THE APO
The Official Research Journal of Gordon College

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH COMPETENCIES OF GORDON COLLEGE FACULTY AND STAFF: BASIS FOR THREE-YEAR STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN

Darwin P. Paguio[1], PhD
Kristin Joy A. Mendoza[2], MM-PM

[1]*College of Education, Arts, and Sciences*
[2]*Human Resource Management Unit*

ABSTRACT

This study determined the scientific research competencies of Gordon College personnel. It utilized a descriptive design with the questionnaire as the main data-gathering tool. Fifty-eight (58) personnel participated in the study selected through convenience sampling. The research skills of respondents were measured through information-seeking skills and methodology skills. The attitude of respondents toward research was determined through eight dimensions using the Educators' Attitudes Toward Educational Research Scale. The research profile of the respondents reveals that they have very little exposure to research-related training, seminars and conferences, and research presentations at the institutional level and more so at regional, national, and international levels. Faculty and staff who were able to attend have only attended one or two of these activities. Research undertakings and publications were also minimal. Respondents strongly agreed that they possess the skill of finding strategies to look for information and that they are highly equipped with collecting survey data and conducting literature reviews; however, they are weak when it comes to preparing a manuscript for publication and writing an abstract. Respondents expressed strong agreement to valuing training in educational research and believed that those who keep up with research are better educators. On the other hand, they disagree that research findings are applicable in real-life contexts.

***Keywords**:* Scientific Research, Competencies, Local Higher Education Institution, Gordon College

How to cite: Paguio, D.P., & Mendoza, K.J.A. (2022). Scientific research competencies of Gordon College faculty and staff: Basis for three-year strategic action plan. *The APO, 5(*1), 61-76. https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.10797478

INTRODUCTION

Research paves the way for development. The UNESCO World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-first Century (UNESCO, 1998) acknowledges that knowledge creation, transmission, and application are the lifeblood of the knowledge-based economy. Higher education institutions are among the primary entities tasked to

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

generate, transmit, disseminate, and apply knowledge (CHED, 2009). This emphasizes the integral role that higher education institutions play in research and innovation in the country.

The 1987 Philippine Constitution in Article XIV, Section 10 mandates the prioritization of research and development, invention, innovation, and their utilization. Commission on Higher Education, the country's government agency that oversees higher education, is mandated to promote, direct, and support higher education institutions in performing their research and instruction functions. In pursuit of this, CHED in partnership with other institutions and agencies developed the National Higher Education Research Agenda which sets the policies, directions, priorities, and thrusts of Philippine higher education research both long-term and medium-term.

Research, in addition to instruction and extension, has been identified as one of the trifocal functions of HEI. As such, HEIs particularly universities are expected to lead in the conduct of discipline-based, policy-oriented, technology-directed and innovative/creative researches that are locally responsive and global (CHED, 2009).

Research is also one of the key areas in accreditation, and it is often called the "waterloo" of most HEIs. This fact is manifested in several studies. For one, Bernardo (2003) in his study on the typology of HEIs in the Philippines concluded that the majority of the HEIs in the Philippines are teaching institutions. Results of his study showed that only 15 out of 223 HEIs in the sample met the requirements for the graduate-capable HEI category, and only two HEIs met the criteria for doctoral/research university categories. Salazar-Clemeña (2006) asserted that despite the initiatives of CHED, the Philippines' current state in terms of higher education research "leaves much to be desired in terms of quantity, quality, thrusts, and contribution to national development".

An assessment using bibliometric indicators of research productivity in the fields of education and psychology in the Philippines by Vinluan (2012) revealed that when benchmarked against the research productivity of Southeast Asian higher education institutions in the same fields, the Philippines starting in the 1990s ranked low in research productivity compared to countries such as Singapore, Thailand, and Malaysia. Specifically, the study elaborated that "only a few researchers, mainly coming from a small number of higher education institutions were publishing papers on a regular basis in a small range of journals". In addition, the journals where the research was published are described as having no or low impact, and the published papers had low citation counts. In terms of collaboration, the study revealed that there is less collaboration with institutions at the domestic and international levels. In explaining the low research productivity, the paper identified several factors including economic factors, funding, the local orientation of social science research studies, individual characteristics of researchers, and the epistemic culture of knowledge production in the country.

