

**FACULTY RESEARCH CHARACTERISTICS, PRODUCTIVITY AND  
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT: BASIS FOR  
ENHANCING RESEARCH CULTURE**

**Lauro S. Aspiras**

*Doctor of Philosophy in Education  
Major in Educational Management*

**ABSTRACT**

*This study aimed to determine the research characteristics, productivity, and research environment of the faculty members of Quirino State University. The study utilized the mixed methods descriptive design employing both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Data were collected through survey questionnaires, interviews and focus group discussion. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics while the qualitative data were analyzed thematically. The study found that the University's research management is efficiently functioning. The three campuses have varied extent of productivity along the number of proposals developed, researches completed, outputs presented, conferences attended, researches published, and creative works copyrighted, patented and trademarked. The faculty members of the three campuses are highly motivated and knowledgeable in doing research. The participants' number of subject preparations significantly affects their motivational, attitudinal drive in doing research. The age and years as a researcher together with their number of subject preparations greatly affected their knowledge and skills in research. The extent of the departmental research culture, participants' working conditions, extent of collaboration and access to professional networks is high and low on online publication in the three campuses. The problems encountered by the participants include overloaded subject preparations, unequal distribution of research training opportunities, fear of statistics, uninstitutionalized collaborative research; only best papers are given recognition and absence of incentive during in-house reviews.*

---

**Keywords:** *Research attitude, research characteristics, research environment, Quirino State University*

## INTRODUCTION

Research in the context of globalization is a newly formulated concept which means different things to different people resulting to a multitude of descriptions, interpretations, and definitions. Defining research globalization is not an easy task because one is faced with a new situation with old disciplinary lenses and thus, one tends to dwell on what his training makes most readily apparent (Stromquist, 2002). Every era has concepts that capture the public imagination and ‘globalization’ has recently emerged as one concept in the present time” (Hall and Tarrow, 2000).

Indeed, the global initiative builds on a legacy of global engagement by encouraging a global outlook in research, study, and practice. Unprecedented emphasis is being placed on research as key motor for advancing the knowledge society and its offspring, the Knowledge Economy (UNESCO Forum, 2007). Consequently, “research on the state of research” has become a high priority agenda for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), focusing on the area of specialization of the different programs of the organization. Thus, it has become essential to map and analyze research characteristics and research environment to acquire an understanding of the needs and priorities of the institution to compete in the global world of scientific knowledge.

Research, as a major function in higher education, sets higher education apart from basic education. In the Bologna Ministerial Meeting of 2007, the world leaders in higher education explicitly stated: “The basis of research in higher education is its independence and search for truth which justifies higher education’s continued exercise of academic freedom”. Furthermore, the UNESCO World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st Century highlights the important role of research in higher education, i.e., “State policies must promote and develop research, which is a necessary feature of all higher education systems, in all disciplines, including the human and social sciences and arts, given their relevance for development”.

In the Philippine context, specifically Republic Act No. 7722, known as the “Higher Education Act of 1994” Section 8, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) is mandated to enhance

the research functions of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines. Pursuant to this mandate, CHED recognizes the need to decentralize the promotion and management of research in order to broaden outreach and provide the research support needed by the HEIs more effectively, efficiently and equitably. Thus, the mandate focuses on research grants, support to paper presentations, and research productivity enhancement. Further, in line with the said mandate, the National Higher Education Research Agenda-2 (NHERA) was formulated which aims to place the Philippine higher education in the international research community through awards and recognition of Filipino researchers in cutting edge disciplines as well as in other priority disciplines.

CHED Memorandum Order 46 Series of 2012, called “Policy Standard to Enhance Quality Assurance (QA) in Philippine Higher Education through an Outcomes-Based and Typology-Based QA,” was the brain child of CHED’s Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) initiatives. The order ultimately came from a series of conferences between HEIs and CHED, changing the focus of modern Philippine education from input-based to output-based. While the focus before is more on the inputs of the teaching-learning process - aiming on teachers, their facilities and their resources, among others - the OBE focuses instead on the outputs of learning. Examples are competencies acquired and developed by students and how these things are made concrete and measurable to be applied in the future. Indeed, the University’s generated research ideas on the new approaches in teaching concepts are valuable as constructive development pedagogy in which teachers apply results of researches in the process of constructing knowledge in their disciplines.

