

International Forum
Vol. 18, No. 2
October 2015
pp. 121-141

FEATURE

**Factors Leading to Limited Faculty Publications in
Philippine Higher Education Institutions**

Safary Wa-Mbaleka

***Abstract.** One of the major expectations of the higher education faculty is to generate knowledge through research and disseminate it through scholarly conferences and journal publications. This expectation has created much pressure on faculty members in higher education, even more so in recent years, as more and more emphasis is placed on presenting and publishing research. Using content analysis as a design, this exploratory study is based on data from higher education faculty members of 3 different universities about the reasons they gave for having no or limited number of publications. Findings reveal that the 7 most challenging factors preventing faculty members from publishing enough or not publishing at all include having limited time, lack of training on publication, fear of rejection, lack of interest, faculty laziness, limited funds, and lack of institutional support. This study helps raise scholars' awareness on the common issues expressed by the faculty, with the hope of starting some constructive discourse in colleges and universities on how to better support the work of publication. Some recommendations are made to help colleges and universities tackle more effectively the 7 issues found in this study.*

Keywords: Content analysis, Philippines, publishing, higher education institutions, faculty, professors

Introduction

A century ago or so, the primary work of a higher education faculty member was primarily to transmit knowledge. Traditional education was based on the assumption that the educator knew everything and it was his or her job to transmit that large wealth of knowledge into the students (Sherman, 1999). Today, educators no longer own the knowledge by themselves. Students can now access knowledge everywhere with the assistance of computer and information technology. It is no longer unusual now to have students who know more about a topic than their own professors. The role of the educator in higher education is no longer about transmitting knowledge only, but more importantly to generate and disseminate knowledge through scholarly conference presentations and journal publications. Unfortunately, it has been consistently claimed over the years that few faculty members are conducting research and even fewer are publishing scholarly journal articles (Dumbrique & Alon, 2013; Fox, 1992; Hardé, 2014; Nuqui & Cruz, 2012; Salazar-Clemeña, 2006; Wa-Mbaleka, 2014).

Higher education institutions have mushroomed all over the Southeast Asian Region. In this region, the Philippines was classified second among countries with the largest number of higher education institutions, after Indonesia (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2014). According to the same report, the Philippines is the third country with the largest number of higher education institutions in Asia, after China and Indonesia. The same report shows the Philippines taking the second place of the largest number of public higher education institutions (after China) and the second place for private higher education institutes (after Indonesia) in Asia. Although this fact may be seen positively from the perspective of accessibility to higher education, it also means that more and more professors in the Philippines are expected to conduct and publish research because they teach in higher education institutions.

In the Philippines, professors are expected to focus on three major aspects: teaching, research, and service to the community (Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007). While all the three can be taught in the graduate programs, the implementation of conducting and publishing research probably receives less training or attention. Yet, it is the role of a faculty member in higher education to generate and disseminate knowledge (Commission on Higher Education [CHED], 2009). It is a failure on the faculty members' part if they only teach, and do not produce and share their own knowledge through scholarly avenues.

Due to consistently limited number of publications from higher education faculty members, the aim of this study was to find the major factors that prevent professors and instructors from publishing. Knowing these factors could be the preliminary step in addressing the complex issue of the limited number of publications in higher education in the Philippines. This paper discusses available literature on publication in higher education, and then presents the current study

before proposing some recommendations to overcome each of the seven issues found in the study.

Review of the Literature

Anyone who has been in a doctoral program or teaches in higher education institutions has at a certain point been confronted with the pressure attached to conducting and publishing research. Scare tactics such as having to publish or perish have left many faculty members in higher education institutions unstable and unsure about the continuity of their work. Despite the consistent recommendations from research and the CHED that faculty member should publish, the issue of lack of or limited publications has persisted over the years (Acar, 2012). This review of the literature helps to place the topic of faculty publications within a clear context. This review discusses the role of higher education faculty members, the mandate of the CHED, and the current state of research publication.

