



Research Article

Faculty research characteristics and research environment: underpinnings of the culture of research

Lauro S. Aspiras*

Research and Development Office, Quirino State University, Cabarroguis Campus, Zamora, Cabarroguis, Quirino

Emma D. Aspiras

Gender and Development Office, Quirino State University, Cabarroguis Campus, Zamora, Cabarroguis, Quirino

Gideon D. Oray

Mathematics Department, Quirino State University, Cabarroguis Campus, Zamora, Cabarroguis, Quirino

*Corresponding Author email: lauro.aspiras@qsu.edu.ph

Submitted: 15 June 2021

Revised: 10 August 2021

Accepted: 17 November 2021

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to evaluate the research characteristics of the faculty members and their research environment. This inquiry utilized the Quantitative Descriptive Research survey design. A total of 45 respondents comprising the permanent faculty members of the university participated in the survey through a semi-structured questionnaire. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics specifically frequency counts and percentages, mean, and Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA). The study highlighted that the faculty members are highly motivated in doing research; they have different attitudes towards engaging research endeavors. On the other hand, number of subject preparations inversely affected their motivation and attitudes towards research writing. It was also found out that the level of research knowledge and skills of the faculty with lower number of preparations is significantly higher than those with higher subject preparations. Further, it was noted a high extent of inclusion and execution of the policies and agenda anchored to the campus' research developmental framework. There is a high extent of research culture and working conditions in their department, also agreed that there is a moderate extent of Collaborations and Access with Professional networks of the campus and the shared that there is a high extent of research management of the campus. It was also noted that there is a high extent of research infrastructure of the campus except for the provision of a separate R and D publication division and on-line research journals and books.

Keywords: *Research Characteristics; Research Environment; Research Culture; Faculty*

1. INTRODUCTION

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 moved high on the priority agenda for Higher Education Institutions.

Moreover, research culture encompasses the behaviors, values, expectations, attitudes and norms of our research communities. It influences researchers' career paths and determines the way that research is conducted and communicated. Indeed, attitudes and characteristics towards research is indeed a factor in research productivity leverage. Indeed, there are numerous issues and concerns that have been found to be associated with research attitudes, characteristics and productivity. According to Papanastasiou (2005), it is important to identify the attitudes towards research so that a positive attitude can be developed among researchers and hence their learning can be facilitated in turn.

Universities in the developed world have recognize research as an important part of their responsibilities. Indeed, faculty members of higher education institutions (HEIs) have consistently evidenced research productivity together with other factors that contribute to the process such as research characteristics and research environment (Sanyal & Varghese as cited by Salazar, C., et.al., 2006).

Further, Monroe, R. S. (2011) studied the Aksum University (AKU) faculty members' attitudes towards academic research. He found out that the faculty members have highly positive attitudes towards academic research process. Monroe also reiterated that faculty members inactivity and low productivity in academic research publications should not be attributed to "a bad attitude" but rather to a lack of experience.

Hence, it becomes 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.

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 and provide the research support needed by the HEIs more effectively, efficiently and equitably. Thus, the mandate focuses on research grants, supports to paper presentations, and research productivity enhancement.

Likewise, in line with the mandates as mentioned in the paragraph above, the National Higher Education Research Agenda-2 (NHERA) was formulated which aims to place 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.

In the case of Quirino State University, Cabarroguis Campus, 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 to improve quality of life of its target clientele. Its conversion into a university from a local college gave way to a new horizon of academic arena and thus very persistent in the realization of the four-fold functions of a university - instruction, research, extension, and production.

In fact, the campus is on its way to developing research culture among the faculty members. Perplexities in pushing the goals and objectives of the Research Department into a success are really challenging. Thus, revitalization on research programs should be undertaken and activities on research capability building among the faculty members should also be organized to enhance their capacity in executing the process of research.

Indeed, the institution wishes to collaborate with other researchers or allied institutions and aspires to prepare every faculty members of the campus to be active and to be engaged in research and be a part of the global research community; thus, the development and sustainability of the campus towards excellence is in the hands of professionally competent, research oriented and productive faculty members.