In the case of Quirino State University, the institution is very steadfast in the realization of its research vision and mission that is to postulate excellence through quality and responsive research and to promote quality research in improving the standard of life of its target clientele. Its conversion into a university gave way to a new horizon of academic arena and thus became very persistent in the realization of the four-fold functions of the Higher Education Institutions - instruction, research, extension, and production. Further, the university has been very determined in the attainment of its altruistic mission and

vision adherent to the aforementioned thrusts of the Commission on Higher Education. Apparently, to achieve this noble vision and mission, a sound Research and Development (R&D) program should be formulated and implemented to answer the technological needs and problems of its service area. Moreover, R & D is an integral part of an academic institution upon which the basis of truth for both instruction and extension is formed.

Currently, QSU is on its path of developing a stronger research culture among its faculty members. The perplexity in successfully attaining the goals and objectives of the Research Department is really challenging. Thus, the revitalization of research programs should be undertaken and activities on research capability building among the faculty members should also be organized to enhance their capacity in conducting research.

Moreover, research undeniably gives the institution the access to work collaboratively with other researchers or with allied institutions and prepares everyone to be active and be engaged participants in a global community. Thus, the development and sustainability of the university towards excellence is in the hands of professionally competent, research oriented and productive faculty members.

One important factor for the successful conduct of research is the researcher's research motivation and attitude. This is the main objective of this study, to find out the research attitude and capabilities of the faculty members of Quirino State University. The survey of research characteristics, productivity and research environment of the teaching personnel can ascertain the current state of the faculty members' skills, capabilities, and competence in conducting research activities. Further, establishing clearly the research attitudes of the identified personnel will provide the university with wise decision on which research domains to develop and which ones are to be sustained to achieve excellence in research.

The crux is: the research culture in any academic institution needs to be enhanced particularly the research environment which could eventually motivate faculty members to achieve. The result of this study can definitely be used as basis in coming up with possible programs

and activities for the Research and Development Office which could be of help in enhancing the research culture and eventually research productivity of the university. Therefore, it is on these premises that the present study was conceptualized.

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study aims to determine the faculty research characteristics, environment and research productivity of Quirino State University. The assessment results served as significant inputs in setting the University's strategic directions aimed at enhancing its research culture.

More specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the campus profile of the University along the following:
  - 1.1 research infrastructure;
  - 1.2 research budget, allocation and utilization;
  - 1.3 research management;
  - 1.4 research priorities, and
  - 1.5 Publications?
2. What is the profile of the faculty in terms of the following:
  - 2.1 faculty members' campus affiliation;
  - 2.2 age;
  - 2.3 civil status;
  - 2.4 academic rank;
  - 2.5 highest educational attainment;
  - 2.6 area of specialization;
  - 2.7 years in service;
  - 2.8 years as a researcher, and
  - 2.9 number of subject preparations?
3. To what extent are the following productivity targets achieved per campus:
  - 3.1 number of developed proposals;
  - 3.2 number of completed research;
  - 3.3 number of researches presented;
  - 3.4 number of research fora/conferences attended;
  - 3.5 number of membership to research organizations;
  - 3.6 number of research publications, and

- 3.7 creative works and patents?
4. To what extent do the faculty manifest the following characteristics:
  - 4.1 research motivation;
  - 4.2 attitude towards research, and
  - 4.3 research knowledge and skills?
5. Is there a significant difference in the extent to which the faculty manifests the specified research characteristics when they are grouped according to profile variables?
6. To what extent do the faculty members experience the following research environment as characterized by the following:
  - 6.1 institutional research policies and agenda;
  - 6.2 departmental culture and working conditions;
  - 6.3 collaborations and access with professional networks;
  - 6.4 research management, and
  - 6.5 infrastructures?
7. What are the problems encountered by the participants in implementing a culture of research?
8. What enhancement program can be implemented to improve the research culture at Quirino State University?

