INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH
FOR INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY, AND EXCELLENCE (IMJRISE)
https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise
Volume 1, Issue no. 5 (2024)
ISSN: 3028-032X (online) | ISSN: 3028-0370 (print)

Heterogeneity in Research Capacities: Exploring Variations Among Philippine Higher Education Institutions

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11307965

Cherry May Q. Bibat
University of the Visayas, Cebu City, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7961-5771

Osias Kit T. Kilag
PAU Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc., Mercado St., Poblacion, Toledo City, Cebu, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0845-3373

Abstract:

This study examines the research culture and productivity within Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs), drawing on a comprehensive analysis of existing literature and empirical data. Findings reveal a predominant focus on teaching functions over research activities in many HEIs, despite efforts by regulatory bodies to promote research orientation. Faculty members exhibit limited involvement in research, with graduate students often driving research output. Moreover, significant heterogeneity exists in research capabilities across HEIs, influenced by factors such as university type, faculty composition, and geographic location. Addressing these challenges requires tailored interventions, including investments in research capacity building, faculty development, and institutional support structures. By fostering a vibrant research ecosystem and promoting collaborative partnerships, HEIs can enhance research productivity, elevate academic standards, and contribute to national development. This study underscores the importance of recognizing and addressing the multifaceted challenges facing research culture and productivity within Philippine HEIs, paving the way for transformative change and innovation in the higher education sector.

Keywords: Philippine higher education institutions, research culture, research productivity, faculty involvement

Introduction:

Higher education institutions (HEIs) play a pivotal role in fostering research culture and driving knowledge creation and innovation. While universities in the developed world have long-standing traditions of research excellence, those in the developing world, including the Philippines, have faced challenges in balancing teaching and research functions (Sanyal & Varghese, 2006). In the Philippines, a significant majority of HEIs have been characterized as primarily teaching-focused institutions, with limited research productivity (Bernardo, 2003).

The Philippine Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has recognized the importance of research in HEIs and has implemented initiatives to promote research orientation and capacity-building among faculty members (CHED, 2016). However, the current state of research in Philippine HEIs leaves much to be desired in terms of quantity, quality, and contribution to national development (Salazar-Clemeña, 2006).

Understanding the research culture within Philippine HEIs is essential for identifying factors that hinder or facilitate faculty engagement in research activities. Research culture encompasses institutional policies, departmental practices, and faculty attitudes towards research (Bland & Ruffin, 1992). By examining faculty perspectives on research culture, this study aims to shed light on the challenges and opportunities for enhancing research productivity in Philippine HEIs.

Literature Review:

Research culture within higher education institutions (HEIs) is a multifaceted concept that encompasses institutional policies, departmental practices, and faculty attitudes towards research. Understanding the factors that influence research culture is essential for promoting research productivity and innovation. In this literature review, we explore existing studies on research culture, particularly focusing on its impact on faculty engagement in research activities within the context of Philippine HEIs.

Faculty members in HEIs traditionally have three primary roles: teaching, research, and community service (Boyer, 1990). These roles are often intertwined, with faculty expected to balance their responsibilities to meet institutional goals and academic standards. However, the emphasis placed on each role varies across institutions and disciplines, influencing faculty priorities and engagement in research activities.

Research culture refers to the norms, values, and practices that shape the research environment within an institution (Bland & Ruffin, 1992). A strong research culture fosters collaboration, innovation, and knowledge

dissemination among faculty members. Studies have identified various factors that contribute to a conducive research environment, including institutional support, funding availability, and recognition of research achievements.

Research culture in developing countries, including the Philippines, faces unique challenges related to resource constraints, infrastructure limitations, and competing priorities (Salmi & Hauptman, 2006). While some HEIs in developing countries have made significant strides in promoting research excellence, many struggle to establish a robust research culture due to systemic barriers and inadequate support structures.

Faculty attitudes and perceptions play a crucial role in shaping research culture within HEIs. Studies have found that faculty members' motivation, incentives, and perceived value of research influence their engagement in research activities (Tierney, 1999). Factors such as workload, institutional support, and career advancement opportunities also impact faculty involvement in research.

Government initiatives and policies play a significant role in shaping research culture and promoting research productivity in HEIs. In the Philippines, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has implemented various programs and incentives to support research activities and capacity-building among faculty members (CHED, 2016). These initiatives aim to enhance the research capabilities of HEIs and contribute to national development goals.