Vinluan's study attests to the claims, through the years, that only a few faculty members in the higher education institutions in the Philippines conduct research and even few are those who publish (Nuqui & Cruz, 2012; Salazar-Clemeña, 2006; Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007; Wa-Mbaleka, 2015).

Research looking at the factors that lead to low research productivity would show that lack of training, lack of research skills, and even funding are the most prevalent reasons.

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

Calma (2011), in a three-year study of research training policy and practice, participated in by 53 government and university executives, and university academics in the Philippines had several conclusions as follows: (1) there are inadequate facilities and resources dedicated to support staff and student research; (2) there is a lack of specific training to develop staff for research and supervision; (3) the emphasis of supervision is on proofreading and the rewards are unattractive; (4) the range of student support available is less dedicated to research; (5) there is low research quality in both staff and student research; and (6) there is limited research collaboration locally and internationally
A follow-up study by Calma (2014) on the challenges in preparing academic staff for research training and supervision showed that the most critical challenge faced by academic staff in the Philippines is the challenge of effectively meeting the dual demands of teaching and research. The other two challenges identified are building a critical mass of researchers, and developing excellent research skills among staff and students.
An analysis by Quimbo and Sulaho (2014) of the research productivity of selected higher education institutions showed that educational attainment, research benefits, and incentive systems are important predictors of both research self-efficacy and research productivity. Self-efficacy has also been found to be a significant determinant of productivity. To promote research culture in higher education institutions, the study suggested that a strong faculty development program, enhanced research collaboration, improved research productivity, and a good incentive system. Five state universities in the Philippines participated in this study, and a total of 377 randomly selected faculty members served as research participants.
The Philippines, next to China, has the second largest number of public higher education institutions (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2014, as cited in Wa-mbaleka, 2015) Public HEIs consist of state colleges and universities which are funded by the national government and local colleges and universities which operates under local government units. While there are limited research undertakings and publications from faculty members from SUCs and private HEIs, there are even fewer from faculty members from LUCs.
This study was undertaken in one of the local colleges in Region 3, Gordon College, which operates under the local government unit of Olongapo City. As a higher education institution, it is mandated to ensure that it provides an academic environment that nurtures and supports the research talents of faculty and staff. This paper was conceptualized to determine the scientific research competencies of faculty and staff in this local college. It aims to identify the areas where interventions may be put in place in order to strengthen further the culture of research in the institution. Specifically, the study answers questions on the research skills of faculty and staff in terms of information-seeking and methodology skills. It also answers the question on their attitude towards research measured in terms of specific dimensions. The results of the study served as the basis for the formulation of a Three-Year Strategic Action Plan

Conceptual Framework

Utilizing the input-process-output model, the study used the profile of faculty and staff, as well as their research skills and attitude towards research, as input. The profile included

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

age, position, highest educational attainment, and number of years in service. Also included as input are research skills measured vis-à-vis information-seeking skills and research methodology skills.

In the study of (Meerah et al., 2012) aimed at developing an instrument to measure research skills, five constructs were identified as necessary skills to conduct research. These include statistical/quantitative analysis skills, information-seeking skills, problem-solving skills, communication skills, and research methodology skills. Research skills, in this study, were delimited to only two constructs, and their operational definition was also adopted from Meerah et.al. Information-seeking skill is the awareness of various sources of information that are available. It is the ability to search, use, and evaluate information. On the other hand, research methodology skills involve identifying and designing appropriate research procedures, and understanding the limitations and scope of research design (for example, sample sizes and data type).

Another factor included under profile is the attitude of the personnel towards research. The Educators' Attitude Toward Educational Research Scale by Ozturk (2011) was used to determine the attitude of the personnel. This scale was intended to provide reliable and valid measurement of different aspects of educators' attitudes toward educational research (Ozturk, 2011).