Role of Higher Education Faculty

As introduced earlier, the role of a faculty member in higher education in the Philippines is threefold. It includes teaching, generating and disseminating knowledge through research and other creative ways, and being involved in serving the community through extension programs (Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007). The evaluation of colleges and universities from accrediting bodies takes these three aspects into serious account. Academic ranking in public universities also takes the three points into consideration. Private institutions are also following suit.

On the teaching part, clear evaluation records of the programs and faculty members' delivery of instruction are considered to evaluate the quality of education that is being offered at an institution. It makes sense why large literature is produced on how to organize and deliver quality education in higher education institutions all around the world (see for instance, Brown, 2014; Greybeck, Gomez, & Mendoza, 2004; Ma, 2003; Murray, Gillese, Lennon, Mercer, & Robinson, n.d.; Orlich et al., 2013; Smith & Ayers, 2006; Tucker, Stewart, & Schmidt, 2003; Wa-Mbaleka, 2012). To teach in higher education institutions, one must prove that they are academically prepared and they have the expertise and experience required to do the task.

More often than not, faculty positions in higher education are based on the candidates' educational background and achievement, and their teaching experience. Indirectly, a faculty member is primarily expected to teach before thinking about the other two roles. It is common for a faculty member to be called by their supervisor if his or her classes are left untaught, if students are in class

without a professor, or if at the end of the semester, the faculty member is unable to finish teaching the class and provide completed grade records within the stipulated time. It is not uncommon, however, to find faculty members who simply teach and never conduct any research or publish any paper and who have never been asked to explain why. The same goes with service. Many faculty members may never be required to show any service records but few are the supervisors who would request for an explanation. This overemphasis on teaching to the detriment of publication and provision of service to the community at large is probably one of the reasons why faculty members do not feel the urge of conducting research or disseminating it through conference presentations and journal publications.

Coming back to Salazar-Clemeña and Almonte-Acosta (2007), all the three aspects of higher education teaching must be promoted for a holistic service of the faculty to their students and their surrounding communities. Education training programs must adequately prepare prospective higher education faculty members (Twale, 2013). Mentorship must be provided for further training of novice faculty members (Phillips, Dennison, & Cox, 2015). In their training and in their teaching, service to humanity must be emphasized (White, 2010).

Generation and publication of knowledge must take a more important role in the work of faculty members in colleges and universities. Academic ranking and accreditation of institutions are affected by research and scholarly publications of the institutions (Wichian, Wongwanich, & Bowarnkitiwong, 2009). The culture of research must be developed and promoted (Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007). This recommendation, however, is not the only solution to this unending issue. Looking at the issue from the perspective of the CHED may give a more complete picture.

Mandate of the CHED

The CHED, the department that oversees higher education in the Philippines, states that “higher education institutions are among the primary entities tasked to generate, transmit, disseminate and apply knowledge. They are thus a major component of the nation’s research and innovation system” (CHED, 2009, p. i). This statement highlights the major role that higher education institutions play. This task of generating knowledge, however, is usually expected from faculty members, although many of them may see their primary job as that of teaching. The CHED expects higher education institutions to help develop the nation through conducting and disseminating research findings. Such a task cannot be ignored. It cannot be considered a secondary task, as the progress of one whole nation depends on it.

Basically, if higher education institutions do not focus on conducting and publishing research, the whole nation’s economy may be at risk. The nation

expects this help from the college and university professors. Unfortunately, the number of those publishing is significantly narrow in the Philippine higher education institutions (Nuqui & Cruz, 2012; Salazar-Clemeña, 2006; Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007). Recommendations have been made over the years on the need for more research and more publications (Salazar-Clemeña, 2006; Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007; Wa-Mbaleka, 2014), but the number of publications is still insignificant compared to the large number of educators currently teaching in Philippine colleges and universities.