Despite efforts to promote research culture, Philippine HEIs face challenges such as limited funding, infrastructure constraints, and competing priorities (Salazar-Clemeña, 2006). Addressing these challenges requires a multifaceted approach, including institutional support, capacity-building programs, and stakeholder collaboration. However, there are also opportunities for enhancing research culture through strategic partnerships, international collaborations, and technology integration.

Methodology:

The study employed a purposive sampling technique to select participants from higher education institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines. HEIs were chosen based on their geographical location and reputation for research activities. Faculty members from diverse disciplines and academic ranks were targeted to ensure a comprehensive understanding of research culture across different institutions.

Data were collected through content analysis of existing literature, policy documents, and institutional reports related to research culture in Philippine HEIs. A systematic search was conducted on academic databases such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and Scopus using keywords such as "research culture," "faculty engagement," and "higher education institutions." Relevant documents, including peer-reviewed articles, government reports, and institutional policies, were retrieved and analyzed to identify key themes and trends related to research culture.

Content analysis was employed to analyze the retrieved documents and extract meaningful insights related to research culture in Philippine HEIs. The analysis involved several steps: Relevant sections of the documents were coded based on predetermined categories related to research culture, such as institutional policies, faculty perceptions, and research productivity.

Codes were grouped into overarching themes to identify patterns and trends in research culture across different HEIs. The coded data were synthesized to develop a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing research culture in Philippine HEIs. Common themes and sub-themes were identified, and relationships between different variables were explored.

The findings were validated through peer review and consultation with experts in the field of higher education research. Feedback from stakeholders, including faculty members and institutional administrators, was also sought to ensure the credibility and reliability of the findings.

Findings and Discussion:

Dominance of Teaching Institutions:
The study underscores a prevailing emphasis on teaching functions within Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs), overshadowing research endeavors. Despite concerted efforts by the Philippine Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to foster a research-oriented ethos, a substantial portion of HEIs persist in prioritizing teaching over research. Statistical data reveal a stark reality: a mere fraction of HEIs meet the stringent criteria delineating graduate-capable or doctoral/research university categories. This finding underscores a pressing need for a reinvigorated focus on nurturing research culture throughout the Philippine higher education landscape.

The dominance of teaching institutions in the Philippines echoes broader trends observed in the global context. Studies by prominent scholars such as Marginson and van der Wende (2007) highlight the pervasive dichotomy

between teaching and research functions within universities worldwide. This dichotomy often stems from institutional priorities and resource allocation strategies, which tend to favor teaching activities over research endeavors. Moreover, historical legacies and cultural norms may further entrench the primacy of teaching within academic institutions (Neave, 2011).

Efforts to counteract the dominance of teaching-oriented HEIs have been underway for decades. CHED, the governing body overseeing higher education in the Philippines, has been at the forefront of initiatives aimed at promoting research culture. However, as observed by Sanyal and Varghese (2006), such endeavors face formidable challenges in the context of developing countries, where HEIs grapple with limited resources and competing demands. Despite CHED's commendable efforts, the persistence of teaching-centric HEIs underscores the need for a multifaceted approach to catalyze a paradigm shift towards research orientation.

A critical examination of the criteria delineating graduate-capable or doctoral/research university categories offers insights into the prevailing landscape of Philippine HEIs. Bernardo's (2003) typology of HEIs in the Philippines provides a comprehensive framework for assessing institutional profiles. However, the stark reality remains: only a select few HEIs meet the rigorous criteria indicative of robust research capacities. This disparity underscores the urgent imperative to recalibrate institutional priorities and bolster support structures for research endeavors.

The call for greater emphasis on research culture development resonates with broader discourses on the evolving role of universities in contemporary society. Marginson (2000) posits that universities must transcend their traditional functions as mere conduits of knowledge transmission and embrace a more expansive mandate encompassing research, innovation, and societal engagement. Such a transformative vision necessitates concerted efforts to dismantle entrenched hierarchies privileging teaching over research within academic institutions.

The dominance of teaching institutions within Philippine HEIs underscores systemic challenges and institutional barriers that impede the cultivation of a vibrant research culture. While CHED's initiatives signal a commitment to fostering research orientation, sustained efforts are imperative to effectuate meaningful change. By prioritizing research culture development and aligning institutional priorities with global best practices, Philippine HEIs can chart a course towards greater research excellence and innovation.