The process frame included the data-gathering tool which is the questionnaire. Personal and research profile were processed to obtain frequencies and percentages. Data on research skills and attitudes towards research were analyzed through weighted mean. As an output of the study, a Three-Year Action Plan to address the needs identified in the study was put forth.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilized a quantitative research design, specifically, a cross-sectional descriptive design to determine the research skills and attitudes of faculty and staff.

Respondents of the Study

Respondents were selected through convenience sampling whereby data was collected from the most readily, and conveniently available faculty and staff as samples for the study. A total of 58 individuals voluntarily participated in the survey.

Instrumentation

Data was gathered through a three-part survey questionnaire. Part I gathered the personal and research profiles of respondents. Part II pertained to the research skills while Part III pertained to the attitude of the faculty and staff towards research.

Statistical Analysis

In order to analyze the gathered data statistically, the study used Microsoft Excel to tabulate, organize, and calculate the statistical treatment. The study used frequency and percentage in order to analyze the data gathered and presented it in a tabular method.

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Personal Profile of Respondents

Of the 58 respondents, 27 (46.6%) fall under the age range 20-29, 15 (25.9%) belong to the age range 30-39, 9 (15.5%) are 40-49 and 4 (6.9%) are 60 and above. Of these respondents, 37, or 84.7 % respondents who hold teaching positions while 21 or 9.8 hold administrative positions. This shows a sample who are mostly in their 20's and 30's and more than half of whom are faculty members.

In terms of educational attainment, the highest percentage of the respondents have a Bachelor's Degree with Master's Units, i.e., 23 (39.7%), 18 (31.0%) have a master's degree, 14 (24.1) have a Bachelor's degree while 2 (3.4%) are master's degree with doctoral units. Only 1 is a doctoral graduate representing 1.7%. Results show that a higher percentage of the respondents have either bachelor's degree or have enrolled in a master's degree program. In higher education institutions, a master's degree is required in order to teach.

In terms of years in service, the majority have served between 1-4 years, specifically, 30 respondents (51.7%) while 10 (17.2%) have served 5-8 years, 9 (15.5%) have served 9-12 years, 7(12.1%) have served for 13-16 years while 2 (3.4%) have served 17 years and above. This data corroborates the data on age since most are still young.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents According to Profile Variables

Profile		**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Age	20-29 years old	27	46.6
	30-39 years old	15	25.9
	40-49 years old	9	15.5
	50-59 years old	3	5.2
	60 years old and above	4	6.9
Position	Administrative Position	21	9.8
	Teaching Position	37	84.7
Highest Educational Attainment	Doctoral Graduate	1	1.7
	Master's Graduate with Doctoral Units	2	3.4
	Master's Graduate	18	31.0
	Bachelor's Degree with Master's units	23	39.7
	Bachelor's Degree	14	24.1
Number of Years in Service	1-4 years	30	51.7
	5-8 years	10	17.2
	9-12 years	9	15.5
	13-16 years	7	12.1
	17 years and above	2	3.4
Total		**58**	**100**

Research Profile of the Respondents

The research profile of the respondents based on the study affirms that they have very little exposure to research-related training, seminars and conferences at the institutional level and more so for regional, national and international levels.

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

Table 2 shows that out of the 58 respondents, 41.4% have not attended any research-related training at the institutional level, 74.1% respondents have not attended any regional/national training, and 93.1% respondents have not attended any international training.

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents According to Attendance at Research Trainings and Conferences

		Number of Research Related Training		Number of Research Related Conferences	
		Frequency	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Institutional	0	24	41.4	31	53.4
	1-2	21	36.2	24	41.4
	3-4	10	17.2	2	3.4
	5 and above	3	5.2	1	1.8
Regional/ National	0	43	74.1	42	72.4
	1-2	11	18.9	13	22.4
	3-4	2	3.5	2	3.5
	5 and above	2	3.5	1	1.7
International	0	54	93.1	53	91.4
	1-2	4	6.9	5	8.6
Total		**58**	**100**	**58**	**100**

Furthermore, table 2 also shows that for those who have attended training, more respondents have attended only 1-2 training at the institutional, regional/national, and international training. 21 respondents have attended 1-2 institutional research training, 11 respondents have attended regional/national training and only 4 have attended international training. Only 10 respondents have attended 3-4 institutional trainings, 2 have attended regional/national trainings while only 3 personnel have attended 5 or more institutional trainings and 2 have attended national/regional.