Hence, it is on these premises that the present study was conceptualized. It is generally aimed to determine the faculty research characteristics and research environment at Quirino State University, Cabarroguis Campus. The result of this study is definitely a basis of coming up with possible programs and activities of the Research and Development Office which could be of help in enhancing research culture and ultimately research productivity of the university.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

2.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study utilized quantitative descriptive research design to collect and analyze the data. Thus, this research 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 characteristics and research environment of the faculty members of the Quirino State University, Cabarroguis Campus. Hence, questionnaire was administered to collect quantitative data. These issues were analyzed to determine possible ways of enhancing the research culture of the faculty members in the campus.

2.2. RESPONDENTS OF THE STUDY

The research protocol in the selection of the respondents for this study was considered. Thus, Total Enumeration sampling was used where the researcher chose to examine the entire population that have a particular set of characteristics that the study requires. A total of 45 respondents comprising all the faculty members of the eight (8) programs/colleges of Quirino State University, Cabarroguis Campus with plantilla position or permanent status. On the other hand, Contract of Service (COS) faculty members were excluded in the conduct of research. Further, the respondents were chosen by the researcher considering the fact that they are the direct individuals who has knowledge in the process of research and has the concept on the research programs and activities of the university.

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

2.3. INSTRUMENTATION

The data gathering tool used in this study was a semi-structured questionnaire that was created based on relevant concepts, theories, and previous literature. The questionnaire was adapted and modified from the HanOver Research (2014) as stipulated in their report "Building a Culture of Research: Recommended Practices". The questionnaire was divided into three parts and each part have sub-sections. The first part contained demographic information for the respondent, including age, civil status, years of service, and number of subject preparations. The next part is the Research Characteristics with three subsections namely: Research Motivation, Research Attitudes, and Research Knowledge and Skills, The third part inquired about the Research Environment of the respondents which comprises of five subsections namely: institutional research policies and agenda, departmental culture and working conditions, collaborations and access with professional networks, research management, and Infrastructures.

The researcher modified the items of each subsections to suit the research context and for a better understanding. In addition, subsections of part 2 and part 3 were measured using 5-point Likert scale as presented in table 1. Before administering the questionnaires, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to test the reliability of the questionnaire, showing a result of 0.9, which means that this instrument is reliable. Moreover, a face to face interview was conducted with the faculty members and departmental research coordinators of the campus to elicit information regarding their research characteristics and their perspectives on their research environment.

Finally, a Documentary Analysis was also executed. A validation of data through cross verification was undertaken in this study. The profile of the faculty members specifically their age, civil status, years in service, and number of subject preparations were verified using the documents from the Human Resource Department.

2.4. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

There were various steps that were followed in the conduct of the study. Thus, Ethics Review Committee protocol was undertaken. The researcher coordinated and secured permission from the university President, Dean for instruction, and Deans/Program chairs regarding the conduct of the study. Upon approval, the researcher obtained the list of faculty researchers of the campus from the Human Resource Department to be validated by the Director for Instruction. The researcher coordinated with the Deans/Program chairs regarding the participation of their faculty researchers in the study. Upon approval of the Deans/Program chairs, the researcher sought permission from the participants or the faculty researchers to participate in the data gathering process. The questionnaires were floated and endorsed properly to the faculty researchers for them to answer. As soon as the instruments were filled-up, the researcher personally collected the filled-up questionnaire so as to attain 100% retrieval. Lastly, the data gathered were consolidated, analyzed, and interpreted by the researcher using appropriate data analysis tools.