The CHED certainly has budget for research production and dissemination, as seen on their summary of the fund utilization (CHED, 2015). A close look at the Commission's website shows that there are calls for grant. It is intriguing, however, to note that for the past five years, there are fewer and fewer reports on how the money was utilized nationwide on research. The report shows fewer and fewer research money being utilized. Without specific research looking into that, no one can tell whether the Commission did not allot money for research and development, or money was made difficult to access, or the higher education institutions and the faculty members did not apply for the grants.

Other than simply focusing on training and promoting the culture of publication in colleges and universities, it may be important to go back to the drawing board to understand better the root of the problem. It is important to hear from the faculty members themselves as to what they consider as the major factors behind this major issue of limited publications. Without properly diagnosing the problem, strategies may be promoted over and over without any real positive impact.

Current State of Research Publication

Previous research and publications have demonstrated a number of problems linked with publication in higher education institutions. To understand this complex issue better, several publications have dealt with inactivity of faculty in publications (Boyer, Moser, Ream, Braxton, & Associates, 2016; Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007; Wa-Mbaleka, 2014), disconnect between research or theory and practice (Bero et al., 1998; Boyer et al., 2016; Boykin & Noguera, 2011; Ioannidis, 2005; Saxena, Pratap, & Saraceno, 2004), little visibility of Filipino scholars on the international arena of scholarly publications (Salazar-Clemeña, 2006; Valencia & Gonzalez, 2007), quality of publications (Ioannidis, 2005; Japos, 2012), lack of cooperation between universities and industries (Leon, 2011), and limited financial resources for research and development (Justimbaste, 2004). All these topics relate to what the scholars in higher education institutions must keep in mind in the process of publication.

The struggle goes on with publications. The fact that the majority of faculty members are not publishing scholarly articles makes this discussion persist as

scholars try to find the ways and strategies to obtain everyone's support. As more and more research is conducted, the chance can be increased to see stronger connection between theory and practice, and between research and people's practical life (Saxena et al., 2004; Titler, 2007). As more publications come out, the likelihood will be increased for the Philippine visibility on the international publication arena. Quality of publications cannot be discussed when there are few people publishing. The culture of writing for publication must be developed all over the nation first. To see the Philippines rise steadily economically will depend on more collaboration between universities and industries. Faculty members will need to refocus their research and publications on the real needs of the industry and the society at large. After all, Philippine colleges and universities are called upon to sustain the nation's development and progress through research (CHED, 2009). Last, the resources need to be made available for research and development, and publication. The lack of resources to support this important endeavor can only continue to contribute to limited publications.

All these issues mentioned above are intertwined. They all depend, however, on a good understanding of the root of the problem of limited publications. Without analyzing the perspective of the faculty members, who are expected to be the first producers of research and writers of publishable articles, it may be a futile effort to try to address the issue. This study, therefore, was conducted with the purpose of hearing the voices of the faculty from three different universities about factors preventing them from publishing or publishing enough. Additionally, it is the purpose of this paper to propose some practical strategies to address the issue of publications.

The research questions of this study were intentionally left out because it was based on content analysis as the main design. It is believed that content analysis is "used as a systematic framework for exploring a body of content without first formulating initial hypotheses or research questions" (Thayer, Evans, McBride, Queen, & Spyridakis, 2007, p. 268). Only one question was asked of the research participants: that of establishing why they were not publishing or not publishing enough.

Methodology

In trying to understand the factors that prevent college and university educators from publishing, this study was conducted using content analysis as the main design. Specifically, the conventional content analysis design, as proposed by Hsieh and Shannon (2005), was utilized. This design was preferred because it allows the researchers to use an inductive approach to data analysis, when data has no predetermined variables or theories. This study had no predetermined variables. It was its purpose to identify the variables that prevent faculty members from researching, publishing or publishing enough.