The same results are reflected in the attendance of respondents at research conferences. 53.4% of the respondents have not attended any institutional conferences, 72.4% have not attended any regional or national conference and 91.4% have not attended any international conference.

Again, personnel who were able to attend research conferences have only attended 1-2 of these conferences. 24 respondents attended 1-2 institutional research conferences, 13 respondents attended regional/national trainings, and only 5 attended international trainings. Only 2 respondents have attended 3-4 institutional trainings, 2 have attended regional/national trainings while only 1 personnel have attended 5 or more institutional trainings and 1 have attended national/regional.

Results confirm Calma's study (2011) which identified a lack of specific training to develop staff for research and supervision as a factor for low research productivity. One of the general principles in higher education research is that for research to thrive, there is a need for an environment that allows for the free flow of information that is supported by

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

honest and analytical exchange of ideas and supportive policy and administrative structures (CHED, 2009).

Table 3. Distribution of Respondents According to Research Paper Presentations

Research Paper Presentations		Frequency	Percentage
Institutional	0	41	70.7
	1-2	13	22.4
	3-4	3	5.2
	5 and above	1	1.7
Regional/ National	0	47	81.0
	1-2	10	17.2
	3-4	1	1.7
	5 and above	2	3.5
International	0	54	93.1
	1-2	4	6.9
Total		**58**	**100**

The results on table 3 about the research paper presentation of faculty and staff is also very dismal as only 70.7% have not presented research at the institutional level, 81% at the regional/national level, and 93.1% at the international level.

Presentation of 1-2 research papers at the institutional level is higher at 22.4%, 17.2% at the national/regional level, and 6.9% at the international level. Only 5.2% have presented 3-4 papers at the institutional level, 1.7% at the regional/national level, and none at the international level. Only 1 respondent presented 5 or more research papers at the institutional level, 2 at the regional/national level, and none at the international level.

Table 4. Distribution of Respondents According to Research Paper Publication

Number of Published Research		Frequency	Percentage
Institutional	0	41	70.7
	1-2	13	22.4
	3-4	3	5.2
	5 and above	1	1.7
Regional/National	0	47	81.0
	1-2	10	17.2
	3-4	1	1.7
	5 and above	2	3.5
International	0	54	93.1
	1-2	4	6.9
Total		**58**	**100**

When it comes to published research Table 4 reveals that 70.7% of the respondents have not published research at the institutional level, 81% at the regional/national level, and 93.1% at the international level. Again, for those who have published research, respondents with 1-2 published research at the institutional level consisted of 22.4%, 17.2% at the regional/national level, and only 6.9% at the international level. Only 3

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

respondents have 3-4 of their research published at the institutional level while only 1 at the regional/national level. Finally, only 1 respondent has 5 and above publications at the institutional level, and only 2 respondents at the regional/national level.

This confirms the results of Vinluan's (2012) study, earlier cited, wherein it was found that there are only a few faculty researchers from a limited number of higher education institutions who publish their papers in a limited number of journals which have either no impact or low impact.

Table 5. Distribution of Respondents According to Researches Undertaken/Ongoing Researches

Number of Researches Undertaken		Frequency	Percentage
Institutional	0	41	70.7
	1-2	17	29.3
Regional/National	0	57	98.3
	1-2	1	1.7
International	0	57	98.3
	1-2	1	1.7
Current/ On-going Research	0	46	79.3
	1	12	20.7
Total		**58**	**100**

Results in Table 5 also shows that 70.7% of the respondents have not undertaken any institutional research while 98.3% have not undertaken or participated in any regional/national research and international research. Finally, only 20.7% of the respondents are currently undertaking research.