2.5. DATA ANALYSIS

The research purposes of this study were to describe the research characteristics and research environment of the faculty members. The data gathered were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Thus, *Frequency counts and percentages* were used in the tabulation of the quantitative data of the study specifically the demographic profile of the participants. Further, mean was used to present data on research motivation; attitudes towards research; research knowledge and skills; research management; research priorities; research publications; research environment; and research infrastructure. To interpret the means, the given scale was used:

Table 1. Interpretation of the Mean Scale

Score Range	Descriptive Value
4.20-5.00	very high extent/very high/very highly favorable
3.40-4.19	high extent/ high/highly favorable
2.60-3.39	moderate extent/ moderate / moderately favorable
1.80-2.59	low extent/low/less favorable
1.00-1.79	very low extent/very low/least favorable

Likewise, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether a significant difference exists on the faculty research characteristics when they are grouped according to profile variables.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. PROFILE OF THE PARTICIPANTS

The study involved 45 faculty members of the Quirino State University, Cabarroguis Campus. The result of the query shows that most of the respondents are in the younger ages whereas 10 or 22.70 percent of them are 26-30 years old, followed by the faculty with ages ranging from 31-35 years old which comprise of 8 or 18.20 percent, then same proportion of participants are within the age range 36-40, 41-45 and 51-55 with a recorded frequency of 6 or 13.60 percent. Very few of the participants are in the age bracket of 21-25, 46-50 and 56-60 as indicated by the frequencies of 5, 3 and 1 respectively. Generally, the faculty members of the university are in the adult ages.

Moreover, as to the civil status of the respondents, 32 or 71.00 percent of the respondents reported were married at the time of survey while 13 or 29.00 percent were reported as single. On the other hand, data show that there are 18 or 40.00 percent who have served the institution for 1 – 5 years, followed by the 8 or 17.78.00 percent faculty who have served the school for 6-10 years; 6 or 13.33 percent has been working in the institution for 21-25 years, followed closely by those who have been with the university for 11-15 years and 26-30 years & above with the same frequency of 4 or 8.89 percent. The data imply that most of the faculty members are young in the service.

Lastly the faculty's number of subject preparations revealed that most or 69.90 percent of the teachers has a subject preparation of 4 – 6 and 11 or 25.00 percent of them have 1 – 3 subject preparations and 5 or 9.10 percent have 7 – 9 subject preparations.

3.2. RESEARCH CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FACULTY MEMBERS

Table 2. Research Motivation of Faculty Respondents

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
I would describe myself as being internally driven to conduct research	3.98	HE
I am motivated to do research to improve my performance as a faculty of the university.	4.25	VHE
I am motivated to do research to be included in the row of the top performing faculty members of the university.	3.43	HE
Research performance and promotion requirements are the main reasons why I am motivated do research work.	3.50	HE
I am doing research work because of the monetary incentives.	2.57	ME
My students' achievements motivate me to do research.	4.00	HE
Peer recognition motivates me to conduct research.	3.43	HE
I am doing research for the purpose of contributing more to the existing body of knowledge.	4.05	HE
I am motivated to do research because of the opportunity of attending domestic or international conferences.	3.48	HE
I am motivated to do research work because it can build up my social prestige.	3.45	HE
Enjoyment on the process of inquiry and curiosity are the motivations why I do research.	3.67	HE
The intellectual challenge of academic research motivates me to work harder.	3.91	HE
I am motivated to do research because my colleagues are conducting research work.	3.74	HE
I am motivated to do research to improve my way of teaching.	4.16	HE
I am motivated to do research to contribute QSU's academic reputation.	4.14	HE
Overall Mean	3.72	HE

*Legend: 4.20-5.00= Very High Extent (VHE) 2.60-3.39= Moderate Extent (ME) 1.80-2.59= Low Extent (LE)
3.40-4.19= High Extent (HE) 1.00-1.79= Very Low Extent (VLE)*

The table above shows the motivation level of the faculty members towards research. The data reveal that faculty members are highly motivated as indicated by the computed mean of 3.72. A "Very high" level of motivation is indicated on item number 2 which says that the participants are motivated to do research to improve their performance as faculty of the campus.

In general, the faculty members are highly motivated in doing research as shown in the overall mean of 3.87 which is described as "high" level of motivation.

