Faculty Members' Participation in the Development of Research Culture in the Philippines

Mark Cleeford L. Quitoras
Office of Research Coordination, University of the East,
Philippines 2219 Recto Ave, Sampaloc, Manila, 1008 Metro Manila
* markcleeford.quitoras@ue.edu.ph

Abstract
Research is a fulcrum in the development of instruction and the advancement of the academic ranking of faculty members. This study aims to explain the faculty responses on the role of the management and the extent of faculty participation in the development of the research culture of the three (3) HEIs namely: HEI1, HEI 2, and HEI 3. It also explicates management in the development of research culture through a comparison of faculty responses on their participation. The researcher used Mixed Methods in this study, specifically by conducting Focus Group Discussions and administering survey questionnaires to faculty members in the three selected HEIs in the Philippines. Indeed, faculty members have a crucial role in the development of research culture in t academic institutions.
Keywords: Faculty Members Participation, Research Culture, HEIs

1. Introduction

Asking someone to get out of his comfort zone is a challenging task. This is equally true to faculty members who have been teaching in ages and suddenly be compelled to do research. The value of research is way beyond simple addition in the body of knowledge. Conducting research can be an antidote for problems in the society (Adipraja, 2021). Georghiou (2015) mentioned multiple ways in which research achieves impact and creates value, these are: 1) increasing the stock of useful knowledge, 2) training skilled people, 3) creating new scientific instrumentation and methodologies, and collaborating with users in the use of such facilities, and 4) collaborating inresearch projects and networks with users.

In addition, Georghiou emphasized that: Research and innovation lie at the heart of Europe's economic strategy and make a critical contribution to the development of its society and cultures. They are a key source of new jobs, growth and competitiveness and underpin a wide range of policy priorities including digital Europe, energy efficiency and sustainability (p. 4). Apparently, research has significantly contributed to the economic development of countries like China and European countries. In the academe, likewise, research is vital to its development and status. (Moseti, 2015) emphasized in her study that "Knowledge production through research in the universities rests largely with academic staff and post graduate students, especially at the PhD level." (p. 17). With respect to Moseti's statement, thesis and dissertation are parts of the graduate curriculum where students are required to produce research to finish their degree programs. Notably, in order to advance or sustain the HEIs' regional and national academic ranking, faculty members need to yield more research output. However, not all faculty members in HEIs are engaged in doing research. Perhaps, most of them do not want to get out of their comfort zone which is teaching or could it be that research culture in many universities remains at its infancy stage? (Mbaleka,2015) contends that "The seven most challenging factors preventing faculty members from publishing enough or not publishing at all include having limited time, lack of training on publication, fear of rejection, lack of interest, faculty laziness, limited funds, and lack of institutional support." To abate faculty members' reluctance in doing research, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) in the country has been serious in compelling HEIs to yield research outputs. CHED's research advocacy is best expressed in Memorandum Order No. 46 Series of 2012, Article V, which mandates universities to contribute to nation building by providing highly specialized educational experiences to train experts in the various technical and disciplinal areas and by emphasizing the development of new knowledge and skills through research and development. The focus on the development of new knowledge is articulated through emphasis on bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs. Universities contribute to nation building by producing experts, knowledge and technological innovations that can serve as resources for long-term development processes in a globalized context. Additionally, CHED 2019 Guidelines for Granting Autonomous Status to Private Higher Education Institutions articulates: At least 50 full-time faculty members or at least 30% of full-time faculty, whichever is higher must have actively engaged in research or creative work in the last five years and at least 10% full-time faculty has patents or publications in refereed journals. Of these, at least 5% of full-time faculty has publications in internationally indexed journals and/or books published in reputable academic presses in the last five (5) years. How HEIs can further serve as a major participant in knowledge production for sustainable

development is amplified by CHED Memorandum Order No. 15, series of 2019, Policies, Standards, and Guidelines for Graduate Programs which states as: To better contribute to the attainment of sustainable development, graduate programs are expected to: 1. Achieve a clear progression beyond basic education baccalaureate/undergraduate education by stressing: a.Cutting edge, integrative and interrogative teaching and learning contents and methods; and b. Higher competencies in knowledge production (research), knowledge sharing and exchange (teaching), and knowledge application and utilization. (p.2). The realization of HEIs mission and vision is dependent on the capacity and capability of their leaders. Same goes with the development of research culture where research leaders should plan and strategize on how they carry out their research goals. Succeeding literature will attest how research leaders' roles are invaluable in the development of research productivity. Thus, "Building a serious research profile does not happen without the deliberate action of executive leaders. Similarly, it is essential that all executive and senior staff actively support research development. While it needs to be led by a member of the executive, the whole task cannot be left to a one person" (Good Practice Guide: Developing Research Capacity, 2012, p. 2).

2. Materials and Methods
This study used mixed methods of quantitative and qualitative research. (Creswell and Plano, 2011) define that mixed methods involves collecting, analyzing, and integrating quantitative and qualitative research in a single study for better comprehension of the phenomenon under investigation. Qualitative research, particularly focus group discussion was used to gather and treat data on the extent of faculty participation in the development of research culture of the three (3) HEIs. For the quantitative aspect of the study, there were 25 faculty members from each of the participating HEIs who answered the survey questionnaire. On the other hand, the qualitative aspect of the study was derived from the Focus Group Discussion with 10 faculty members form the three selected HEIs. The statements of the faculty members were used to support and enhance the descriptions of the tables in the research findings. The researchers used fictitious names of the three selected Higher Education Institutions suc ah HEI 1, HEI 2, and HEI 3 to protect their identity and reputation. This study was subjected to ethical review process and given approval by the Ethical Review Committee.   Based on qualitative research methodology and review of related literature and studies, quantitative study captured the extent of faculty participation in the development of research culture in the said HEIs.