Faculty and Staff Research Skills

Faculty and staff research skills were measured in terms of information-seeking skills and research methodology skills. Based on Table 6, the respondents expressed a strong agreement to information-seeking skills. Out of the 26 indicators, 4 indicators were rated Agree while the rest were rated Strongly Agree. The indicator rated highest pertains to looking at the strategy to find information again in order to get exactly what I want if it is not successful the first time.

Table 6. Faculty and Staff Research Skills in terms of Information Seeking Skills

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) I premeditate the types of information that I need like books, articles, journals and others.	3.36	Strongly Agree
2) I am aware that information found in journals are more often checked, edited and criticized compared to information found in magazines.	3.33	Strongly Agree
3) I am aware that information can be obtained through various means (e.g. electronic media, images, audio and video).	3.39	Strongly Agree
4) I am aware that the primary source is the first source (original source) that records work related to the literature.	3.41	Strongly Agree
5) I am aware that the secondary source is the source that discusses the work of others.	3.32	Strongly Agree

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

6) I use other sources besides the library in my institution such as the *inter-library loan* service.	3.17	Agree
7) I identify and look for synonyms, themes or key words that can be used to find information based on my topic.	3.44	Strongly Agree
8) In order to find information, I read general texts like dictionaries or encyclopedia articles to gain more understanding on the terminologies used in my topic.	3.46	Strongly Agree
9) I need to broaden my search using key words given that the existing source of information indicates that my topic of research is too narrow.	3.47	Strongly Agree
10) I am aware that I can use truncation (or shortcuts) in my search or I can also use root words to start my search.	3.16	Agree
11) I am aware that I can find a book based on the title given.	3.25	Agree
12) I have to conduct the search according to the field in order to identify the materials titles according to a particular field.	3.42	Strongly Agree
13) I will look at the strategy to find information again in order to get exactly what I want if it is not successful the first time.	3.49	Strongly Agree
14) I usually evaluate the writer's expertise to see if he/she is qualified in the written field.	3.26	Strongly Agree
15) I evaluate the accurateness of the content by reading other sources mentioned by the writer.	3.42	Strongly Agree
16) I understand the contextual effect for instance how various cultures, history and geography can influence the perspective of the information.	3.44	Strongly Agree
17) I realize that time is a factor that influences the relevance of the information to my topic of research.	3.38	Strongly Agree
18) I get the confirmation of my understanding on a certain topic by getting an opinion or an expert's view (through individual interviews, email, telephone and others)	3.42	Strongly Agree
19) When searching for information, I arrange each item systematically.	3.36	Strongly Agree
20) I am able to adjust with the various quotation styles used.	3.20	Agree
21) When searching for information using a database, I know how to store it into my disk or to email it to my email.	3.47	Strongly Agree
22) I can record quotations in order to seek information.	3.30	Strongly Agree
23) I write down the important concepts myself using my own words.	3.36	Strongly Agree
24) I use the main ideas obtained from the information researched in order to support my topic.	3.46	Strongly Agree
25) I combine the main ideas from one source or more in order to form a new idea.	3.37	Strongly Agree
26) I can construct my own conclusion based on the information gathered.	3.46	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.37**	**Strongly Agree**

The lowest rated indicators were focused on using other sources besides the library in the institution using the inter-library loan service, awareness of the use of truncation (or shortcuts) in the search or using root words to start the search, awareness about finding a book based on the title given and ability to adjust with the various quotation styles used.