Table 3. Attitudes of the Faculty Members towards Research

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
I believe that doing academic research is important for building my career.	4.30	VHF
I assumed that academic research improves my teaching.	4.27	VHF
I believe that knowledge from research is as useful as writing.	4.27	VHF
I use my vacant time in doing research.	3.58	HF
I consider sharing research results with other academics a very self-satisfying.	4.20	VHF
I want to build my reputation as an academic scholar through research.	3.08	MF
Academic research is valuable to me and I will participate in any research endeavors of the university.	2.58	LF
I fully understand that doing research is an asset for promotion in the appointment I hold.	4.09	HF
I believe that pursuing my interest in research works lead to more excellent opportunities.	4.14	HF

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
The skills I have acquired in research will be helpful to me in the future.	4.14	HF
I am inclined to study the details of research procedures carefully.	4.23	VHF
I believe that research should be indispensable in my professional training.	4.18	HF
I have to conduct research to fulfill my responsibility as an academic staff member.	3.38	MF
Research-orientated thinking plays an important role in my daily life.	2.68	LF
I can contribute to QSU's academic reputation by publishing research papers.	4.18	HF
Overall Mean	3.82	HF

Legend: 4.20-5.00= Very Highly Favorable (VHF) 2.60-3.39= Moderately Favorable (MF)
 1.80-2.59= Lowly Favorable (LF) 3.40-4.19= Highly Favorable (HF) 1.00-1.79= Very Lowly Favorable (VLF)

The data indicate a general qualitative rating of "Highly favorable" attitude with an overall mean average of 3.82. More specifically, the table reveals that varied results were obtained on the fifteen items as indicated in the table.

Thus, attitude of faculty members ranges from lowly favorable, moderately favorable to very highly favorable result.

Table 4. Research knowledge and Skills of the Faculty Members

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
I am knowledgeable on the criteria in writing research title.	3.71	HE
I have the knowledge in writing comprehensive research introduction.	3.48	HE
I have the ability to stay very "up-to-date" on the current literature in my research interest area(s).	3.48	HE
I have the skills to do effective electronic database searching of the scholarly literature, paper citation, and documentation of sources.	3.39	HE
I have the ability to identify, apply and develop methods and experimental techniques appropriate for research projects.	3.39	ME
I am knowledgeable in the presentation and tabulation of data.	3.32	HE
I have the ability to read and understand research findings and discussions in academic journals.	3.45	HE
I have the ability to recognize and validate problems; to formulate and to apply solutions to a range of research problems.	3.48	HE
I have the knowledge in the formulation of conclusions and derivation of recommendations of the study.	3.55	HE
I have the ability to effectively present research findings both verbally and in written form.	3.57	HE
I have the skill in identifying appropriate audience for my research.	3.39	ME
I have the knowledge in preparing and packaging research proposals for funding.	3.57	HE
I have the ability to identify possible sources of fund for research projects.	3.39	ME
I am knowledgeable in recording, managing and handling information/data using appropriate bibliographic software and other information technologies.	3.32	ME
I have the knowledge in publishing research outputs in the indexed journals.	3.74	ME
Overall Mean	3.48	HE

Legend: 4.20-5.00= Very High Extent (VHE) 2.60-3.39= Moderate Extent (ME)
 1.80-2.59= Low Extent (LE) 3.40-4.19= High Extent (HE) 1.00-1.79= Very Low Extent (VLE)

The data in the above table show the level of research knowledge and skills of the participants. As indicated in the data, a mean of 3.48 with a qualitative rating of "high" level of research knowledge and skills of the faculty members.

As a result, the overall mean is 3.48 with a descriptive interpretation of “High Extent”. Therefore, the outcomes indicate that the participants are highly knowledgeable and have the essential skill on the basics and advance concepts of research.