3. Results and Discussions
3.1 HEI 1
Table 1 shows the responses of the faculty as regards the role of the management in the development of research culture in terms of creation of research Infrastructure. The high ranking group of individuals describes HEI 1's management in the development of research culture in terms of creation of research infrastructure through the following arrangement: *the University has a Research Office*, *the University provides awards for outstanding faculty and student research*, *the University conducts research capability seminar/training-workshops for the faculty*, *the University has an Ethical Review Committee*, and *the University encourages internal and external research collaboration*

Table 1
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management
in the Creation of Research Infrastructure

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. The University has a Research Office.	3.96	SA	1
13. The University provides awards for outstanding faculty and student research.	3.88	SA	2
3. The University conducts research capability seminar/training-workshop for the faculty.	3.84	SA	4
10. The University has an Ethical Review Committee.	3.84	SA	4
16. The University encourages internal and external research collaboration.	3.84	SA	4
12. The University organizes Research Fora/Forum.	3.80	SA	7
20. The Dean motivates/supports me in doing research, publication, and application for patent.	3.80	SA	7
25. The University supports application for external research grant.	3.80	SA	7
11. The University has a system in the selection of research proposals for funding.	3.72	SA	9.5

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
24. The University has research tools/computer software such as Turnitin, SPSS and Stata.	3.72	SA	9.5
18. The University Library has the latest books and online/references/publication/research reading materials.	3.68	SA	11
15. The University provides incentives for Intellectual Property output.	3.52	SA	12
21. The Research Director gives comments and suggestions on my research proposal.	3.48	SA	13.5
22. The University has a research laboratory.	3.48	SA	13.5
14. The University has a refereed publication journal.	2.96	A	15

Based on the highest ranking mean of 3.96, the faculty members of HEI 1 *strongly agreed* that their University has a Research Office because the faculty members feel the presence and functions of the Research Office. One (1) of the 10 faculty members who participated in the FGD had this to say, *A yun sobrang approachable sa Research Office dun, they also help us pag dating sa mga proposals, kasi as faculty puwede kaming mag submit ng papers, kapalit nun teaching load may mga ganung options* (sic.) (That's it they [the staff and Research Director} are approachable in Research Office, they also help us with [our research] proposals, because as faculty we can submit [research] papers in exchange for teaching load, we have those kinds of options). Another research participant added: *Magaling yung si Dr. Hera* [fictitious name of Research Director]. *May research office kami, may committee at tsaka naglalatag talaga sila* [programs in research] (sic.) (The Research Director is brilliant. We have a research office, committee [research] and they create research programs).

The low ranking mean scores include the following: The University has a refereed publication journal (2.96), the Research Director gives comments and suggestions on my research proposal (3.48), the University has a research laboratory (3.48), the University provides incentives for Intellectual Property output (3.52), and the University Library has the latest books and online/references/publication/research reading materials (3.68).

Though faculty members of HEI 1 *agreed* that the University has a refereed research journal, it is noteworthy that this item has the lowest ranking mean score of 2.96. In an interview with Dean Asclepius (fictitious name), she confirmed that they have a research journal in the University. ...*Also, we do have a journal here, a platform where the faculty can publish their research, aside of course from the other third party journals outside the university*. Additionally, the faculty members affirmed the existence of a research journal: ...Yeah! meron kaming journal publication dito at nagbibigay ng incentive ang University pag nag publish ka. (Yes! We have journal publication here and the University provides incentives for a publication). Some research participants do not have research publications and have not tried publishing research articles in the University journal. This results in unawareness of some research faculty participants on the existence of the University journal and perhaps that is the reason behind the lowest ranking mean of 2.96. In addition, most probably the reason for the lowest ranking mean is the faculty members who answered the survey questionnaire are new faculty in HEI 1. Naturally, faculty who are new or in probationary status may lack awareness of the research policies and research programs in the university.

Table 2 shows the responses of the faculty with respect to the role of the management in the Formulation of institutional research policies. The high ranking group describes HEI 1's management in the development of research culture in terms of the following arrangements: *The University has a committee for formulation of research policies*, *The University formulates and adopts Research Agenda*, and *My College has its own Research Agenda*.

On one hand, the highest ranking mean score is 3.92, the faculty members *strongly agreed* that the University has a committee for formulation of research policies. This was validated by a faculty member during the FGD when she said: ...*Every year, ni rereview namin yung incentives policy. Meron kaming University Research Council Committee na nagrereview ng mga proposals at policies.* (Every year we review the incentive policy. We do have University Research Council Committee that reviews [research] [proposals and policies).

Table 2
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management in the Formulation of Research Policies

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
2. The University has a committee for formulation of research policies.	3.92	SA	1
8. The University formulates and adopts Research Agenda.	3.84	SA	2.5
9. My College has its own Research Agenda.	3.84	SA	2.5
4. The University has deloading scheme for faculty engaged in research.	3.80	SA	4

This is an evidence of HEI 1's awareness in the impact of faculty participation in the formulation of research policies on accreditation.

On the other hand, the number four (4) item, *the University has deloading scheme for faculty engaged in research* has the lowest ranking mean score of 3.80 which obtained a mark of *strongly agreed.* Two faculty members shared the following statements during the FGD respectively: *...And when you are under a research grant, you will be deloaded ng ilang subjects, depende sa lawak ng research mo.* (And when you are under a research grant, you will be deloaded with some subjects, depending on the scope of your research). The second faculty member said: *...It's either idi deload kami ng six units ng teaching loads, then papasukan ng research load parang ganun.* (It's either they are going to deload us with six (6) units (two subjects) of teaching load, then you will be given research load, a sort of that).

Table 3 shows the responses of the faculty as regards to the role of the management in the Generation of Research Funds. The faculty members *strongly agreed* with a 3.88 mean score, that indeed, the University provides subsidy for research capability seminar/training workshop.

Table 3

Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management in the Generation of

Research Funds

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
7. The University provides subsidy for research capability seminar/training workshop.	**3.88**	**SA**	**1**

This was attested by a faculty member: *When it comes to the use of resources, they are exposing us to different trainings, conferences outside para dun sa research* (for research)*. Last semester, I attended sa* (in) *UST, writeshop ng* (of) *Elsevier. (sic.)* Another faculty member shared: *When it comes to research policies, kasi kahapon kasi I attended a seminar about a stat yung speaker namin galing sa labas, galing sa Lyceum* (sic.) (When it comes to research policies, yesterday, I attended a seminar on statistics, with a speaker from Apollo). In other words, attendance in external training/seminars in research is mandated by the university research policy. Hence, this is a conscious effort on the part of HEI 1 to harness the research writing skills of faculty by sending them to research fora for additional knowledge and skills in research.

Table 4 shows the responses of the faculty as regards to the role of the management in the Provision of incentives for publication. The highest mean score which is 3.92 indicates that this particular item was *strongly agreed* by the faculty members from Aphrodite University. Then, ranked next is a mean score of 3.72 which indicates that it was also *strongly agreed* by the faculty members.