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This study used a mixed method research design employing both quantitative and qualitative approaches to collect and analyze the data. The study used the descriptive survey design. This design fits best in the present study considering that it describes the nature of situations as it exists at the time of the study and explores issues that could have possible connections to the present queries. More specifically, this design was applied to describe and assess the research environment, characteristics and productivity of the faculty members in the three campuses of Quirino State University. Hence, questionnaires were administered to collect the quantitative data, while qualitative data were gathered using interviews and focus group discussion.

### **Participants of the Study**

The research protocol for this study was submitted to the Ethics

Review Committee of the Graduate School of St. Paul University Philippines. As approved by the committee, the participants of this study were the 145 full time faculty members in the three campuses of Quirino State University. All faculty members with plantilla position or with permanent status were included in the study. On the other hand, newly hired Contract of Service (COS) faculty members were excluded in the conduct of this research. Moreover, the departmental research coordinators and the two Campus Research Directors were also included as participant in this study. The Campus Research Director of QSU, Cabarroguis is not included considering that he is the proponent of this endeavor. Further, the participants were chosen by the researcher considering the fact that they are the direct individuals who possess the knowledge of the processes of research and understand the implementation of the research programs and activities of the university. The data contained in the following table present the participants to be covered in the study:

Table 1  
*Data on the Number of Participants per Campus*

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Number of Participants</b>
Quirino State University, Main Campus	69
Quirino State University, Cabarroguis Campus	44
Quirino State University, Maddela Campus	32
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>145</b>

Informed consent from the participants was secured prior to the conduct of interviews and the administration of the questionnaire. This is to ensure of the participants' willingness to provide information for the attainment of the study objectives.

### **Instrumentation**

To obtain the data needed for the investigation, the researcher used the following data gathering instruments:

Interview Script. A face to face interview was conducted with

the faculty researchers, research coordinators and research directors in the two campuses to elicit information regarding their research characteristics and their perspective concerning research environment.

**Semi-structured Questionnaire.** The questionnaire was developed based on the review of research literature and ideas from texts and documents on action researches. Having validated the content of the various aspects covered in the questionnaire, it was later sent to all the participants. The questionnaire consisted of the structured items describing teachers' involvement and the drive in conducting research.

**Documentary Analysis.** A validation of data through cross verification will also be undertaken in this study. Thus, the profile of the faculty members specifically their educational attainment, years in service, training and workshop attended, and membership to research organizations were verified using the documents from the Human Resource Department. On the other hand, the number of research proposals, number of completed researches, and research fora/conference attended by the faculty researchers were verified in the office of the university research director, considering the fact that the data needed were stipulated in the university quarterly report of the Research and Development Office.

**Focus Group Discussion (FGD).** The focus group discussion (FGD) is also one of the data gathering tools to be utilized. This process is a good way to gather together people from similar backgrounds or experiences to discuss specific topics pertaining important research-related issues and problems. The participants were selected from the different groups consisting of the departmental research coordinators and selected faculty members. They are selected considering that they are the direct individuals who initiate and observe research activities and programs in their department. The main objectives of the FGD are to get information particularly on the activities undertaken in their respective departments, research environment, and the problems they had encountered in the conduct of research.

Further, the process started by setting the date and the time for the group discussion. Upon approval of the date and time, the members of the group met on the said date to discuss further the

research activities of the department and their observations on the characteristics or the attitude towards research of the faculty members in their department. Moreover, the discussions were recorded which were used in the affirmation of the data stipulated in the filled-out questionnaire by the faculty researchers.

Thus, to fully understand the issue, the study obtained qualitative data by interviewing selected groups of teachers, selected departmental research coordinators, and selected program chairs in the three campuses. The purpose was to gather a more complete and in-depth information on what hampers the faculty members to conduct research. Moreover, this approach is also a reaffirmation on some of the results of the quantitative part of this study. Further, the researcher purposively selected the nine participants per campus composed of three faculty members, three research coordinators, and three department heads representing each group either active or not active in research. They were all contacted and showed willingness to be interviewed. Face to face interviews were held with the participants in their respective campuses. The casual conversation with the participants made the interview comfortable and set a more sincere sharing of experiences. Most of the data were recorded and the researcher had to take notes as the interview is conducted. Thus, all the data were recorded and written down in verbatim, and the researcher went through the transcripts. The major themes and trends were identified and classified. The psychometrician of the campus, experienced in qualitative research, was asked to go through the transcripts. There was an agreement to the general themes identified.