Research Setting

This study was based on qualitative data from professors in three different higher education institutions in the Philippines. The first institution is a large private college located in Laguna Province of the Philippines, situated in Luzon (or the northern part of the Philippines). The college offers primarily different types of engineering programs. The second institution is a large public university in Leyte Province, located in the Visayas (the center of the Philippines). This university offers primarily teaching, natural science, and other social science programs. The last college was a private, church-owned college in Negros Occidental, in the Visayas. It offered most programs in social sciences.

Sample and Sampling

In total, 173 faculty members from the three higher education institutions participated in the study. The total population was targeted in each of the three institutions. I was asked to give an institution-wide seminar on how to write for publication in each of the three institutions. Everyone who attended the one-day seminar therefore participated in the study, as part of the activities of the seminar. Only those who were absent at the time of the activity did not participate. The first college (referred to as School1), located in Laguna Province, had 50 participants. The second institution (or School2), a university in Leyte Province, provided 53. The last one (or School3), a private church-owned college in Negros Occidental Province, had 70 participants.

Data Collection

As part of the different activities that the faculty members had to complete for the seminar on publication, they had to write individually and privately on an index card their answer to the prompt “write down two main reasons why you are not publishing or publishing enough”. They were told not to write their name there. They were not told at first that this was part of a research study, as the activity fitted in well with the other activities of the day. This decision was made to avoid giving the participants a chance to rationalize their answers. By withholding this information from them at the beginning and asking them not to write their names on the index cards, I hoped to receive more honest answers.

Participants were given 3 to 5 minutes to write their answers down. After all index cards were collected, they were informed that their answers would be included in an ongoing research study. They were given the choice to have their index card removed from the stack of index cards if they wished but no one did. This step was taken to guarantee voluntary participation, which gives participants the right to withdraw from the study any time they wish.

Because the instrument was made of only one question with only one purpose of knowing why college and university professors are not publishing or publishing enough, no validation of the instrument was necessary. This practice was especially understandable as this question was part of many other instructional activities that were part of the one-day seminar.

By the end of the seminar, some preliminary results were shared with all the participants of the seminar. These were based simply on emerging trends from the collected index cards. A promise was made to share the complete findings of the study on the Facebook group that they were all encouraged to join as part of the seminar. The study would be shared on that group only after publication, as the group is already functional. Additionally, the study would be shared with the highest administrators involved in organizing the seminar so that they could share it with all the faculty members of the participating institutions.

Data Analysis

Both manifest analysis, using word or theme count, and latent analysis, or use of underlying meaning, were used as proposed by Thayer et al. (2007). Some data was clearly presented, such as lack of funds, lack of training, which was easily used for manifest analysis. Some other data, however, required a keener look into the underlying meaning. For instance, a sentence like “my university doesn’t really care if I don’t publish” was interpreted and coded as “lack of institutional support”. The sentence “teaching and advising eat up all the time; no time left for research or writing” was coded as “limited time”. A sentence like “my English is not good” or “I struggle with English” was coded as “fear of English”. For such data, latent analysis was thus used.

Results

The data presented below is grouped in the different reasons given for faculty’s limited or lack of publications. All in all, 14 reasons were given. Table 1 provides the synthesis of the data.

All in all, 173 faculty members from three higher education institutions participated in this study. Their detailed demographic data were not collected because they were not the primary focus of this study. Additionally, the instrument used was part of the activities for a seminar that would have drawn the participants’ attention. If other demographic details were required from the participants, they could have given rationalized answers instead of honest ones.