3.3. TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Table 5. Significant Differences on the Research Characteristics of the Faculty When Grouped According to Personal Profile

Research Characteristics	Personal Profile							
	Age		Civil Status		Number of Years in Service		Number of Subject Preparations	
	F Value	P Value	F Value	P Value	F Value	P Value	F Value	P Value
Research Motivation	1.80	0.09	0.91	0.34	1.34	0.43	5.34	0.01*
Research Attitudes	0.66	0.70	0.02	0.39	0.53	0.75	7.17	0.001*
Research Knowledge and Skills	2.18	0.04*	0.18	0.67	2.29	0.06	3.73	0.03*

*Note: N=45, * significant at 0.05*

It indicates in the table the Research Characteristics of the faculty members along Research Motivation, Research Attitudes, and Research Knowledge and Skills. The data evidently show that the research characteristics of the respondents has no significant differences when grouped according to age, civil status, number of years in service as it incurred an F values higher than the alpha level of .05. On the other hand, it can also note that along subject preparations has an F value of 5.34, 7.17, 3.73 and a p-value of 0.01, 0.001, and 0.03 respectively. Testing at an alpha level of .05, the p-value is less than the alpha level of .05. Consequently, the null hypothesis which states that “there is no significant difference on the extent to which the faculty manifests research motivation when grouped according to the number of subject preparations” is rejected. Therefore, number of subject preparations of the faculty members inversely affected their motivation, attitudes, and knowledge and skills towards research writing. Accordingly, the lower the number of subject preparation the higher motivation and favorable attitude they had and the higher the number of subject preparations the lower the motivation and unfavorable attitude they had in research writing.

Hence, the results of this research are in support to the context of the study of Jung (2012), which states that gender, years of experience, teaching time versus research time, level of multi-disciplinary collaboration, research style and workload are of relevance.

Moreover, number of studies have highlighted the importance of researcher’s attitudes on performance. Wooding et al. (2013 found out that, for impactful research, individual characteristics such as motivation and entrepreneurial attitude are of importance, as well as skills beyond research methods and engagement with wider stakeholders. This point of view supports the objective of the present study as it focuses on the attitudes of the faculty towards research endeavor.

3.4. RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT OF THE FACULTY MEMBERS

Table 6. Institutional Research Policies and Agenda of the Campus

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
The university's research agenda is based on its vision, mission, philosophy, and goals.	4.26	VHE
The university has relevant policies and procedures that are made available to sponsors, researchers, research Staff, research participants, and the Institutional Review Board or Ethics Committee, as appropriate.	4.17	HE
The university has a systematic and comprehensive Human Research Protection Program that affords protection for all research participants.	4.03	HE
The university supports faculty members on their research endeavors by giving rewards and incentives to their outputs.	4.18	HE
The university has and follows written policies and procedures for reviewing the scientific or scholarly validity of a proposed research study.	4.06	HE
The university follows written policies and procedures setting forth the ethical standards and practices of the Human Research Protection Program.	3.99	HE
The university follows written specific research protocols that establish good rapport between the participants, the researchers and the partner institutions.	4.11	HE
The university promotes the involvement of community members, when appropriate, in the design and implementation of research and the dissemination of results.	4.11	HE
The research priorities of every department are aligned to the research agenda of the university and the research thrusts of their respective field.	4.08	HE
Promotion of and sharing of research outputs is stipulated in the policies of the research department.	4.09	HE
Overall Mean	4.11	HE

Legend: 4.20-5.00= Very High Extent (VHE) 2.60-3.39= Moderate Extent (ME)
 1.80-2.59= Low Extent (LE) 3.40-4.19= High Extent (HE) 1.00-1.79= Very Low Extent (VLE)

Table 6 presents the faculty members' observations on the research environment of the university particularly the institutional research policies and agenda.

It indicates that the respondents highly favored that the university's research agenda is based on its vision and mission as indicated by their composite mean score of 4.26 which described as very high extent. On the other hand, composite mean of all the other items set forth in this study are as follow: 4.18, 4.17, 4.11, 4.09, 4.08, 4.06, 4.03 and 3.99 which are uniformly described as high extent. This gives a total mean of 4.11 and interpreted as high extent.