### **Data Gathering Procedure**

There are various steps that were followed in the conduct of the study. The Ethics Review Committee protocol were strictly observed.

1. The researcher coordinated and secured permission from the University President, Dean for Instruction, Deans/Program Chairs, and Campus Research Directors regarding the conduct of the study.
2. Upon approval, the researcher got the list of faculty researchers in the three campuses of the university from the Human Resource Department and validated by the Director for Instruction.

3. The researcher coordinated with the Deans/Program Chairs regarding the participation of their faculty researchers in the study.
4. Upon approval of the Deans/Program Chairs, the researcher also sought permission from the participants or the faculty researchers to participate in the data gathering process.
5. The researcher conducted interview and Focus Group Discussion with Research Coordinators and Research Directors.
6. The questionnaires were floated and endorsed properly to the faculty researchers for them to answer.
7. As soon as they answered the instrument honestly, the researcher personally collected the filled-out questionnaire so as to attain 100% retrieval.
8. Lastly, the data gathered were consolidated, analyzed, and interpreted by the researcher using appropriate data analysis tools.

### **Data Analysis**

The following were the statistical tools used in the analysis of data:

*Scale ratings.* This was used to present the data on the campus research profile such as research infrastructures, research management, research priorities, research publications and research environment. The rating scale used is presented below:

---

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Descriptive Value</b>
0	Not present
1	Present
2	Present and functioning well/ present and partially implemented
3	Present and efficiently functioning/present and fully implemented

---

*Frequency Counts and Percentages.* These were used in the tabulation of the quantitative data of the study specifically, the demographic profile of the participants.

*Mean.* This was used to present data on budget allocation and utilization; research productivity; research motivation; attitudes towards research; research knowledge and skills; research infrastructure; research management; research priorities; research publications and research environment.

*Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).* This was used to determine whether significant differences exist on the faculty research characteristics when they are grouped according to profile variables.

*Thematic Analysis and Narrative Analysis.* These were used to analyze interview responses as well as the participants' responses in the conducted Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Campus Profile of the University**

#### *Research Infrastructure*

Research infrastructure of the three campuses is present and efficiently functioning. On the other hand, software and publications is not present in the two campuses of the university (Campus A and B). It was also found out that the three campuses adopted the format standards for data archiving and data mining; and have a pool of experts and considered long term sustainability of research infrastructure.

#### *Research Budget, Allocation and Utilization*

There is an allocated budget for the research departments of the three campuses and optimally utilized by the department. Thus, the allocated budget and its utilization are stipulated in the Project Procurement Management Plan (PPMP) of the division approved by the university and DBM. As such, although given the prerogative of the research division to utilize the allocated budget, guidelines and procedures that govern the use of SUCs' income pursuant to RA 8292 should be taken into consideration.

### *Research Management*

All the three campuses have clear organizational structure and are presently and efficiently functioning. In all campuses, the R & D management is composed of the University Research Director, Campus Research Director, Departmental Research Coordinators, Pool of Experts, and Liaison Officers to research linkages. Further, it also shows that the policies on research funding and monetary incentives for research productivity as well as their honoraria, and inclusion of students in the research activities of the division is present and efficiently functioning. The research programs and activities in the campuses and departments in particular were given prerogative or independence in their implementation.

### *Research Priorities*

The three campuses have defined research priorities that match the stated university vision. The campuses also have different research priorities whereas the items are rated as present and fully implemented except for Campus B where research priorities is present and partially implemented. Further, Campus A prioritizes researches on technical, developmental, social science, educational and technological. On the other hand Campus B focuses on social science, educational and technological researches. Campus C also focuses on technical and social science researches.

### *Publications*

Campus A and B have institutional research journals and research publications which are efficiently functioning. Further, Campus C has no institutional research publication and has manpower resources but not functioning well. Campus C has manpower resources in their Research and Development publications but not functioning. Finally, the result of the study also revealed that Campus A, B, and C has no online research journal.