Table 1
Factors Preventing Faculty Members from Publishing

Factor	School1	School2	School3	TOTAL
1. Limited time	28	20	45	93
2. Lack of training	22	38	28	88
3. Fear of rejection	9	9	17	35
4. Lack of interest in writing or research	3	4	27	34
5. Laziness	3	4	22	29
6. Lack of funds	2	4	10	16
7. Lack of institutional support	3	7	4	14
8. Fear of English	2	3	8	13
9. Lack of topics	2	-	8	10
10. No solid foundation in research	5	2	1	8
11. Lack of mentoring	3	2	1	6
12. No reading habit	1	2	1	4
13. No financial gain	1	-	1	2
14. No internet access	-	-	1	-
Total participants	53	50	70	173*

*Note: *173 is solely the total number of participants of this study.*

From Table 1, it is evident that although the struggles that faculty members face in the three institutions are the same, their experiences are perceived at different intensity. For instance, the first factor leading to limited publications in the School1 and School3 is limited time, while in School2 it is lack of training. Looking at the third factor, School1 and School2 share the same factor; that is, fear of rejection, while School 3's third factor is lack of interest in writing or research.

Because of the discrepancies found in the ranking of the different factors, the total was preferred from the three institutions to come up with an aggregate that reflects all the three together. Data presented in Table 1 was provided for readers to see the distribution of each institution.

Personal decision and preference considered the first 50% of the factors that came from the three institutions to be the main focus of the discussion of the remainder of this paper. The rest of this section therefore discusses the seven major factors limiting faculty's publications. Some practical solutions are recommended for each of the factors in the next section.

For the findings of this study, the seven major factors preventing faculty members from publishing (enough) include limited time, lack of training, fear of rejection, lack of interest in writing or research, laziness, lack of funds, and lack of institutional support. Before, discussing the recommendations proposed in the next section, it is important to clarify each of the seven factors, as presented in the data from the participants.

On limited time, it was surprising to hear (informally) at one of the three institutions that some faculty members are asked to teach more than 24 units of teaching load every semester. Such a load would certainly leave no more room for anything else. In addition, many faculty members teaching at the graduate level are expected, if not required, to be part of the thesis or dissertation committees. They must be reading several theses and dissertations and provide needed advising to students who are in the writing process. From human perspective, it is definitely not practical to even think about research and publication with such a work overload.

Lack of training turned out to be the second most important factor preventing faculty members from writing for publication. One may wonder how someone becomes a college or university faculty member without knowing how to write for publication. Well, unfortunately, this finding reflects the reality in these three institutions. It may not be too different from most other institutions, according to existing research (Boykin & Noguera, 2011). According to previous research, lack of training is based on two major issues: no such a solid training in the graduate education and limited financial support for such an endeavor from the CHED (Calma, 2009, 2010). It is not customary for many universities to require students to publish at least one article in a scholarly journal before the students can graduate. Since publication is not a graduation requirement in many institutions, it is therefore understandable that not much attention is given to training graduate students in writing for publication. Consequently, a significant number of people graduate without being taught how to write for publication. University ends up becoming something like an upgraded high school.

Lack of training and knowledge needed to write for publication makes the faculty members feel afraid of trying and unprepared for the daunting task before them. No wonder, fear of rejection was the third factor in the data. Perhaps restating: Participants in this study expressed fear of rejection in the event of submitting papers that may be assessed as not meeting acceptable publishing standards. In addition to the lack of training, maybe this fear of being rejected

may be associated with the eastern culture of the fear of losing face (DeCapua & Wintergerst, 2004; McInnes, 2012). In many eastern cultures, people can do all it takes to avoid being ashamed in public. To avoid losing face through the publication process, therefore, may lead some to simply avoid submitting a draft for publication considerations.

Lack of interest in writing or research was the next factor. This factor seemed to be linked to two other issues. First, people would not be interested in something they do not know how to do. So, if they do not know how to write for publication and they feel unprepared in conducting research, they would most definitely lose interest in writing and conducting research. Second, a number of participants indicated that they lacked interest in writing for publication because it is not a lucrative activity; yet, this activity is a time-consuming task. If the faculty members feel that teaching an extra course financially benefits them more and faster than writing an article, they might simply be drawn more easily to adding extra teaching load than conducting research or publishing scholarly articles.