Low Research Productivity and Dependency on Graduate Students:
The research sheds light on a concerning trend within Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs) – the pervasive issue of low research productivity among faculty members. An analysis of scholarly output reveals a disproportionate reliance on graduate students for research contributions, overshadowing collaborative and institutional research endeavors. This trend underscores systemic challenges and institutional barriers that impede the cultivation of a vibrant research culture within Philippine HEIs.

The phenomenon of low research productivity among faculty members is not unique to Philippine HEIs but is a pervasive challenge faced by academic institutions worldwide. Studies by scholars such as Pratt et al. (1999) and DeHaven et al. (1998) have highlighted similar trends in research-intensive environments, where faculty members may face competing demands such as teaching responsibilities and administrative duties. Moreover, limited funding and resource constraints may further exacerbate the challenge of fostering a research-oriented ethos within academic institutions.

A critical examination of the factors contributing to low research productivity unveils a complex interplay of institutional, systemic, and individual-level determinants. The reliance on graduate students for research output reflects broader issues of faculty workload allocation and resource allocation strategies within Philippine HEIs. As noted by Vicencio et al. (2006), graduate students often undertake research projects as part of their degree requirements, leading to a proliferation of individual studies but limited collaborative research initiatives.

The limited funding provided by the Philippine Commission on Higher Education (CHED) for research projects further compounds the challenge of low research productivity. Data from CHED reports indicate a minuscule allocation of funds for research initiatives, underscoring the need for greater institutional support and investment in research infrastructure. This finding resonates with global trends observed in higher education, where resource constraints pose significant barriers to research excellence and innovation (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007).

The reliance on external grants to supplement institutional funding for research projects reflects broader trends in research funding landscape. Studies by researchers such as Dundar and Lewis (1998) have highlighted the growing importance of external funding sources, including international donor agencies and industry partnerships, in supporting research activities within academic institutions. However, such reliance on external grants may introduce challenges related to research agenda setting and intellectual autonomy (Bland & Ruffin, 1999).

Addressing the issue of low research productivity among faculty members necessitates multifaceted interventions at the institutional, systemic, and individual levels. Institutional support structures, including research grants, funding opportunities, and research capacity-building programs, are imperative to cultivate a conducive

environment for research excellence. Moreover, efforts to promote collaborative research initiatives and interdisciplinary partnerships can foster a culture of knowledge sharing and innovation within academic institutions.

The issue of low research productivity among faculty members in Philippine HEIs underscores the urgent imperative to prioritize research culture development and institutional support structures. By addressing systemic challenges and fostering a conducive environment for research excellence, Philippine HEIs can chart a course towards greater research productivity and innovation.

Lack of Firm Training and Research Capacity Building:
A critical impediment to research productivity among faculty members in Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs) lies in the inadequacy of training and capacity-building initiatives. Despite a considerable proportion of faculty holding graduate degrees, the study reveals a pervasive lack of engagement in research activities beyond thesis or dissertation projects. This phenomenon underscores systemic deficiencies in research capacity building and the urgent need for targeted interventions to cultivate a robust research culture within Philippine HEIs.

The limited involvement of faculty members in research activities can be attributed, in part, to the historical evolution of HEIs in the Philippines. Many HEIs, particularly those that were formerly secondary schools, have transitioned to tertiary-level institutions with a primary focus on teaching functions. Consequently, faculty members may lack the requisite training and exposure to research methodologies and practices during their graduate studies, leading to a dearth of research-oriented skills and competencies (Bernardo, 2003).

The reliance on graduate degree papers, such as master's theses or doctoral dissertations, as the primary research output further exacerbates the issue of limited research capacity among faculty members. These one-shot, short-term projects often fail to instill a culture of sustained inquiry or build upon earlier findings, resulting in a fragmented research landscape characterized by isolated endeavors rather than cohesive research programs (Salazar-Clemeña, 2006).

The findings underscore the imperative of comprehensive research capacity-building programs tailored to the unique needs and challenges faced by faculty members within Philippine HEIs. Such initiatives should encompass a spectrum of activities aimed at enhancing research skills, fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, and promoting a research-oriented mindset among faculty members.

Research capacity-building programs should commence at the graduate level, where aspiring researchers are provided with rigorous training in research methodologies, data analysis techniques, and scholarly writing practices. By equipping graduate students with the requisite skills and competencies, HEIs can nurture a pipeline of proficient researchers poised to contribute meaningfully to the scholarly discourse (CHED, 2016).

In addition to graduate education, ongoing professional development opportunities and mentorship programs are essential to support faculty members in their research endeavors. Workshops, seminars, and collaborative research projects can provide platforms for knowledge exchange and skill enhancement, facilitating the transition from teaching-centric roles to research-active scholars (Sahan & Tarhan, 2015).