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

Table 7. Faculty and Staff Research Skills In terms of Methodology Skills

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) Ability to plan research.	3.17	Satisfactory
2) Developing a research question.	3.12	Satisfactory
3) Searching for a research problem.	3.17	Satisfactory
4) Doing a literature review.	3.21	Satisfactory
5) Design an experiment study.	3.05	Satisfactory
6) Selecting an instrument.	3.16	Satisfactory
7) Developing an instrument.	3.07	Satisfactory
8) Collecting of survey data.	3.23	Satisfactory
9) Writing an abstract.	3.04	Satisfactory
10) Preparing a manuscript for publication.	3.03	Satisfactory
11) Selecting an appropriate research method.	3.09	Satisfactory
12) Choosing an appropriate method analysis of data.	3.05	Satisfactory
13) Interpreting the result of a research study	3.12	Satisfactory
Overall Mean	**3.12**	**Satisfactory**

Table 7 presents the faculty and staff research skills in terms of methodology skills. The overall mean is 3.12 corresponding to Satisfactory. All indicators were rated Satisfactory. Data shows that the skill that respondents were highly equipped with was collecting survey data followed by doing a literature review. On the other hand, the skills that were rated lowest were preparing a manuscript for publication and writing an abstract.

The results show that respondents are more adept in the preliminary stages of research, which are research for literature and data collection. However, they are less skilled when it comes to writing the research paper itself.

Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards research

The attitude of faculty and staff towards research were also assessed in terms of the degree of valuing training in educational research, the belief that keeping up with research makes better education, valuing doing research in their school, the belief that research findings are applicable to real-life context, doing own research in their practices, preparing research reports that are understandable, investing of time and resources to make use of findings and investing time and effort in learning about findings.

Table 8 depicts that respondents are unanimous in their strong agreement with the value of training in educational research. Specifically, as the indicator with the highest mean, they highly believe that educational research can help educators improve their practice. On the other hand, the indicator found with the weakest mean pertains to the awareness that the said training can improve educators/ teachers skills to do research in their fields.

When it comes to the attitude of faculty and staff towards research in terms of keeping up with research to be better educators, Table 9 results also show how the respondents value research vis-à-vis its contribution to improving their practice. The indicator with the highest mean pertains to the respondents' feeling that reading research could provide insights into issues regarding one's practice with a mean of 3.45.

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

Table 8. Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards Research in terms of Valuing Training in Educational Research

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) I think that training in educational research can help educators improve their practice	3.64	Strongly Agree
2) I feel that training in educational research may help educators/teachers make more informed decisions in their practices	3.50	Strongly Agree
3) I think that training educators/teachers in research methods is one way to improve the quality of education in schools.	3.40	Strongly Agree
4) I think that educators can achieve a better understanding of research findings through training in research methods	3.57	Strongly Agree
5) I am aware that training in educational research can improve educators'/teachers' skills to do research in their fields	3.33	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.49**	**Strongly Agree**

Table 9. Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards Research in terms of the Belief of Keeping up with Research to be Better Educators

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) I feel that educators/teachers who keep up with research in their fields tend to be better educators than those who do not.	3.18	Agree
2) I consider reading research as an effective means to become a successful educator/teacher.	3.40	Strongly Agree
3) I feel that reading research can provide insight into issues regarding one's practice	3.45	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.34**	**Strongly Agree**

When it comes to valuing the conduct of research in their schools, Table 10 results showed agreement among the respondents. The highest mean was seen in the indicator, which shows that careful analysis of classroom/school experiences is an important learning experience for educators/teachers.

Table 10. Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards Research In terms of Value Doing Research in their Schools

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) I think that educators/teachers can learn very much by doing their own research in their classrooms/schools.	2.67	Moderately Agree
2) I think that careful analysis of our own classroom/school experiences is an important learning experience for educators/teachers.	3.52	Strongly Agree
3) I think that observations made in classrooms/schools are of great use to shape one's practice.	2.79	Moderately Agree
Overall Mean	**2.99**	**Agree**

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

For the attitude of faculty and staff towards research in terms of the belief that research findings are applicable to real life context, the respondents in Table 11 were in disagreement. Specifically, respondents disagreed that professors/researchers who do research really know the conditions in schools and that recommendations made in research reports are realistic.

Table 11. Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards Research In terms of the Belief that Research Findings Are Applicable to Real Life Context

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) I feel that most educational research findings are applicable in schools.	2.52	Agree
2) I feel that professors/researchers who do research really know the conditions in schools.	2.45	Disagree
3) I think that recommendations made in research reports are realistic	2.45	Disagree
Overall Mean	**2.47**	**Disagree**

When it comes to incorporating the conduct of their own research in their practice, Table 12 respondents generally agreed. Keeping a log for observations in the classroom/school received the highest mean.