Laziness was another factor that came up in the top seven. This factor was unexpected before the beginning of the study. For all the participants who indicated laziness as the major issue, no additional explanation was provided. Three possible related issues can be argued here. First, it is possible for the participants to be lazy because they do not know how to write for publication. Second, they may be lazy because the activity itself is not lucrative and they feel that they can do more lucrative or more exciting activities. Last, it might be because they are already overloaded with other academic activities. When they have some free time, they just wish to rest. They translate this rest as laziness. Whatever the reason is, a number of participants felt that laziness plays an important role in the problem of limited publications.

Next, lack of funds was the sixth factor. The ranking of this factor was surprising. When one talks informally with people, this issue always comes up. Data from all the participants, however, revealed that there are more serious issues than funding. Limited financial resources for conducting research, publication, and remuneration for publications, prevent some faculty members from publishing. Even the few faculty members who may know how and have the zeal to publish may lose their passion when they find that there is little to no financial support. After all, it is also for the credibility of the institution that their faculty members publish scholarly articles. It helps build the prestige and quality of their institution. Administrators, therefore, need to provide financial support for this endeavor (Salazar-Clemeña & Almonte-Acosta, 2007).

Lack of institutional support was the last factor found in this study, just as highlighted in earlier research (see Wichian et al., 2009). While administrators may often encourage faculty members to conduct research and/or publish scholarly articles, they often fail to sustain that encouragement or requirement.

They seem to know well that with the inexplicable teaching and advising load of the faculty members, it is understandably difficult to have a considerable amount of publications. They seem to understand that, without proper financial support and training, faculty members may not be motivated to undertake the work of publishing scholarly articles. It might also be that they forget about supporting this important task because they too are busy with other important work-related issues.

The seven factors presented here are all interconnected. Some solutions can help with more than one problem. One problem, on the other hand, may need more than one solution. The proposed solutions in the next section are not at all meant to be exhaustive. They reflect my personal opinion that needs to be tested with further research. They are informed with personal experience as a faculty member in different colleges and universities in different countries over a number of years, a prolific writer of scholarly articles, an editor of two scholarly journals, and peer reviewer of several scholarly journals on four continents (North America, Europe, Asia, and Africa).

Proposed Recommendations

The proposed solutions here are meant primarily for the Philippines.

Table 2
Recommendations for the Seven Major Factors Leading to Limited Publications

Factors	Recommendations
1. Limited time	De-loading, balancing roles of faculty members: teaching, research, & service
2. Lack of training	Providing training on research & writing for publication, & mentoring
3. Fear of rejection	Providing regular training on research & writing for publication, & mentoring
4. Lack of interest in writing/ research	Revising remuneration policies about research & publication
5. Laziness	Promoting mentoring, better reward policies, & inspiration of speakers
6. Lack of funds	Providing better financial support for research & publication
7. Lack of institutional support	Designing & implementing clearer guidelines & policies on research & publication

Table 2 presents the seven factors and their proposed recommendations. They may or may not work depending on different factors of each institution and different faculty members. They should therefore be taken as such—recommendations, not required guidelines.

For the issue of limited time, it is obvious that de-loading, or reducing the teaching and advising load of the university faculty members should be one of the best strategies to deal with it. Faculty members in higher education institutions cannot be expected to teach the same number of hours as K-12 educators (or even teach more than them in some cases) and still publish scholarly articles. In the case of the Philippines, where the number of colleges and universities is significantly high, adjunct faculty should be hired to help teach a number of courses to allow full-time faculty members to have enough time for publications. The CHED needs to regulate the number of hours that a higher education faculty member should teach every year. Additionally, de-loading should happen whenever a faculty member presents a complete plan for research or scholarly writing. The plan should outline exactly what and how much will be written in a semester. The faculty member would then be held accountable to keep that plan for the whole semester and demonstrate at the end that he or she complied with it. Last, de-loading will help balance the faculty member's responsibilities of teaching, conducting and producing research, and providing service to the community. If overemphasis continues to be only on teaching, service and writing for publication can be expected to continue declining. Time must be intentionally created and carefully planned for faculty scholarly writing.