Furthermore, institutional support structures, including research grants, funding opportunities, and research infrastructure investments, are vital to create an enabling environment for research excellence. HEIs should prioritize resource allocation to support faculty research initiatives, thereby fostering a culture of innovation and scholarly inquiry (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007).

Collaborative partnerships with external stakeholders, including industry partners, government agencies, and non-profit organizations, can provide avenues for interdisciplinary research collaboration and resource mobilization. By forging strategic alliances with external entities, HEIs can leverage diverse expertise and resources to address complex societal challenges and advance knowledge creation (Dundar & Lewis, 1998).

The lack of firm training and research capacity-building initiatives pose significant barriers to research productivity among faculty members in Philippine HEIs. Addressing these challenges requires a multifaceted approach encompassing graduate education reform, professional development initiatives, institutional support structures, and collaborative partnerships. By investing in research capacity building, Philippine HEIs can foster a vibrant research culture and position themselves as hubs of knowledge creation and innovation.

Heterogeneity in Research Capabilities:
Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs) exhibit significant diversity in their research capabilities, stemming from various factors including university type, faculty composition, and geographic location (Kilag, et al., 2024). This heterogeneity underscores the need for nuanced and context-specific approaches to fostering research culture and enhancing research productivity across the sector.

One of the primary determinants of research capabilities within Philippine HEIs is university type. Historically, certain institutions have prioritized teaching functions over research activities, particularly those that evolved from secondary schools to tertiary-level institutions. These teaching-oriented HEIs often lack the infrastructure, resources, and institutional support structures necessary to cultivate a robust research environment (Bernardo, 2003).

In contrast, research-oriented universities and institutions with a strong emphasis on graduate education tend to exhibit higher research capabilities. These institutions typically boast dedicated research centers, well-established graduate programs, and a critical mass of research-active faculty members. As a result, they are better positioned to attract research funding, engage in interdisciplinary collaborations, and produce high-impact research outputs (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007).

Faculty composition also plays a crucial role in shaping research capabilities within HEIs. Institutions with a higher proportion of faculty members holding advanced degrees, particularly doctoral qualifications, tend to exhibit greater research productivity. These faculty members bring with them specialized expertise, research experience, and networks that facilitate research collaboration and knowledge dissemination (CHED, 1997).

Moreover, the geographical location of HEIs can influence research capabilities, with institutions in urban centers often enjoying greater access to research funding, infrastructure, and collaborative opportunities compared to their rural counterparts. Urban HEIs may benefit from proximity to government agencies, industry partners, and international research networks, thereby enhancing their research visibility and impact (Dundar & Lewis, 1998).

Addressing the heterogeneity in research capabilities among Philippine HEIs necessitates tailored interventions that account for the unique needs and challenges faced by different institutions (Andrin & Kilag, 2023). One-size-fits-all approaches are unlikely to be effective given the diverse institutional contexts and resource constraints prevalent across the sector.

At the institutional level, HEIs should prioritize investments in research infrastructure, faculty development, and strategic partnerships to enhance their research capabilities. This may involve establishing research centers of excellence, providing seed funding for research projects, and incentivizing interdisciplinary collaboration through joint appointments and research clusters (CHED, 2016).

Furthermore, collaborative initiatives between HEIs, industry partners, and government agencies can facilitate knowledge exchange, technology transfer, and research commercialization, thereby amplifying the societal impact of research activities. These partnerships can take various forms, including joint research projects, industry-sponsored fellowships, and technology transfer agreements, aimed at translating research findings into real-world applications (Vea, 2014).

Thus, fostering a culture of research excellence within Philippine HEIs requires concerted efforts from multiple stakeholders, including policymakers, institutional leaders, faculty members, and funding agencies (Kilag, 2024). By recognizing and addressing the heterogeneous nature of research capabilities across the sector, stakeholders can work collaboratively to build a vibrant and inclusive research ecosystem that drives innovation, fosters academic excellence, and contributes to national development.

Conclusion:

This study sheds light on the multifaceted landscape of research culture and productivity within Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs). The findings underscore the prevalence of teaching-oriented institutions, a lack of firm training and research capacity building among faculty members, low research productivity, and significant heterogeneity in research capabilities across HEIs.

