedagogical Research*, 6(1), em0087. <https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/9355>.
- Regadio Jr., C. Q., & Tullao Jr., T. S. (2015). The Role of the Government in Enhancing Research Productivity of SUCs and Private HEIs in the Philippines. In *Proceedings of the DLSU Research Congress Vol. 3 2015*. https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/conferences/research-congress-proceedings/2015/LLI/001LLI_Regadio_CQ.pdf.
- Rogayan, D. V., & Corpuz, L. N. (2022). Evaluating the research productivity of a state university in Central Luzon, Philippines: Basis for policy recommendations. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 11(1), 128. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v11i1.22099>.
- Salazar-Clemeña, R. M., & Almonte-Acosta, S. A. (2007). Developing research culture in Philippine higher education institutions: perspectives of university faculty. *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge*, 1–13.
- Scimago Journal & Country Rank*. (2020, April 30). <https://www.scimagojr.com/countryrank.php?region=Asiatic>.
- Suson, R., Capuno, R., Manalastas, R., Malabago, N., Aranas, A. G., Ermac, E., & Tenerife, J. J. (2020). Educational research productivity road map: Conclusions from the identified research barriers and variables. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 15(5), 1160–1175. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i5.5162>.
- Tarrayo, V. N., Hernandez, P. J. S., & Claustro, J. M. a. S. (2021). Research Engagement by English Language Teachers in a Philippine University: Insights from a qualitative study. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, 21(3), 74–85. <https://doi.org/10.59588/2350-8329.1387>.
- Usang, B., Akuegwu, B. A., & Lucy, U. (2007). Academic staff research productivity: a study of Universities in South-South Zone of Nigeria. *Educational Research and Review*, 2(5), 103–108.
- Valencia, M. N. (2004). International Scientific Productivity of Selected Universities in the Philippines. *DOAJ (DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals)*. <https://doaj.org/article/f31a609631694849991e6e1e5a0fb045>.
- Vinluan, L. R. (2011). Research productivity in education and psychology in the Philippines and comparison with ASEAN countries. *Scientometrics*, 91(1), 277–294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-0496-5>.
- Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2015). Factors Leading to Limited Faculty Publications in Philippine Higher Education Institutions. *International Forum Journal*, 18(2), 121–141.