Lack of training can be dealt with in two ways, for both research capability training and scholarly writing training. Holding regular seminars on these two aspects within the school can help train a large number of faculty members at once. Inviting a trainer to the school may actually be more financially sustainable than sending a handful of faculty members to attend a seminar in another city, which requires paying flights, hotels, and expensive registration fees, for just few faculty members. The writing seminars would be specifically focused on how to write for publication. The research seminars would be a refresher on research methods, introduction to new research designs, or how to write a research grant proposal. The second approach should be to plan and promote some mentoring relationships where faculty members with large experience of publishing can mentor novice ones. In fact, all novice faculty members could be assigned to such expert faculty from the very beginning of their career in a college or university. This approach could lead to more sustainability in the work of publications.

Lack of interest in writing or research may be the result of fear of being rejected and also the lack of knowledge. In this case, the solutions proposed above would address the problem. If, however, the problem is based on the fact that the incentives attached to publishing are not attractive to the faculty members, the

academic leaders in higher education may need to revise the remuneration policies about conducting research and publishing scholarly articles. Just as faculty members are remunerated for teaching, they should see clear guidelines on the remuneration of their publications. This is probably what administrators do not wish to budget for; as a result, motivation is keeps going down. It may be different for service because service entails voluntary and free assistance to other people. The time required to conduct research and to publish scholarly work, however, needs to be assessed more carefully so that proper remuneration can be given.

Laziness is a problem that is difficult to address as it depends much more on personal effort than any outside influence. Mentoring may be used to motivate faculty members who feel lazy. Such an encouragement would need to be coupled with better reward policies for faculty who publish scholarly articles. Some type of motivational speakers on the topic of publishing could be utilized to inspire such faculty members. Regular and consistent “public recognition” of faculty members who publish may also be used as part of the reward system that can motivate those with the problem of laziness.

Lack of funds for research and publication need to be addressed. Institutions need to put in place a better budgetary support for research and publication. Faculty members should receive more training on how to write grant proposal. The institutions should have a grant writing office to generate funds from industries, the CHED, and from other countries. Such a responsibility should not be simply placed on the shoulders of the institution’s research department; as such a department is usually busy with guiding both students and faculty in their ongoing research. The CHED should intentionally set aside a budget for more training on grant writing and make research grants much more accessible to the faculty members. Such an approach would strengthen the relationship between the faculty and their institution, faculty or institution and the surrounding industries (thus closing the gap between research and practice), and institutions and the CHED.

Lack of institutional support came up as last on the list of the top seven factors that negatively affect publications in higher education institutions. All faculty members seem to know well that scholarly publication is expected from them. Education leaders seem to be so busy with all other academic requirements of the institution that they forget to promote and support the work of publication. They should design and implement clear guidelines and policies on research and publication. The institution must have a clear research agenda and regularly encourage their faculty members to conduct research to fulfill that agenda. Such an agenda needs to be regularly updated to meet the new reality of social issues and needs of the industries for better national development and better fit for international competitiveness.

Four Levels of Change

For the proposed solutions to lack of publications in higher education institutions, work must be done at four different levels. All the four levels must be strengthened for better and consistent results. Failure in one of the four can still have negative effect on scholarly publication.

The first level involves providing training on scholarly writing at the graduate level. All graduate students should take at least one course on how to write for publication. The course must be one of the graduation requirements. To pass the course, each student needs to publish one article. As part of the mentorship process, students can first publish with their own professors before they publish individually. Students who thus publish before graduating could develop scholarly writing skills that could help them in their thesis or dissertation writing, make them more marketable for future faculty position, and create in them the desire to continue publishing even long after their graduation. People who publish before they graduate are probably more likely to continue publishing after they graduate than those who do not.