---

## **Faculty Profile**

### *Faculty Members' Campus Affiliation*

Among the three campuses, the biggest number of participants is Diffun Campus followed by the Cabarroguis Campus and Maddela Campus, respectively.

### *Age*

Most of the participants are in the middle age category. Generally, the faculty members of the university are relatively young in the profession as most of them are in the early adult age.

### *Civil Status*

Overall, seventy-three percent of all participants reported they are married at the time of the survey and twenty-six percent reported that they are single.

### *Academic Rank*

The highest reported percentage of faculty members' academic rank is in the instructor level (62.07%) and most of them are Instructor I, followed by Assistant Professor level (29.66%) of which most of them are Assistant Professor II and III, respectively. The Associate Professor Level has the least number (8.28%).

### *Highest Educational Attainment*

Among the 145 faculty members, most of them have Doctoral units (28.28%), followed closely by those who finished their Master's Degree (26.90%). The participants with the least number are those who graduated with a Doctoral Degree (11.72%). This implies that most of the teachers of the university attended post graduate school.

*Area of Specialization*

Language teachers have the highest percentage (19.31%), followed by science category (13.10%), technical Vocational (10.34%), agriculture (8.97%), mathematics (8.28%), business management (7.59%), health sciences (6.92%), social sciences/ psychology and Information technology (6.21%), management (4.83%), education (4.14%), and engineering/ forestry (3.45%).

*Years in Service*

Out of 145 participants, there are 65 or 44.83 percent who have served the institution for 1 to 5 years, followed by the 29 (20.00%) faculty who have served the school for 6 to 10 years. Furthermore, 16 or 11.03 percent hve been working in the institution for 11 to 15 years, followed closely by those who have been with the university for 21 to 25 years with a frequency of 15 or 10.34 percent. Moreover, there are 11 or 7.59 percent who have been with the university for 16 to 20 years, and lastly 9 of the faculty who have been serving the school for 26 to 30 years.

*Number of Years as Researcher*

Most of the faculty members of QSU have been researching for 1 to 5 years. There are only 5 among the faculty who have been engaged in research for more than 10 years.

*Number of Subject Preparations*

Most or 58.62 percent of the teachers have 4 to 6 subject preparations. On the other hand, 51 or 35.17 percent of them have 1 to 3 subject preparations and 9 or 6.21 percent have 7 to 9 subject preparations.

**Extent of the Attainment of Productivity Targets per Campus**

*Number of Developed Proposals*

Campus A has a high extent of attainment of its productivity

targets along the number of proposals. On the other hand, the other two campuses (B, C) have moderate extent of number of proposals target attainment.

#### *Number of Completed Research*

Campus A attained high extent of productivity targets with respect to the number of completed researches. Campus B has a moderate extent of productivity and Campus C has a low extent of productivity.

#### *Number of Researches Presented*

Campus A has a very high extent of productivity target on the number of researches presented locally, high extent on the regional and national presentation, and moderate extent in the international level. Campus B achieved high extent of productivity specifically on local presentations. Further, Campus B also achieved very low extent in the regional/national level and attained low extent in the international level. Campus C has a moderate extent rating on regional/national and international level research presentations; and very low in the regional/national level.

#### *Number of Research Fora/Conferences Attended*

Campus A has a very high extent rating along the number of research conferences/fora locally, high extent rating on the regional and national conferences, and moderate extent rating in the international level. On the same productivity indicators, Campus B achieved high extent of productivity specifically on local fora or conferences. Further, Campus B also achieved very low extent rating in the regional/national level and attained low extent rating in the international level. Campus C has a moderate extent rating on regional/national and international level research conferences and very low in the regional/national level on research presentations.

#### *Number of Membership to Research Organizations*

There is a high extent rating of Campus A, moderate extent

rating for Campus B, and low extent rating for Campus C with respect to the number of membership to research organizations.