Table 4

Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management in the Provision of Incentives for Publication

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
5. The University provides incentives for publication in refereed journal.	**3.92**	**SA**	**1**
6. The University provides incentives for Paper/Poster Presentation in professional conferences.	**3.72**	**SA**	**2**

The succeeding statements of the faculty members are pieces of evidence that corroborate the mean scores: *...Malaki ang incentives dito parang umaabot din ng 20 thousand pesos kapag nag pupublish...*(sic.) (Incentives are huge, it goes up to 20 thousand pesos if you are publishing [research articles]). Another faculty was enthusiastic in sharing that her upcoming research presentation abroad will be given a financial support by HEI 1: *This August, I am going to Dubai para mag present ng paper, malaki yung binibigay na pera, umaabot siguro ng 50 thousand.* (This August, I am going to Dubai to present a paper, they [University] are giving a good sum of money, perhaps it is close to 50 thousand pesos (P50,000). A modest financial support provided by the University seems to be a factor on faculty member's enthusiasm regarding her research presentation abroad. Similarly, Finelli (2013) found in his study of a university in the United States of America, the faculty value Infrastructure and Culture (Teaching evaluation, incentives and rewards, college teaching policies, didactic teaching traditions, tenure criteria and documentation) which serve as major factors impacting their motivation towards adoption of novel efficient and effective teaching practices.

Table 5 shows the responses of the faculty as regards the role of the management in the development of research culture in terms of Responsiveness to accreditation. The faculty members in Aphrodite *strongly agreed* that their respective colleges articulate the value of published research articles in relation to accreditation with a highest mean score of 3.88. Followed by the item: *The University promotes research to meet the accreditation requirements of external agencies* which was also *strongly agreed* by the faculty members with a mean score of 3.80. The rank mean score of 3.64, according to the faculty members in HEI 1, is an expression that they *strongly agreed* that the University makes the faculty develop awareness on the value of published research article in relation to accreditation of academic programs by external agencies.

The following lines are proof that the faculty members in HEI 1 are participating in accreditation: *When it comes to accreditation, our Dean involves us in the preparation of documents needed during the accreditation*

visit. It's quite taxing, we have no choice but to comply because it is a part of our responsibility as a faculty.

Table 5
Rank Distribution on the Role of Management with Respect
to Responsiveness to Accreditation

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
17. My College articulates the value of published research article in relation to accreditation.	**3.88**	**SA**	**1**
23. The University promotes research to meet the accreditation requirements of external agencies.	**3.80**	**SA**	**2**
19. The University makes the faculty develop awareness on the value of published research article in relation to accreditation.	**3.64**	**SA**	**3**

Another faculty member added: *In fairness kay dean namin, ini encourage niya kami magparticipate sa accreditation, tumulong daw kaming mga faculty at umattend ng dialogue with the accreditors.* (In fairness to our dean, she encourages us to participate in accreditation, by attending the dialogue with the accreditors). The value of research in accreditation is paramount in the sense that research output such as: national and international research presentations, research and book publications, and patents are keys to the sustainability and advancement of higher education ranking. The academic leaders in HEI 1 especially the deans are mindful that research output and faculty involvement in instruction and extension are requirements for accreditation.

Table 6 below shows the highest ranking percentage of items on the extent of faculty participation in the development of research culture which is 96%. The items which have the highest ranking percentage are the following: *I have participated in the seminar/workshops on research organized by the University* (96%) and *I can convert my research into a publishable article* (96%). The faculty members in HEI 1 answered *yes* on the said items.

The accounts of the faculty members confirmed that HEI 1 is investing well on faculty development through research capability seminars and the faculty members of this univeristy have the capacity to publish research articles in journals: *The University is also organizing research capability seminars which I personally appreciate because this is an opportunity for us to be updated and improve our research skills;* and *Ako so far, nakapag published na sa local at international journals at nabigyan din naman ako ng University ng incentive.* (As far as I'm concerned, I was able to publish in local and international journals and I received an incentive)

The lowest ranking percentage of items on the extent of faculty participation in the development of research culture is 12%. There are only a few faculty members who answered *yes* on the item: *I doubt my research competence*. It goes without saying that most of the faculty members are capable in conducting research. As a matter of fact, two faculty members confirmed this matter: *I love doing research, if possible , magreresearch nalang ako, gusto ko ang research,* (if possible I will just do research, I like research); and ...*Like nitong recent* [research] *meron akong, kasama from Dentistry. So napapasama ako sa mga ganun, hindi na lang iisa, multidisciplinary. Hindi lang ako sa main field ko. Being the Statistician or data processor dito na eexpose ako sa ibat ibang klase ng research in different fields, like even in Dentistry, Medical Technology, kahit mga experimental yan.*

Table 6
Rank Distribution of Percentage on the Extent of Faculty Participation
in the Development of Research Culture

Item	Percent (Y)	Rank
5. I have participated in the seminar/workshops on research organized by the University.	**96%**	**1.5**
11. I can convert my research into a publishable article.	**96%**	**1.5**
1. I have presented a paper in a national conference.	**88%**	**3.5**
9. I am satisfied with the University Research policies and incentives.	**88%**	**3.5**
6. I co-authored a research with my fellow faculty members.	**84%**	**6**
8. I was invited to serve as a Panel Member/Critic/Referee/Adviser in research related activities.	**84%**	**6**
14. I am active in doing research.	**84%**	**6**
2. I have presented a paper in an international conference.	**76%**	**9**
13. I am teaching research subject.	**76%**	**9**
15. I participated in crafting the Research Agenda in my college.	**76%**	**9**
12. I find teaching easier than doing research.	**68%**	**11**
4. I have published an article in an international refereed journal.	**64%**	**13**
7. I conducted a research capability seminar/workshop in this University or in other Universities.	**64%**	**13**
16. I was given support by the University in my external application for research grant.	**64%**	**13**

Item	Percent (Y)	Rank
3. I have published an article in a national refereed journal.	**56%**	**15**
17. I was a recipient of research mentoring by a senior colleague.	**54%**	**16**
20. I developed my passion for research on my own.	**48%**	**17**
18. I find teaching more rewarding than doing research.	**44%**	**18**
10. I am hesitant to conduct research because I feel inadequate.	**16%**	**19**
19. I doubt my research competence.	**12%**	**20**

(Just like our recent research, I have a co-researcher from Dentistry. So I have been part of those, it is not a solitary field, it is multidisciplinary. I don't focus solely on my own field of study. Being a statistician or data processor, I am exposed to different fields like in Dentistry, Medical Technology; including experimental studies). This is confirmatory that HEI 1 holds research capability seminar-workshops to develop and enhance research competence of faculty members.

3.2 Summary

The research participants of HEI 1 confirmed the existence of the following themes: a functional structure, outsourcing of talents, provision of incentives, a platform for conducting research, and a system for external research collaboration.

The strength of this university originates from the strong support of the management to research activities which are translated to a functional research office providing the following research programs: Research Capability Seminars, Official Research Journals, Publication Incentives, and Research Forums. This initiative of HEI 1 to support and create research programs for the improvement of faculty members' research competence draws theoretical support from Fayol's Administrative Theory wherein it underscores the crucial role of managers or academic leaders in forecasting, planning, and organizing for the realization of institutional goals.