Thus, 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.

Table 7. Departmental Culture and Working Conditions of the Campus

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
The Research programs and strategies are designed to encourage and sustain research productivity among the faculty in the department.	4.07	HE
Faculty members of the department has a commonly held research vision as stipulated in the five year development plan of the program.	4.01	HE

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
Department's faculty researchers clearly understand how their research work and goals related to the department vision.	3.99	HE
Researchers consider the protection of the participants before conducting research study.	4.08	HE
The department employ processes and methods of documentation appropriate to the type of research and the study population.	4.00	HE
The department employs collaborations among the faculty members in conducting research.	3.98	HE
Researchers and research staff of the department identify and disclose financial interests according to organizational policies and regulatory requirements.	3.99	HE
Senior researchers and research staff of the department are willingly extend their expertise to the neophyte researchers.	4.00	HE
Researchers of the department maintain appropriate oversight of each research study, and appropriately delegate research responsibilities and functions among the proponents of the study or project.	3.94	HE
Researchers and research staff of the department follow the requirements of the research protocol or plan and adhere to the policies and procedures of the university.	4.58	VHE
Overall Mean	4.01	HE

Legend: 4.20-5.00= Very High Extent (VHE) 2.60-3.39= Moderate Extent (ME)
1.80-2.59= Low Extent (LE) 3.40-4.19= High Extent (HE) 1.00-1.79= Very Low Extent (VLE)

Presented in the Table above is the departmental research culture and working conditions of the faculty members. It indicates that item number 10 which states that the researchers and research staff of the department follow the requirements of the research protocol or plan and adhere to policies and procedures of the university as indicated by the composite mean score of 4.58 which described as very high extent. On the other hand, composite descriptive interpretation of all the other items set forth in this study are of high extent.

Thus, it could be inferred that the faculty members favored that there is a high extent of research culture and working conditions in their department.

Table 8. Collaborations and Access with Professional Networks of the Campus

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
The university established collaborations and partnerships to research industries.	2.46	LE
Collaboration on Local, national, and international linkages has been a part of the research fund sourcing of the university.	2.58	LE
The university highlighted that by establishing partnerships with industry, the attractiveness of the region and of the university itself had increased.	3.42	HE
The conduct of research with partner institutions established assistantship and improve management processes of the collaborative projects.	3.58	HE
The initiatives of the university on collaborations and access to companies strengthen the capacity of the R&D in delivering result of researches to the community.	4.06	HE
Overall Mean	3.22	ME

Legend: 4.20-5.00= Very High Extent (VHE) 2.60-3.39= Moderate Extent (ME)
1.80-2.59= Low Extent (LE) 3.40-4.19= High Extent (HE) 1.00-1.79= Very Low Extent (VLE)

Table 8 presents the research environment of the faculty members particularly on collaborations and access with Professional networks. The faculty got the lowest rating in item number 1 and 2 which state that "the university established collaborations and

partnerships to research industries” and “Collaboration on Local, national, and international linkages has been a part of the research fund sourcing of the university” as indicated by the composite mean scores of 2.46 and 2.58 respectively which described as low extent.

On the other hand, the composite descriptive interpretation of “high extent” as set forth in this study is given to items, 3, 4, 5 respectively. This gives a general or total mean of 3.22 and interpreted as moderate extent.

Thus, it could be concluded that the faculty members agreed that there is a moderate extent of Collaborations and Access with Professional networks of the campus.