### *Number of Research Publications*

Campus A has a very high extent of attainment of productivity targets with respect to publications specifically on institutional research journal but have very low rating on international refereed journal. Moreover, Campus B has a moderate extent rating on institutional journal publication and a very low extent rating on the publication in the international journals. Campus C has no extent of research productivity indicator specifically on institutional journal.

### *Creative Works and Patents*

Campus A has a moderate extent of attainment of the productivity target with respect to the number of copyrighted researches and very low extent along patent and trademark. Campus B has a moderate extent of attainment along copyrighted researches but no extent of attainment along patent and trademark. Campus C has a moderate extent of attainment along copyrighting of researches but no extent of attainment along patent and trademark.

## **Extent to which Faculty Manifest the Following Characteristics**

### *Research Motivation*

The participants have a very high level of motivation in doing research to improve their way of teaching and to contribute to the university's academic reputation. On the other hand, the participants have a moderate level of motivation on monetary incentives. In general, the faculty members are highly motivated in doing research as revealed in the overall mean of 3.87 which is described as "high" motivation.

### *Attitude towards Research*

The participants have high positive attitude towards research undertakings. They believed that research is very important in

building their career, which could lead to more opportunities and could improve their way of teaching.

### *Research Knowledge and Skills*

The participants are highly knowledgeable on the basics and advance concepts of research.

## **Test for Significant Difference on the Extent to which the Faculty Manifests the Specified Research Characteristics when Grouped according to their Personal Profile**

### *Research Motivation*

Faculty Members' Campus Affiliation. The motivation of the faculty members to conduct research is significantly different when grouped according to their campus affiliation. It shows in the results that Campus C has significantly higher motivation compared with Campus A and B.

Age. There is no significant difference on the research motivation of the participants when grouped according to their age. Civil Status. The research motivation of the participants has no significant difference when grouped according to civil status.

Academic Rank. There is no significant difference on the research motivation of the participants when grouped according to academic rank.

Highest Educational Attainment. There is no significant difference on the research motivation of the participants when grouped according to highest educational attainment.

Area of Specialization. There is no significant difference in the research motivation of the faculty members when grouped according to their area of specialization.

Years in Service. The result is not significant, which implies that the research motivation of the faculty is not dependent on their number of years in service.

Number of Years as Researcher. The research motivation of the faculty is not dependent on the number of years as a researcher.

Number of Subject Preparations. The level of research motivation of the faculty with 1 to 3 subject preparations is significantly higher than those with 4-6 and 7-9 subject preparations.

### *Attitudes towards Research*

Faculty Members' Campus Affiliation. The result is not significant, which implies that the research attitude of the faculty has nothing to do with the campus where they belong.

Age. The result shows no significant difference on the research attitude of the participants when grouped according to age.

Civil Status. The result is not significant, which imply that the research attitude of the faculty is not significantly different when grouped according to their civil status.

Academic Rank. There is no significant differences on the research attitudes of the participants when grouped according to academic rank.

Highest Educational Attainment. The result is not significant. Thus, there is no significant differences on the research attitudes of the faculty members when grouped according to educational qualification.

Area of Specialization. The result is not significant. There is no significant differences on the research attitude of the faculty members when grouped according to the area of specialization.

Years in Service. The result is not significant, The research attitude of the faculty is not dependent on their number of years in services.

Number of Years as Researcher. The research attitude of the faculty is not dependent on the number of years as a researcher.

Number of Subject Preparations. The data tabulated and analyze show significant result. Thus, it indicates that those with less preparations (1-3 subject preparations) have a more favorable attitude towards research as compared to those with higher number of preparations ( 4-6 and 7 -9 subject preparations).

### *Research Knowledge and Skills*

Faculty Members' Campus Affiliation. There is a significant result as shown by the Scheffe test, the Research Knowledge and Skills of faculty in Campus C is significantly higher than those in Campus A and B.

Age. The age of the faculty member has a great influence to the research knowledge and skills they manifest. Scheffe test reflects that faculty with age range 46-50 and 51-55 have higher level of skills and knowledge as compared with the rest of the age groups.

Civil Status. Result is not significant, which imply that the research knowledge and skills of the faculty is not significantly different when grouped according to their civil status.