Clearly, the behavior of all statistical data and the responses of research participants showed the University and Research Office joint support for faculty members' research endeavors.

Some faculty research participants are unaware of the existence of research publication journal and research laboratory which is understandable because perhaps those who participated in the survey questionnaire included new, part time, probationary or not research-oriented faculty members.

At this juncture, there is no doubt that the university top management has prioritized the creation of an infrastructure for the promotion of research where research culture is represented by an organized system that supports research activities.

3.3 HEI 2

The quantitative assessment of HEI 2 underscored that the strength of this University is research collaboration. Majority of the research participants who joined in the FGD had conducted research while some are currently engaged in collaborative research with faculty members in this University and external HEIs.

Table 7 shows the responses of the faculty with regard to the role of management in the development of research culture in terms of creation of research infrastructure. The high ranking group describes Hermes' management in the creation of research infrastructure through as follows: *The University has a Research Office* (3.64), *The University conducts research capability seminar/training-workshop for the faculty* (3.48), *The Research Director gives comments and suggestions on my research proposal* (3.24), *The University encourages internal and external research collaboration* (3.04), *The University supports application for external research grant* (3.04), and *The University has a system in the selection of research proposals for funding* (2.96).

The highest ranking mean of 3.64 affirms the faculty awareness of the item, *University has a Research Office*. Excerpts attest what faculty said in the FGD: *Yes we do have a research office, the Director is Dr. Hercules* (a fictitious name) *they organize the structure of research, they give seminars for the faculty members para ma-engage sa research...* (to be engaged in research); *The Director is very supportive, actually the whole office* [research office] *is very supportive. They try their best to help you, hindi lang financially eh, but they will lead you to, yung mga point persons na kailangan mo talaga* (They try their best to help you, not just financially but they will lead you to point-persons who can help you in research).

Table 7
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management in the Creation of Research Infrastructure

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. The University has a Research Office.	3.64	SA	1
3. The University conducts research capability seminar/training-workshop for the faculty.	3.48	SA	2
21. The Research Director gives comments and suggestions on my research proposal.	3.24	A	3
16. The University encourages internal and external research collaboration.	3.04	A	4.5
25. The University supports application for external research grant.	3.04	A	4.5
11. The University has a system in the selection of research proposals for funding.	2.96	A	6
20. The Dean motivates/supports me in doing research, publication, and application for patent.	2.92	A	7
13. The University provides awards for outstanding faculty and student research.	2.80	A	8
12. The University organizes Research Fora/Forum.	2.76	A	9
22. The University has a research laboratory.	2.72	A	10
18. The University Library has the latest books and online/references/publication/research reading materials.	2.48	D	11
10. The University has an Ethical Review Committee.	2.44	D	13
15. The University provides incentives for Intellectual Property output.	2.44	D	13
24. The University has research tools/computer software such as Turnitin, SPSS and Stata.	2.44	D	13
14. The University has a refereed publication journal.	2.40	D	15

The low ranking mean scores are in the following items: *University has a refereed publication journal*, *University has an Ethical Review Committee University provides incentives for Intellectual Property output*, *University has research tools/computer software such as Turnitin, SPSS and Stata*, and *University Library has the latest books and online/references/publication/research reading materials*. The qualitative data from the faculty FGD and interview with the Research Director revealed that fund for research is insufficient, and this explains the absence of an internally refereed publication journal. Thus, faculty members are encouraged to look for external refereed publication journals. The insufficiency of research funds explains the absence of a referred publication journal, research tools/computer software, and other research-related matters or activities. The quantitative response of the faculty members validates the qualitative data.

The responses of the faculty members with the lowest ranking mean score of 2.40 show their disagreement that the University has a refereed publication journal. The following statements of faculty members confirm the absence of a refereed publication journal and other relevant research tools and structure: *...Wala lang kaming publication journal dito kung saan sana kami pwedeng mag publsih ng research namin. Pero dito we are encouraged to do collaborative research with external funding.* (We do not have journal publication here [university] where we can publish our research. Nevertheles, we are encouraged to engage in collaborative research that involves external funding). Another faculty member disclosed:

> *Office [of research] nakita niyo na siguro sir maliit lang, office lang talaga siya. anong meron doon? office,meron bang statistician? wala. Yung mga kailangan namin, meron bang I.P. person doon? wala, meron bang plagiarism checker doon, wala. So talagang office lang talaga na may pangalang research office. Yung mga Turnitin [plagiarism checker], statistics software, wala...*

Such disclosure of faculty members confirms that the Research Office is more of a physical space devoid of a supposedly provider of a functioning entity in an organization.

Table 8 manifests the responses of the faculty with respect to the role of the management in the development of research culture in terms of Formulation of institutional research policies. The two high ranking items describe Hermes University's management in the development of research culture in the following order: *the University has a committee for formulation of research policies* and *the University formulates and adopts Research Agenda.*

Table 8
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management
in the Formulation of Research Policies

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
2. The University has a committee for formulation of research policies.	3.32	SA	1
8. The University formulates and adopts Research Agenda.	3.24	A	2
4. The University has deloading scheme for faculty engaged in research.	3.16	A	3
9. My College has its own Research Agenda.	2.80	A	4

The highest mean score of 3.32 on the item, *University has a committee for formulation of research policies*. The faculty members of Hermes *strongly agreed* that there is a committee in charge of research policy making. The following statements of faculty members are testimonies that research policy in Hermes is taken care of by certain individuals: *Sasabihin ko sa iyo ng talagang it is an improved policy. Kasi nun naabutan ko siya bali it was in the stage of being revised, so ngayon na revised na siya and talagang merong mga benefits na nakukuha.* (Because when I came in, it was under revision (university research policies), so now, it was already revised and there are real benefits that you can receive). This is a perfect example of the cliché "policy changes," on the part of Hermes, the academic leaders modify their research policies in response to the changing needs of the University and faculty researchers; *Sa ngayon, yung mga policies nag eexist naman kung ano yung mga kailangan. Hindi pa siya ganung ka mature or fully developed. Basta kung ano lang yung kailangan meron. Oh kailangan natin to, malamang gagawin na naman, So far, base sa needs. Ok naman yung policies.* (For now, research policies do exist, whichever you need [in conducting research]. It is not yet mature or fully developed. I mean, whichever you need is available. Oh we need this, for sure they will incorporate it [in the research policies]. So far it is based on the needs. The policies are fine. The narrative shows that research policy at HEI 2 evolves on as needed basis. It is at its infancy stage, reactive and evolving simultaneously. The University is too pragmatic that it limits its priorities and could speak of modest internal research fund, otherwise, HEI 2 should have been pro-active in providing the research tools needed by faculty researchers. Thus, the evolution of specific policies comes in trickles, more of a reaction to an urgent need.