Table 9. Research Management of the Campus

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
The research management of the university monitors and screens the types of research conducted.	4.01	HE
The research management of the university has an effective evaluation system	3.93	HE
The research management of the university is responsible of looking into ethical dilemmas involved, especially in sensitive fields.	4.05	HE
The management of the university conducts regular in-house evaluation of its research programs.	4.26	VHE
The management of the university establishes clear cut research policy of the university.	4.11	HE
The management of the university design and implement a capacity building program for researchers.	4.14	HE
The research management continuously consult with research funding agencies and review of research agenda maximizing the participation of stakeholders.	4.10	HE
The research management of the university designs an effective monitoring and evaluation system for R & D activities.	4.12	HE
The management maintains a complete set of materials relevant to the review of the research protocol or plan for a period of time sufficient to comply with legal and regulatory requirements, sponsor requirements, and organizational policies and procedures.	4.05	HE
The research management creates mechanisms on motivating faculty to do research.	4.08	HE
Overall Mean	4.08	HE

Legend: 4.20-5.00= Very High Extent (VHE) 2.60-3.39= Moderate Extent (ME)
 1.80-2.59= Low Extent (LE) 3.40-4.19= High Extent (HE) 1.00-1.79= Very Low Extent (VLE)

Presented in Table above the research environment of the faculty members particularly on research management. It can be noted in that there is only one item with a descriptive interpretation of “very high extent” with a composite mean score of 4.26 which states that “the management of the university conducts regular in-house evaluation of its research programs.” On the other hand, items number 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 rated as “very high” respectively. This gives a general or total mean of 4.08 and interpreted as “high extent”.

Thus, it could be inferred that the faculty members agreed that there is a high extent of research management of the campus.

Table 10. Research Infrastructures of the Campus

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
There is a separate research office of the campus.	4.53	VHE
There is a research governing body of the campus to oversee the conduct of faculty and students researches.	4.31	VHE
There is a separate publication division of the R & D department.	2.15	LE
There is a space for the conduct of research outputs' in-house reviews.	4.10	HE
There is an adequate equipment for the printing and reproduction of research instruments, research outputs, etc.	3.89	HE
There are laboratories available and accessible for the conduct of research.	3.60	HE
There are adequate library holdings specifically on online references like online journals and books.	1.52	VLE
There are available software for data tabulation and analysis like SPSS, Plagiarism detection software, NVIVO and the like.	3.77	HE
Overall Mean	3.45	HE

Legend: 4.20-5.00= Very High Extent (VHE) 2.60-3.39= Moderate Extent (ME)
 1.80-2.59= Low Extent (LE) 3.40-4.19= High Extent (HE) 1.00-1.79= Very Low Extent (VLE)

The table above reflects the research environment of the faculty members particularly on infrastructure. It can be noted in that items 1 and 2 have both descriptive interpretation of “very high extent” with a composite mean score of 4.53 and 4.31 respectively. Further, item number 7 has the lowest composite mean score of 1.52 which described as “very low extent”, item number 3 has a composite mean score of 2.15 described as low extent, items 4, 5, 6, 8 described as “very high.” In general, their rating got an overall mean of 3.45 which is interpreted as “high extent”.

Thus, it could be inferred that there is a high extent of research infrastructure of the campus except for the provision of a separate R and D publication division and on-line research journals and books.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are deduced:

It was noted that as to the profile of the participants, the faculty members of the university are in the adult ages and most of them are married at the time of survey and young in the service. It was also found out that most of the teachers has a subject preparation of four to six subject preparations. Moreover, the paper highlighted the characteristics of the respondents towards research endeavor. Indeed, the result evidently revealed that the faculty members are highly motivated in doing research.

Additionally, the outcome clearly indicated that the faculty members has highly favorable attitude towards research undertakings.

Furthermore, it was also found out that the participants are highly knowledgeable and have the essential skill on the basics and advance concepts of research. Likewise, the paper also highlighted significant differences particularly on the characteristics of the faculty members when grouped according to their profile. It was noted that the number of subject preparation has something to do with the motivation level, attitude, and research

knowledge and skills of the participants. Thus, number of subject preparations inversely affect the characteristics of the faculty members towards research undertakings.

On the other hand, as to the research environment of the faculty members, it was observed that there is a high extent of inclusion and execution of the policies and agenda anchored to the to the university's research developmental framework. It was also revealed that the faculty members favored that there is a high extent of research culture and working conditions in their department.