Academic Rank. There is no significant differences on the research knowledge and skills of the participants when grouped according to academic rank.

Highest Educational Attainment. The result is not significant. There is no significant differences on the research knowledge and skills of the faculty members when grouped according to educational qualification.

Area of Specialization. There is no significant differences on the research knowledge and skills of the faculty members when grouped according to the area of specialization.

Years in Service. The result is not significant, which implies that the research knowledge and skills of the faculty is not dependent on their number of years in services.

Number of Years as Researcher. The results shows significant differences on the research knowledge and skills of the participants. The research knowledge and skill level of those with less than 5 years of experience as a researcher is significantly lower than those with more than those with 6-10 years or with those more than 10 years of experience in research.

Number of Subject Preparations. The data tabulated show significant result. It shows that the level of research knowledge and skills of the faculty with 1 – 3 subject preparations is significantly higher than those with 4-6 and 7-9 subject preparations.

### **Extent to which the Faculty Members Experience the following Research Environment**

#### *Institutional Research Policies and Agenda*

It indicates in the result that the overall composite mean in this area is 4.11 and interpreted as high extent. It could be inferred that the faculty members observed a high extent of inclusion and execution of the policies and agenda anchored to the to the university's research developmental framework.

#### *Departmental Culture and Working Conditions*

The faculty members favored that there is a high extent of research culture and working conditions in their department.

#### *Collaborations and Access with Professional Networks*

The result shows a high extent of Collaborations and Access with Professional networks of the university specifically Campus A and C.

#### *Research Management*

The faculty members of the three campuses agreed that there is a high extent of research management of the university.

### *Infrastructures*

There is a high extent of research infrastructure of the university specifically Campus A. Campus B and C shows moderate extent on the provision of a separate R and D publication division and on-line research journals and books.

### **Problems Encountered by the Participants in Implementing the Culture of Research**

Problems encountered by the faculty members were acquired from the conduct of face to face interviews with selected group of teachers, research coordinators, and program chairs of the three campuses. Responses from the interviews were analyzed thematically. The themes emerged are as follow: Overload Subject Preparations, Unequal Distribution of Research Training Opportunities, Fear of Statistics , Collaborative Research is not institutionalized, Only the Best Papers are given Recognition and Incentive during In-house reviews

### **Enhancement Program to Improve Research Culture at Quirino State University**

A program for Research Culture Enhancement was conceptualized and proposed based on the result of the present study. The main focus of the program is to enhance the research attitude and eventually develop the culture of research among the faculty members of the university.

### **CONCLUSION**

This study focuses on issues related to research motivation, attitude, productivity, and research environment. The data gathering process carried out in the present study have provided valuable insights and data on their research characteristics and problems encountered by the participants in inseminating research culture in the university. The results also show existence and non-existence of some of the aspects of the R & D infrastructure and giving emphasis on the problems encountered by the faculty in the implementation of research culture in the university. Indeed, such problems assumed

to be the reasons why some of the faculty members are reluctant in engaging themselves in research and most probably affect their research characteristics. Thus, these problems are the real empirical data and considered as serious issues that the university must address. Therefore, the university should include elements of changing the views of faculty towards research endeavor. Enhancement program emphasizing research culture could be of great help in realizing the vision and mission of the institution towards the ambition to be a “research university”. This, the researcher is certain, will motivate teachers to embark research in the institution – the Quirino State University.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following are recommendations grounded from the outcomes and scrutiny of the study. Concomitantly, research studies could be conducted to further explore the queries pointed out in this study.

Based on the findings and result of the study, it is recommended that programs that could encourage change in the motivational behavior of teachers needed to develop research culture in their respective department, or the university as a whole.

It is strongly recommended that faculty members take into account the research sustained “engaged inquiry” or “scholarly inquest.”

To sustain the programs on research culture, it is recommended that there is a constant monitoring and evaluation of the existing research policies and guidelines.

The University may innovate and repackage the research benefits to maintain the number of faculty who engage in research.

There is a need for faculty to update and harness their research writing skills.

The proposed enhancement program needs support from the administration.