The responses of faculty regarding the role of management in the Generation of Research Funds is a low 2.96, a proof of the University's financial support for research capability seminar/training workshop.

Table 9
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management
in the Generation of Research Funds

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
7. The University provides subsidy for research capability seminar/training workshop.	2.96	A	1

Though the mean score is low relative to the other items, the faculty members' testimony on the same matter is affirmed by their statement derived from the FGD: *Minsan nag oorganize naman sila ng mga seminar about research para matulungan kaming mga faculty gumawa at makapag publish ng research.* (Sometimes, the research office is organizing seminars about research to help us faculty members conduct and publish research). Another faculty member said: *Meron kaming mga scientific writing, kumbaga seminar on how to publish* (We do have scientific writing, seminar on how to publish), *how to write a research article. Seminar on IP* [Intellectual Property] *orientation and seminar on how to make a research proposal. They offer seminars both for students and faculty members.* To the credit of the University, the following research capability seminar-workshops are organized for the faculty: 1) research capability building, 2) research for publication, and 3) intellectual property orientation.

Table 10 shows the faculty responses on the role of management in the provision of incentives for publication. The highest mean score is 2.92 which means that the faculty of Hermes agree on the existence of incentives for Paper/Poster in research fora and for publication in refereed journal.

Table 10
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management
in the Provision of Incentives for Publication.

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
6. The University provides incentives for Paper/Poster Presentation in professional conferences.	2.92	A	1
5. The University provides incentives for publication in refereed journal.	2.88	A	2

Despite certain limitation on the University's provision for research, a faculty member shared his happy research experience in the University. He enjoyed support from HEI 2:...*Kasi ang nangyari* (What happened is), *my first presentation, international presentation happened in in this University, my first peer-reviewed*

publication happened in HEI 2 and my first ISI/Scopus indexed publication happened in HEI 2. However, a certain faculty contradicts the testimony of the previous faculty when he said :

> *Kasi ako bibigyan ako ng pera dito* [for publication incentive]. *Pero kung ico-compare mo sa iba, nagkaroon ako ng incentive, wala eh. Siguro sa ibang university ang ISI publication nila is 50k, dito sa Hermes University one-fifth (1/5) lang nun. So hindi ko ginawang motivation ang pera, kasi kung yun ang gagawin mong motivation, kasi parang you are doing it for the sake of money which I think makaka-epekto rin yun sa output mo eh. If you are just working for money.* (The university is giving me incentive for my publication. In comparison with other universities, it's nothing. Perhaps their ISI publication is 50,000.00 pesos, here in HEI 2 it's just one-fifth (1/5) of that amount. Money is not my motivation for doing research because if that's your motivation, it is just like you are doing research for the sake of money which I think could affect your output).

The narrative just cited conveys faculty members' ambivalent feelings about the token monetary incentive. On the other hand, he said it did not matter but in fact, he has misgivings about the miniscule monetary publication incentive. It implies that monetary research publication incentive is a mere token.

Table 11 shows the responses of the faculty on the role of management in the development of research culture on responsiveness to accreditation. The faculty members *agreed* that *the University promotes research to meet requirements of external agencies with a highest mean score* of 3.08. This is followed by: *My College articulates the value of published research article in relation to accreditation* with a mean score of 2.80. Finally, the lowest mean score is 2.76 on the item: *the University makes the faculty develop awareness on the value of published research article in relation to accreditation* which was *agreed* by the faculty members who believe the College and the University as a whole, it is the former that puts greater emphasis on the value of published research in relation to accreditation of academic programs. During accreditation visit of external agencies, it is the College as a matter of practice that puts heavy emphasis on research as one of the much-needed exhibits.

Table 11
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management
with Respect to Responsiveness to accreditation

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
23. The University promotes research to meet the accreditation requirements of external agencies.	3.08	A	1
17. My College articulates the value of published research article in relation to accreditation.	2.80	A	2
19. The University makes the faculty develop awareness on the value of published research article in relation to accreditation.	2.76	A	3

Below is a statement of a faculty who confirms that HEI 2 is making sure that faculty members realize the impact of research on accreditation:

> *...So, parang ang naging strategy kasi ni Dr. Ares* (fictitious name of the Research Deputy Director) *ngayon, as per PACUCOA accreditation, mag perform muna ng need assessment sa research, then afterwards it turns out yung mga need ng faculty like scientific writing, how to make a proposal for funding outside, kasi nga wala naman kaming ganung pera. Parang ang thrust namin naman eh we maximize our potential and then get funding outside...* (So what Dr. Ares (fictitious name of Research Deputy Director) did as his strategy now, as per PACUCOA, need assessment must be performed first in research, then afterwards, the needs of the faculty will be identified, like scientific writing, how to write research proposal for external funding, because we [University} do not have enough money. It is like, our thrust is maximization of our potential and then get outside funding.

Another faculty from HEI 2 mentioned that the Dean of his college encourages them to conduct research in order to meet the requirements on research of accrediting agencies: *Sinasabihan din niya kami na gumawa ng research at mag publish para maka tulong sa accreditation.*(He [Dean] encourages us [faculty members] to do research to support the quest for accreditation.

Despite the insufficiency of internal research funds, as stated by a faculty, HEI 2 is able to organize and conduct research trainings not only for accreditation purposes but also for faculty development. In addition, it is worth mentioning that the effort of academic leaders in guiding and helping faculty researcher look for external research grants.

Table 12 shows the highest rank percentage of 92% for the item, *I have participated in the seminar/workshops on research organized by the University*. The faculty answered *yes* on the said item. The FGD with faculty members in HEI2 2 indicates that the University is doing something on the development of research culture. Three faculty members confirmed this respectively: *Well actually the research in the University is, there are a lot of researchers in the university. Most of them are from Aeronautical Engineering; I also join with the research activity, at the same time, our Deputy Director for Research and the Head of Extension of UE joined together for a Pasig River Research, involved ako doon* (I was part of that research)*, and Alam mo sir timing na timing yung dating mo kasi may talk din ako bukas, research, about how to make a literature review for publication* (You know what sir your visit is timely because I have a talk tomorrow on research, about how to make a literature review for publication). Thus, this ranking confirms the statements of faculty in the previous chapters that Hermes organizes research capability seminar-workshops to equip the faculty with research skills needed in conducting research and writing for publication.

The lowest ranking percentage of items on the extent of faculty participation in the development of research culture is 12% representing publication of an article in a national refereed journal. The other three items with the lowest percentage ranking on extent of faculty participation in the development are as follows: 1) *I conducted a research capability seminar/workshop in this University or in other Universities*, 2*) I have published an article in an international refereed journal*, and 3) *I have presented a paper in a national conference*. The abovementioned three items could translate into lack of faculty engagement in research because if a faculty member does not conduct a research, he/she will not be able to experience research presentation and publication. This could also be an impact of the absence of publication journal in Hermes where faculty can submit research article for possible publication.