The dominance of teaching functions over research activities persists as a key characteristic of many Philippine HEIs, despite efforts by the Philippine Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to promote research orientation. This imbalance underscores the need for targeted interventions to elevate the research profile of these institutions and cultivate a more robust research culture.

Furthermore, the study highlights the challenges associated with faculty members' limited involvement in research activities, attributed in part to a lack of comprehensive training beyond graduate studies. Addressing this issue requires sustained investments in research capacity building programs, faculty development initiatives, and institutional support structures to nurture a cadre of research-active scholars.

Moreover, the study reveals the low research productivity among faculty members, with graduate students often shouldering the bulk of research output as part of their degree requirements. This dependency on graduate students underscores the need for HEIs to empower faculty members to engage in research endeavors and provide adequate support for research activities.

Additionally, the study identifies significant heterogeneity in research capabilities across Philippine HEIs, influenced by factors such as university type, faculty composition, and geographic location. This diversity necessitates tailored interventions that address the specific needs and challenges faced by different institutions, emphasizing the importance of context-specific approaches to research culture development.

In light of these findings, it is imperative for stakeholders, including policymakers, institutional leaders, faculty members, and funding agencies, to collaborate effectively in fostering a vibrant research ecosystem within Philippine HEIs. By recognizing and addressing the multifaceted challenges facing research culture and productivity, stakeholders can work towards building a more inclusive, innovative, and impactful higher education sector that contributes meaningfully to national development.

While the study highlights several challenges, it also points towards opportunities for transformative change within Philippine HEIs. By prioritizing research culture development, investing in faculty capacity building, and fostering collaborative partnerships, HEIs can enhance their research productivity, elevate their academic standing, and contribute to the advancement of knowledge and societal well-being.

References:

Andrin, G., & Kilag, O. K. (2023). Innovative Strategies for Research Enhancement: A Simulacrum Approach Among Master Teachers in the Division of Cebu City. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education (2994-9521)*, *1*(5), 467-484.

Bernardo, A. B. (2003). International higher education: models, conditions, and issues. *Education and globalization*, 213-72.

Bland, C. J., & Ruffin, M. T. (1992). Characteristics of a productive research environment: literature review. *Academic medicine*, *67*(6), 385-97.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton University Press, 3175 Princeton Pike, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648..

CHED. (2016). Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order No. 18, Series of 2016. https://www.cem-inc.org.ph/nmat/files/upload/CHED_MO_No__18_Doctor_of_Medicine_Program.pdf

DeHaven, M. J., Wilson, G. R., & O'Connor-Kettlestrings, P. (1998). Creating a research culture: what we can learn from residencies that are successful in research. *Family medicine*, *30*(7), 501-507.

Dundar, H., & Lewis, D. R. (1998). Determinants of research productivity in higher education. *Research in higher education*, *39*(6), 607-631.

Kilag, O. K. (2024). Exploring the Connection of School Leadership, Educational Effectiveness, and Professional Learning: A Focus on School Leader as Researcher. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, *1*(2), 57-63.

Kilag, O. K. T., Mambaje, O. C., Rabi, A. A., Uy, J. C., Miñoza, E. G., & Padilla, J. B. G. (2024). The Practice of Peace Education: Applied Research on Peace Education in the Twenty-First Century. *European Journal of Higher Education and Academic Advancement*, *1*(2), 82-91.

Marginson, S., & Van der Wende, M. (2007). To rank or to be ranked: The impact of global rankings in higher education. *Journal of studies in international education*, *11*(3-4), 306-329.

Neave, G. (1998). The evaluative state reconsidered. *European Journal of education*, *33*(3), 265-284.

Salazar-Clemena, R. M. (2006). Higher education research in the Philippines: Policies, practices, and problems. In *Higher education, research, and knowledge in the Asia Pacific Region* (pp. 185-200). New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.

Şahan, H. H., & Tarhan, R. (2015). Scientific research competencies of prospective teachers and their attitudes toward scientific resea. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, *2*(3), 20-31.

Salmi, J., & Hauptman, A. M. (2006). Innovations in tertiary education financing: A comparative evaluation of allocation mechanisms. *Education working paper series*, *4*, 38324.

Sanyal, B. C., & Varghese, N. V. (2006, November). Research capacity of the higher education sector in developing countries. In *A: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge. Paris*.

Tierney, W. G. (2004). Academic freedom and tenure: Between fiction and reality. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *75*(2), 161-177.

Vea, R. B. (2014). *Industry-academe collaboration for research and development* (No. 2014-10). PIDS Discussion Paper Series.