## References

- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, C. A. (2007). Likert scales and data analyses. The American Society for Quality. Retrieved from <http://asq.org/quality-progress/2007/07/statistics/likert-scales-and-data-analyses.html>
- Bland, C. J. & Center, B. A. A. & Finstad, D. A. & Risbey, K. R. & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 89-123. The Ohio State University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2006.0002>
- Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. (2014). Benchmark best practices: Nature of work: service. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Deem, R., & Lucas, L. (2006). Learning about research: exploring the learning and teaching/research relationship amongst educational practitioners studying in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(1), 1-18. DOI: 10.1080/13562510500400040
- Esponilla, F. D. II (2015). Motivators of research productivity level in the Technological University of the Philippines (TUP), Manila campus. International Conference on Management Science, Innovation, and Technology 2015, Faculty of Management Science, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University. <http://icmsit.ssrु.ac.th/icmsit/fmsicmsit1/images/PDF/icmsit1.pdf>
- Hardré, P. L., Beesley, A. D., Miller, R. L. & Pace, T. M. (2011) Faculty motivation to do research: Across disciplines in research-intensive universities. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 5(1). Retrieved from [http://caarpweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/5-1\\_Hardre\\_p.35.pdf](http://caarpweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/5-1_Hardre_p.35.pdf)

- Lechuga, V. M., & Lechuga, D. C. (2012). Faculty motivation and scholarly work: Self-determination and self-regulation perspectives. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 6(2), 59-97. Retrieved from [http://caarpweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/6-2\\_Lechuga\\_p.59v2.pdf](http://caarpweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/6-2_Lechuga_p.59v2.pdf)
- Milgrom, P., Heima, M. Tomar, S., & Kunzel, C. (2008). Research productivity of members of IADR behavioral sciences and health services research group: Relationship to professional and personal factors. *Journal of Dental Education*, 72(10) 1142-1148.
- Monroe, S. R., & Kumar, R. (n.d.). Faculties attitudes towards academic research: A basis for improvement in publication productivity. Retrieved from [www.aabri.com/LV11Manuscripts/LV11034.pdf](http://www.aabri.com/LV11Manuscripts/LV11034.pdf)
- Okiki, O. C. (2013). Research productivity of teaching faculty members in Nigerian federal universities: An investigative study. Nigeria: University of Lagos. *Chinese Librarianship: an International Electronic Journal*, 36. Retrieved from [www.iclc.us/cliej/cl36okiki.pdf](http://www.iclc.us/cliej/cl36okiki.pdf)
- Rezaei, M., & Zamani-Miandashti, N. (2013). The relationship between research self-efficacy, research anxiety and attitude toward research: A study of agricultural graduate students. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 3(4). Retrieved from <http://www.wjeis.org/FileUpload/ds217232/File/09c.rezaei.pdf>
- Salazar-Clemeña, R. M., & Almonte-Acosta, S. A. (2007). Developing research culture in Philippine higher education institutions: Perspectives of university faculty. Manila, Philippines: De La Salle University. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000157869>
- St. Paul University Philippines. (2015). *Research Writing Guide: A Handbook for Student Researchers*. Tuguegarao City, Philippines: Northern Forum Publishing.
- Stafford, M. T. (2011). Faculty research productivity at Addis Ababa University (Doctoral Thesis). University of North Texas.

Sulo, T., Kendagor, R., Kosgei, D., Tuitoek D., & Chelangat, S. (2012). Factors affecting research productivity in public universities of Kenya: The case of Moi University, Eldoret. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS)*, 3(5), 475-484. Retrieved from <http://jetems.scholarlinkresearch.com/articles/Factors%20Affecting%20Research.pdf>

Zhang, X. (2014, October). Factors that motivate academic staff to conduct research and influence research productivity in Chinese project 211 universities (Doctoral thesis). Australia: University of Canberra, Australian Capital Territory. Retrieved from [http://www.canberra.edu.au/researchrepository/file/0814ee30-680b-401e-b059-3905b0b686cc/1/full\\_text.pdf](http://www.canberra.edu.au/researchrepository/file/0814ee30-680b-401e-b059-3905b0b686cc/1/full_text.pdf)