Table 12

Rank Distribution of Percentage on the Extent of Faculty Participation in the Development of Research Culture

Item	Percent (Y)	Rank
5. I have participated in the seminar/workshops on research organized by the University.	92%	1
12. I find teaching easier than doing research.	80%	2
10. I am hesitant to conduct research because I feel inadequate.	68%	3
11. I can convert my research into a publishable article.	64%	4
18. I find teaching more rewarding than doing research.	60%	5.5
20. I developed my passion for research on my own.	60%	5.5
19. I doubt my research competence.	48%	7
8. I was invited to serve as a Panel Member/Critic/Referee/Adviser in research related activities.	40%	8.5
15. I participated in crafting the Research Agenda in my college.	40%	8.5
14. I am active in doing research.	36%	10.5
17. I was a recipient of research mentoring by a senior colleague.	36%	10.5
9. I am satisfied with the University Research policies and incentives.	32%	12.5
13. I am teaching research subject.	32%	12.5
6. I co-authored a research with my fellow faculty members.	24%	14
2. I have presented a paper in an international conference.	20%	15.5
16. I was given support by the University in my external application for research grant.	20%	15.5
1. I have presented a paper in a national conference.	16%	18
4. I have published an article in an international refereed journal.	16%	18
7. I conducted a research capability seminar/workshop in this University or in other Universities.	16%	18
3. I have published an article in a national refereed journal.	12%	20

3.4 Summary

Majority of the research participants of HEI 2 acknowledged and recognized the presence of the Research Office and the research prowess of Hercules (fictitious name), the Research Director.

The major strength of HEI 2 is the Research Director, his capability to inspire and guide the faculty members in conducting research especially on externally funded research. Another strength is the research orientation of certain faculty members in conducting collaborative research that receive external funding.

Two limitations of the University include the absence of an official research publication journal and the lack of some relevant research tools such as *Turnitin*, a plagiarism software, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), statistical analysis software.

Despite meager research funding from the University, the faculty members are still enthusiastic in

conducting collaborative research with other faculty members/personnel from different HEIs and government and private agencies. Thus, Laissez faire leadership is observed in the management of research by topmost officers in this University, wherein the management is letting the academic leaders such as deans and research directors guide their faculty in finding possible external funding agencies and modify research policies based on the needs of faculty researchers.

3.5 HEI 3

The affirmation of research participants is reflected on the tables which validate the strong support of HEI 3 to faculty researchers and its serious attempt to create a research culture through the development of research infrastructure that caters to the research needs of the faculty.

Table 13 shows the responses of the faculty with respect to the role of the management in the development of research culture. The high ranking percentage items describe HEI 3's management in the development of research culture in terms of creation of research infrastructure through sequential related development. Thus, HEI 3, through its Research Office, maintains a Research Office, organizes Research Fora, subscribes to research tools/computer software such as Turnitin, SPSS and Stata, and conducts faculty research capability seminar/training-workshops. Given this research infrastructure of Apollo, it embodies Fayol's Administrative Theory wherein academic leaders are supposed to forecast and plan, organize, command, coordinate, and control on matters that will get the job done.

The item, *The University has a Research Office* has the highest ranking mean score of 3.92. The faculty *strongly agreed* on the said item which suggests that Apollo, indeed, has a well-functioning Research Office where faculty members come for the purposes related to research. The faculty members' disclosure in FGD confirms the highest ranking mean score; thus, …*When it comes to office* [research] *naman I can see na they are really supportive naman when it comes to research incentives and at the same time yung coaching nila...* (when it comes to research office, I can see that they are really supportive when it comes to giving research incentives and at the same time their coaching); and *So aside from the monetary incentive, iga guide ka or iko coach ka ng RIC to hone your paper so yun* (So aside from the monetary incentive, the research office will guide or coach you on how to hone your paper [research proposal].

Though rated by the faculty as *strongly agreed*, items with low ranking mean scores as compared to other items are on the presence of the following: a research laboratory, Ethical Review Committee, a refereed publication journal, support for application for external research grant, and a system in the selection of research proposals for funding.

Table 13
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management
in the Creation of Research Infrastructure

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. The University has a Research Office.	3.92	SA	1
12. The University organizes Research Fora/Forum.	3.64	SA	2.5
24. The University has research tools/computer software such as Turnitin, SPSS and Stata.	3.64	SA	2.5
3. The University conducts research capability seminar/training-workshop for the faculty.	3.60	SA	4
13. The University provides awards for outstanding faculty and student research.	3.56	SA	6
16. The University encourages internal and external research collaboration.	3.56	SA	6
20. The Dean motivates/supports me in doing research, publication, and application for patent.	3.56	SA	6
18. The University Library has the latest books and online/references/publication/research reading materials.	3.52	SA	8.5
21. The Research Director gives comments and suggestions on my research proposal.	3.52	SA	8.5
15. The University provides incentives for Intellectual Property output.	3.44	SA	10
11. The University has a system in the selection of research proposals for funding.	3.40	SA	11
14. The University has a refereed publication journal.	3.36	SA	12.5
25. The University supports application for external research grant.	3.36	SA	12.5
10. The University has an Ethical Review Committee.	3.28	SA	14
22. The University has a research laboratory.	2.64	A	15

There are two possible reasons for the low comparative rankings, first, the faculty research participants have

not conducted research in the University resulting in lack of awareness of the presence of research infrastructure.

Likewise, the faculty research participants are perhaps from a College without official research publication journal. During the interview with HEI 3's Research Director, she confirmed that the University has no official research publication journal, however certain colleges have their own where the faculty members publish research articles.

Faculty members rated the presence of a research laboratory as the lowest with a mean score of 2.64. This rating shows faculty's ambivalence on the presence of a research laboratory. The FGD with the faculty shows uncertainty as they expressed: *...Also, I am not sure if the University has a research lab pero sana meron* (but I hope there is) *so we can use it for our research. Yun lang* (That's it); and *... My experience is about being a research adviser of the students. Tsaka kung pwede sanang mag request sa University kung wala pa? ng laboratory para magamit namin ng mga students ko sa pag develop ng prototypes* (Also, if I may request to the University if there is none yet? A laboratory so that my students and I can use it for developing prototypes).