Further, the participants also agreed that there is a moderate extent of Collaborations and Access with Professional networks of the campus and that there is a high extent of research management of the university. Furthermore, it could be inferred from the result of the study that there is a high extent of research infrastructure of the university except for the provision of a separate R and D publication division and on-line research journals and books.

The crux is: Research culture in any academic institution needs to be enhanced, particularly the research environment that could establish positive research characteristics and eventually motivate the faculty members to achieve excellence. Therefore, building positive attitudes and characteristics towards research and establishing positive research environment are the underpinnings of the culture of research.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the Quirino State University Research and Development Office for the support extended to the research enthusiasts of the university.

Reference:

- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2000). Attitudes and the attitude-Behavior Relation: Reasoned and Automatic Processes. (Ed.) Stroebe, W., & Hewstone, M. European Review of Social Psychology, Chichester, England:
- Bland C.J. and Ruffin M.T (1992). Characteristics of a Productive Research Environment: Literature Review. Retrieved from PubMED.com. Website <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1596337>
- Deem, R., & Lucas, L. (2006). Learning about research: exploring the learning and teaching/research amongst educational practitioners studying in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(1),1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562510500400040>
- Dundar, H., & Lewis, D. (1998). Determinants of research productivity in higher education. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(6), 607-631. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018705823763>
- Gonzalez, A. 2006. Creating a culture of research in a developing country. Bernardo, A. B. I., Muñoz, M. P., & Valencia, M. N. (eds.) *Research and Higher Education Development: Asia-Pacific Perspectives*. Manila: Lasallian Institute for Development and Educational Research, College of Education, De La Salle University-Manila.
- Hanover Research (2014). Building a Culture of Research: Recommended Practices. www.hanoverresearch.com/.../Building-a-Culture-of-Research-Recommended-Practice
- Harrington, M & Levine, D. (1986). 'Relationship between faculty characteristics and research productivity', *Journal of Dental Education*, vol. 50, September, pp. 518-525.

- Lechuga, V.M. and Lechuga, D.C. (2012), "Faculty motivation and scholarly work: self-determination and self-regulation perspectives", *Journal of the Professoriate*, Vol. 6 No.2, pp.59-97.
- Milgrom, P.D., et. al. (2008). Research Productivity of Members of IADR Behavioral Sciences and Health Services Research Group: Relationship to Professional and Personal Factors. *Journal of Dental Education* Volume 72, Number 10
- Monroe, S.R. (n.d.). *Faculties Attitudes Towards Academic Research: A Basis for Improvement in Publication Productivity*. Metropolitan State College of Denver, Colorado, USA. www.aabri.com/LV11Manuscripts/LV11034.pdf
- Papanastasiou, E. C. (2005). Factor structure of the attitudes toward research scale. *Statistics Education Research Journal*, 4(1): 16-26.
- Philippines (1994). 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)
- Rivera, M., Jr. and Rivera, R. V. ((2007). *Practical Guide to Thesis and Dissertation Writing*. Katha Publishing, Inc. Quezon City, Philippines
- Salazar, RM.C., Almonte, S. A. (2007) *Developing Research Culture in Philippine Higher Education Institutions: Perspectives of University Faculty*. De La Salle University – Manila, Philippines
- Salazar-Clemeña, R.M. (2006). higher education research in the Philippines: Policies, practices, and problems. Meek, V. L. & Suwanwela, C. (eds.) *Higher Education Research and Knowledge in the Asia Pacific Region* (pp. 185-200). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shim, S., O'Neal, G., & Rabolt, N. (1998). Research attitudes and productivity among faculty at four-year U.S. institutions: A socialization perspective. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 16(3), 134-144.
- UNESCO (2007). *The Impact of Globalization on Higher Education and Research in the Arab States*. Retrieved at UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge: Selected Proceedings [Web link](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/files/.../Selected_Proceedings_Arab_2007.pdf)
http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/files/.../Selected_Proceedings_Arab_2007.pdf