Table 12. Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards Research In terms of Incorporating Doing their Own Research in their Practices

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) I systematically collect and record data in my classroom/school.	3.09	Agree
2) I keep a log for my observations in my classroom/school.	2.93	Agree
3) I prefer collecting my own data in my classroom/school to assess/revise my practice.	3.09	Agree
Overall Mean	**3.04**	**Agree**

Table 13 revealed the understandability of research in the study, respondents agreed that they would read more research reports if they were easier to understand which is the indicator with the highest mean. On the other hand, the respondents also agreed to the lowest rated indicator which is that research reports are presented in a confusing manner

The attitude of faculty and staff towards research in terms of time and resources to make use of research findings showed a general agreement in Table 14. Highest rated indicators pertain to support from the administrators of the school in terms of encouragement to engage in research-related activities and providing funding for research-related activities.

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

Table 13. Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards Research In terms of the Degree to which Educators Believe that Research Reports are Understandable

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) I think that research reports are often easy to understand.	2.96	Agree
2) I think that research terminology makes research reports too technical.	2.84	Agree
3) I would read more research reports if they were easier to understand.	3.11	Agree
4) I think that research reports present their findings in a confusing manner.	2.56	Agree
Overall Mean	**2.87**	**Agree**

Table 14. Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards Research In terms of Investing Time and Resources to Make Use of Research Findings

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) I suppose that administrators in my school put money aside for research-related activities.	3.07	Agree
2) My school provides me with easy access to academic journals.	2.88	Agree
3) My administrators encourage me to engage in research-related activities.	3.11	Agree
4) My school administration encourages me to read research.	2.95	Agree
5) My administrators provide me with the time and the resources for research.	2.87	Agree
Overall Mean	**2.98**	**Agree**

When it comes to investing time and effort in learning about research findings, the respondents in Table 15 were generally in agreement especially in regularly visiting professional websites to learn about latest developments in their field which garnered the highest mean.

Table 15. Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards Research in terms of Investing Time and Effort in Learning About Research Findings

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1) I like regularly reading academic journals in my field.	3.17	Agree
2) I use every means to update myself about research in my field.	2.98	Agree
3) I regularly visit professional websites to learn about latest developments in my field.	3.23	Agree
Overall Mean	**3.13**	**Agree**

Based on the summary presented on Table 16 on the attitude of faculty and staff towards research, only two dimensions were rated Strongly Agree namely the dimension that educator's value training in educational research and educators who keep up with research are better educator. Four indicators were rated Agree Educators Value Doing Research in their Schools Incorporate Doing their Own Research in their Practices Educators Believe that Research Reports are Understandable Time and Resources to Make Use of Research Findings Invest Time and Effort in Learning About Research Findings. Only one dimension was rated Disagree which is research findings are applicable to real life context.

Table 16. Summary of Attitude of Faculty and Staff towards Research

Dimensions	Mean	Interpretation
1) Educators Value Training in Educational Research	3.49	Strongly Agree
2) Educators Who Keep Up With Research Are Better Educators	3.34	Strongly Agree
3) Educators Value Doing Research in their Schools	2.99	Agree
4) Research Findings Are Applicable to Real Life Context	2.47	Disagree
5) Incorporate Doing their Own Research in their Practices	3.04	Agree
6) Educators Believe that Research Reports are Understandable	2.87	Agree
7) Time and Resources to Make Use of Research Findings	2.98	Agree
8) Invest Time and Effort in Learning About Research Findings	3.13	Agree
Overall Mean	**3.04**	**Agree**

CONCLUSION

Based on the aforementioned results of the study, the researchers hereby conclude the following:

1) For the profile of the respondents, there were more respondents that belongs to the age group 20-29 years old, working in teaching positions, having bachelor's degree with masteral units, and 1- 4 years in work service.
2) In terms of attendance to research trainings and conferences, there were more respondents that have yet to attend any research trainings and conferences. For research paper presentations, almost majority of the respondents have not presented any paper in either institutional, regional, national, or international events. As for research paper publication and research undertakings, the study also yielded the same scenario.
3) For the faculty and staff research skills, they strongly agreed on information seeking skills of the respondents and have satisfactory methodology skills.
4) In the case of attitude of faculty and staff towards research, the respondents strongly agreed on the following terms: Valuing Training in Educational Research and Belief of Keeping up with Research to be Better Educators. On the other hand, the respondents only agree on the following: Value Doing Research in their Schools, Incorporating Doing their Own Research in their Practices, Educators Believe that Research Reports are Understandable, Time and Resources to Make

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

Use of Research Findings, and Invest Time and Effort in Learning About Research Findings. However, only Research Findings Are Applicable to Real Life Context got a disagree response from the faculty and staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the results and conclusion of the study, the researchers provided the following recommendations:

1) The institution should strengthen the promulgation of its research agenda in order for faculty and staff to promote a culture of research productivity among themselves.
2) The faculty and staff should get involved in research and make it a habit that if there is a problem in their workplace, research is one way of finding a solution.
3) The institution with the help of the Research Development and Publication Unit should spearhead timely research skills and training programs in order to motivate faculty and staff in doing research.
4) The Research Development and Publication Unit should also offer assistance to interested faculty and staff in doing their research papers by means of consultation and meetings in order to improve their papers.
5) The institution shall provide the necessary incentive schemes in order to help prospective faculty and staff researchers to promote their confidence in research productivity.
6) As an output of the study, a Three-Year Action Plan to address the needs identified in the study was put forth.

References

Bernardo, A. B. 2003. Towards a typology of Philippine Higher Education Institutions. In Towards Rationalizing Philippine Higher Education. Proceedings of the Symposium on the Rationalization of the Philippine Higher Education System. CHED: Philippines.

Calma, A. (2014). Challenges in preparing academic staff for research training and supervision. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 28*(6), 705-715. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-06-2013-0092

Calma, A. (2011). Postgraduate Research Training: Some Issues. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *65*(4), 368–385. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2011.00495.x

CHED. (2009). National Higher Education Research Agenda-2 Declaration, Unesco World Education, Higher Century, Twenty-first. *Ched 2009-2018*. https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/NHERA-2.pdf

Volume 1, Issue 1
January to December 2022
ISSN: 2546-1745

Meerah, T. S. M., Osman, K., Zakaria, E., Ikhsan, Z. H., Krish, P., Lian, D. K. C., & Mahmod, D. (2012). Developing an Instrument to Measure Research Skills. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *60*, 630–636. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.434

Nuqui, A. V., & Cruz, R. C. (2013). Determinants of faculty research productivity in Augustinian higher education institutions in Luzon. *IAMURE International Journal of Education*, *3*(1), 1-1.

Ozturk, M. A. (2011). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Educators' attitudes toward educational research scale. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, *11*(2), 737–747.

Quimbo, M. A. T., & Sulabo, E. C. (2014). Research productivity and its policy implications in higher education institutions. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(10), 1955. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1628896258?accountid=47253

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.

Salazar-Clemeña, R. M., & Almonte-Acosta, S. A. (2007). Developing research culture in Philippine higher education institutions: Perspectives of university faculty. https://policycommons.net/artifacts/8958277/developing-research-culture-in-philippine-higher-education-institutions/9825077/

UNESCO. (1998). World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-first Century: Vision and Action and Framework for Priority Action for Change and Development in Higher Education. *World*, *October*, 1–22. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000141952

Vinluan, L.R. (2012). Research productivity in education and psychology in the Philippines and comparison with ASEAN countries. *Scientometrics, 91*, 277–294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-0496-5

Wa-mbaleka, S. (2015). *Factors Leading to Limited Faculty Publications in Philippine Higher Education Institutions*. *18*(2), 121–141.