Table 14 shows faculty response on the role of the management in the development of research culture with respect to formulation of institutional research policies. The highest ranking mean score is 3.76 which falls on the University's deloading scheme for faculty engaged in research. Here are the pieces of evidence about the perks given to those who conduct research: *...kapag na approved yung research proposal mo, mabibigyan ka ng time to do your research through research deloading* (If your research proposal is approved, you will be given time to do your research through research deloading); and *May research deload kami dito when you do research. For me, malaking bagay yun para matapos namin yung project namin* (We have research deloading here when you do research. For me, that is a great help for us to finish our project[research]. A minimum of three (3) units for a one (1) subject deload or more depending on the scope of the research proposal is awarded to the faculty who is given a research grant to give the faculty time to do research.

Table 14
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management
in the Formulation of Research Policies

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
4. The University has deloading scheme for faculty engaged in research.	**3.76**	**SA**	**1**
8. The University formulates and adopts Research Agenda.	**3.68**	**SA**	**2**
2. The University has a committee for formulation of research policies.	**3.64**	**SA**	**3**
9. My College has its own Research Agenda.	**3.48**	**SA**	**4**

The lowest ranking mean score is 3.48 which falls on the item: *my College has its own Research Agenda*. The faculty also rated *strongly agreed* on the following: *to university formulation and adoption of Research Agenda*. This is confirmed by the faculty FGD, thus: *Last year I was also part of the team who created our college research agenda. It was challenging yet fullfilng on my part; and plus accreditation and formulation of college research agenda wise, merong kaming mga ganung commitments kaya all of this nakaka excite sa isang researcher* (We do have those kind of commitments, that is why all of these bring excitement to a researcher). Formulation and adoption of College Research Agenda are among the accreditation requirements. The differences of mean scores are narrow, it is an indication that indeed the requirements of a research culture in an HEI are in place at Apollo. The management supports and maintains the requirements of a research culture based on creation of systems for research.

Table 15 shows the responses of the faculty on the role of the management in the development of research culture in terms of Generation of Research Funds. At HEI 3, the faculty members *agreed* with a highest mean score of 3.48 that the University provides subsidy for research capability seminar/training workshop.

Table 15
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management in the Generation of
Research Funds

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
7. The University provides subsidy for research capability seminar/training workshop.	**3.48**	**SA**	**1**

The statements of faculty members affirm the University's support for research: *I have good experiences in this university like attending to trainings and conferences* (sic.)*;* Another faculty member said:

> *...Sa akin para siyang isang roller coaster kasi may mga moments na nakaka excite kasi for example may mga trainings, maeexpose ka sa mga trainings, naa update ka, may mga workshops ganun nadadagdagan kami ng knowledge. Maganda yung mga ganung klaseng experience.* (For me, it is like a roller coaster ride because there are exciting moments, for example, there are training, you will be exposed to those trainings, you will be updated, there are workshops where in you will gain knowledge. Those are beautiful kind of experiences)

Hence, the faculty statements reveal the relevance of research capability trainings for academic and

professional growth.

Table 16 shows the answers of faculty with respect to role of the management in the development of research culture in terms of Provision of incentives for publication. To this end, the University provides incentives for the following: publication in refereed journal and for Paper/Poster Presentation in professional conferences. Both items have a mean score of 3.64 which were *strongly agreed* by faculty members of Apollo.

Table 16
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management
in the Provision of Incentives for Publication

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
5. The University provides incentives for publication in refereed journal.	3.64	SA	1.5
6. The University provides incentives for Paper/Poster Presentation in professional conferences.	3.64	SA	1.5

Some faculty members were candid in sharing their experiences in paper presentation and publication as an output of their research: *...My research was accepted in Harvard and I presented it in Harvard and it was SCOPUS indexed last year. Kaya ang sabi ko, kung itong project na ito hindi natuloy edi sana wala akong publication.* (So I told myself, if this project [research] did not push through, I would not have a publication); *Same lang* (the same) *challenging and exciting at the same time kasi* (because) *we get to present our research paper outside the university.* The experience of the faculty is a testament of publication as spinoff of research.

Table 17 unveils the responses of the faculty on the role of the management in the development of research culture in terms of Responsiveness to accreditation. The faculty members in HEI 3 *strongly agreed* that their respective Colleges articulate the value of published research article in relation to accreditation with a highest mean score of 3.72. Ranked next is the item, *University makes the faculty develop awareness on the value of published research article* in relation to accreditation with a mean score of 3.68. Finally, the lowest mean score is 3.52 with the item, *University promotes research to meet the accreditation requirements of external agencies* which was *strongly agreed* by the faculty members.

The statements of two faculty members suggest that accreditation in HEI 3 is supervised. The importance and significance of accreditation is articulated by the data presented in Table 17 where the means of the four items indicate that they are *strongly agreed* upon by the research participants.

Table 17
Rank Distribution of Means on the Role of Management
with Respect to Responsiveness to Accreditation

Item	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
17. My College articulates the value of published research article in relation to accreditation.	3.72	SA	1
19. The University makes the faculty develop awareness on the value of published research article in relation to accreditation.	3.68	SA	2
23. The University promotes research to meet the accreditation requirements of external agencies.	3.52	SA	3

Furthermore, the explanation of faculty members supports this: *...She* [Dean] *always highlights the relevance of research not only for our college but for the university. In other words, the Dean wants us to do research to contribute for the accreditation and university ranking;* Another faculty member whose statement is similar: *...mga paper*[research] *na sina submit ng mga faculty. Ang priority ng College when it comes to research eh dapat related sa programs na ini offer ng college namin. Again, for accreditation purposes eh mag benefit kami, ang college. So ganun lang may mga reminders.* (The priority of our college when it comes to research is those related to the programs being offered. Again, for accreditation purposes, we [faculty members and College will benefit from it]. That's it there are reminders). Thus, research with respect to accreditation is shared by the research participants and the College administration as represented by the Dean.

Table 18 presents the percentage on the extent of faculty participation in the development of research culture. The highest item is 88%: *I can convert my research into a publishable article*. This is a manifestation of faculty's capacity to transform a research into a publishable article. The research capability trainings organized by Apollo may have a dent in the development of faculty's writing skills.

The data presented in Table 18 show items with high percentage level of participation in the development of research culture rendered by the faculty is a manifestation of research culture in the University shared by them. On the other hand, a minority group of faculty feel discomfort in participating in the development of research culture in the University. Poor research orientation, insufficient monetary incentives and lack of motivation are the possible odds of faculty hesitation in conducting research.

The FGD with the faculty members in HEI 3 discloses that some faculty members have the capacity and capability to publish an article: *...Siguro* (perhaps) *It gives me an opportunity to produce publications. Right now,*

I have less than ten research publications, national and international ones. Another faculty added: *...I had presented my research abroad, in an international conference and I was able to publish an article out of that...*

As data show, faculty members have participated in university research-related activities toward the development of research culture. The research capability trainings organized by Apollo may have a huge factor in the development of faculty's writing skills.

Table 18

Rank Distribution of Percentage on the Extent of Faculty Participation in the Development of Research Culture

Item	Percent (Y)	Rank
11. I can convert my research into a publishable article.	88%	1
5. I have participated in the seminar/workshops on research organized by the University.	84%	2.5
18. I find teaching more rewarding than doing research.	84%	2.5
20. I developed my passion for research on my own.	80%	4
12. I find teaching easier than doing research.	76%	5
1. I have presented a paper in a national conference.	72%	6.5
14. I am active in doing research.	72%	6.5
8. I was invited to serve as a Panel Member/Critic/Referee/Adviser in research related activities.	68%	8
13. I am teaching research subject.	64%	9
2. I have presented a paper in an international conference.	60%	11
6. I co-authored a research with my fellow faculty members.	60%	11
9. I am satisfied with the University Research policies and incentives.	60%	11
15. I participated in crafting the Research Agenda in my college.	56%	13
7. I conducted a research capability seminar/workshop in this University or in other Universities.	52%	14
17. I was a recipient of research mentoring by a senior colleague.	48%	15
3. I have published an article in a national refereed journal.	44%	16
16. I was given support by the University in my external application for research grant.	40%	17
4. I have published an article in an international refereed journal.	36%	18.5
19. I doubt my research competence.	36%	18.5
10. I am hesitant to conduct research because I feel inadequate.	28%	20

The lowest ranking percentage on the extent of faculty participation in the development of research culture is 28%. There are only a few faculty members who answered *yes* on the item: *I am hesitant to conduct research because I feel inadequate*. Such percentage says that most of the faculty members in Apollo are confident in conducting research. Another faculty member expressed his willingness to do research: *...I would love to do research all the time as long as they* [University] *give me more time to complete my research.* An additional statement of a faculty member that speaks about his willingness and confidence in doing research:

> *My research experience dito sa university is really exciting kasi I get to collaborate with other units*[college]. *Let's say for example noong first time ko dito*[university] *as part time* [faculty] *one of the policies of the University kapag nagka conduct ka ng research dapat mag hanap ka ng partner mo na full time faculty. So nakakuha ako sa iba, so ang discipline nila eh more on international relations tapos ako is on business so ayun exciting kasi I was able to do interdisciplinary*[research]*collaboration...*(My research experience here in the University is really exciting because I get to collaborate with other units [college]. Let's say for example, when I was still a part time faculty in this university, one of the policies of the university is when you conduct a research you should look for a full time faculty member as your partner. So I was able to find one from the other unit [college], so their discipline is more in international relations, mine is on business, so that's exciting because I was able to do interdisciplinary [research] collaboration.

The narrative of faculty amplifies their willingness to do research but a faculty mentioned that he would do research as long as HEI 3 will give him ample time to finish his research. This could be a hint that the deloading scheme of the University is insufficient, or could also be a reason why some faculty are not motivated to do research.

3.6 Summary

The research participants of HEI 3 appreciated the performance of the Research Office in motivating and supporting faculty members to engage in research and publication.

The University has a functional research office that offers research programs such as research capability seminars on publication and patent, research incentives, and deloading schemes. Fayol's Administrative Theory explains how Apollo manages research. The University practices Fayol's Administrative Theory through departmentalization by allowing the research directors and deans to create research programs that will help the faculty produce research output as well as to plan and update existing research policies in order to facilitate the needs of faculty researchers.

One limitation of the University is the nonexistence of a research laboratory. Although, some research participants showed uncertainty of the existence of research laboratory, this did not hamper them in expressing appreciation of the research capability seminars and incentives provided by the University.

Based on the data presented faculty members of HEI 3 are pleased with the research policies, incentives, and management of research as a whole.

Though research culture may not be lived and experienced by all faculty members, its existence in the University is generally felt and experienced by the key players in research activities.

4. Conclusion

Faculty members are major participants in the development of research culture because the other activity components of research belong to the faculty who are expected to write and submit research proposals, conduct research, present and publish their research output. These functions are mandated by the university, Commission on Higher Education, and accreditation agencies. This study revealed that the two major motivations of faculty members in conducting research are incentives and promotions which is a combination of Maslow's self-actualization and esteem hierarchy of needs. Faculty members are enticed to do research in order to avail of research incentives provided by the university which is a natural human tendency so as to satisfy the basic needs. Some faculty members are engaged in research for the advancement of academic rank and tenure for faculty under probation which is synonymous to the definition of self-actualization. Data confirmed that monetary incentive is a great motivation for faculty researchers. However, other HEIs like Hermes has measly research fund which results in fragmented research infrastructure which leads to faculty ambivalence in conducting research. Another roadblock that hampers research production in Hermes is lack of full time faculty. In academic settings, part-time faculty are usually branded "teach and go", meaning they go from one school to another after their classes, either return to their mother school or go to another institution to teach. Another drawback is where the long-established practice where incentives for research are only intended for full-time and with tenure faculty members. The exclusion of part-time faculty members from research incentives discourage them to engage in research because their efforts are not remunerated well. On the sunny side, faculty in three (3) HEIs divulged that passion is their rationale for engaging in research. A few elaborated that aside from monetary incentives, there is self-fulfillment in doing research. Additionally, other faculty members enjoy doing research for the opportunity to travel as they do research presentations both in national and international research conference.

5. Acknowledgement

References

Adipraja, P.F. E. (2021). *The Importance of Doing Research.* https://www.indowhiz.com/articles/en/research-importance/

Creswell, J. (2015). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.),
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Georghiou, L. (2015). *Value of Research*, https://ec.europa. eu/research /openvision/pdf/rise/georghiou-value_research.pd,

Moseti, I. (2015). *Knowledge Production through Mentorship of Next Generation Scholars: Case Study of Universities in Kenya.African Journal Of Library, Archives & Information Science,* 25(2), 91-109.

Mbaleka, S. (2015) *Factors Leading to Limited Faculty Publications on Philippine Higher EducationIinstitutions*, International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290395664_Factors_Leading_to_Limited_Faculty_Publications_in_Philippine_Higher_Education_Institutions.

"Good Practice Guide: Developing Research Capacity," (2012). Accessed January 12, 2021http://www.usc.edu.au/media/10176277/clrd_gpg-capacity_lr-final.pdf

Mark Cleeford L. Quitoras earned his Doctor of Education in Educational Administration and Leadership, Master of Arts in Reaching in English, and Bachelor of Arts in English from the University of the East. He is currently a full-time researcher-writer at the Office of Research Coordination and a part-time faculty member at the University of the East Graduate School and College of Arts and Sciences.