The second level is that of the faculty members. They need to have opportunities and be required to attend capability-building seminars on both research and writing for publication. They must be involved in some mentoring programs where published authors mentor novice faculty members. Faculty members should focus on the institution's research agenda, and such an agenda should focus on addressing the real issues of the industries and society at large. Faculty members need to know that it may be for their own good to invest some resources in their own learning when it comes to strengthening their own research and scholarly writing skills. After all, when they accepted the position of faculty, they knew all too well that publishing is expected from them. Such a personal investment, however, does not and should never replace the responsibility of the institution and the CHED to fund capability-building activities in these areas.

The third level is the one of the institution itself. It should provide regular effective capability-building opportunities. These activities should be well budgeted every year. The education leaders need to work on de-loading the faculty members so that more time can be available for scholarly writing. They must provide better incentives and better support for scholarly publication. They must set clear policies and guidelines for the expectations they have for all faculty members in the matter of publishing. They might also wish to give three options to faculty members (50% teaching + 50% research, 75% teaching + 25% research, or 25% teaching + 75% research). In this case, each faculty member could choose the option that fits best for his or her preference. Such a plan could be revised every 3 to 5 years because the preference may change over the years. Last, through the linkages that the institution has with the industries, the faculty members need to be involved more in using research to address the problems of

the industries and the national problems in different fields. Government and research grants could therefore be made accessible to faculty members. As an outcome of such research, papers would be published on practical ways to help the nation progress effectively.

The last level is that of the CHED. This national entity should improve the budget of research in higher education institutions. It should have a stronger relationship with these institutions to be able to develop more effective capability-building programs that can empower faculty members in better research and better quality scholarly publications. It should set more realistic expectations for these institutions so that when these expectations are presented to them, it is obvious that they are achievable. Once these are achieved, the CHED can progressively raise the expectations. Setting expectations beyond the reach of faculty members can be a factor to demotivate them from conducting research and publishing. Last, the CHED needs to create linkages with other ministries of higher education in the ASEAN Region. Such linkages will help make the Philippines more competitive in research and publications, as far as higher education institutions are concerned.

Conclusion

This study has presented seven major factors negatively affecting scholarly publishing in three institutions. In order of priority, they include limited time, lack of training, fear of rejection, lack of interest in writing and research, laziness, lack of funds, lack of institutional support. Recommendations were made including de-loading, providing capability building in research and scholarly writing, designing and promoting clear research and publication guidelines and policies, designing or revising remuneration policies for research and publication, mentoring, among others. The recommendation was that these strategies should be implemented at four levels: the graduate student, the faculty member, the institution, and the CHED. It is expected that work must be done at all the four levels to be able to see effective and sustainable improvement in the area of scholarly publishing.

Three major recommendations can be made here for practice. First, more resources must be allocated in each institution to provide capability-building training on research and scholarly writing, for de-loading of faculty for them to have more time for research and publication, for more funding for research and publication, and for improved incentives needed for research and publication. Second, more linkages are needed between faculty members, institutions, and industries to make research more relevant to practice. The CHED needs to be more involved with individual institutions in providing much-needed capability building on scholarly writing, grant writing, research grants, and linkages with other ASEAN countries.

Last, personal commitment from every faculty member is definitely important in addressing the issue of limited publications. The faculty members need more personal determination and dedication to conduct research and publish scholarly articles. They need to remember that publishing is expected from them just as teaching and service are. Publishing is not only about personal gain in rewards and incentives; it is also improving the ranking of the institution, learning more relevant information that is fit for teaching and service, and addressing real social issues to make this world a better place to live. Indeed, “conducting research and publishing it is an act of love for people” (Wa-Mbaleka, 2014, p. 125). It should be seen as service to the world community because once an article is published, it can be read virtually all over the world and thus potentially help address the problem worldwide.

Other scholars interested in this topic may wish to plan a larger study with the seven factors found in this study. The proposed strategies can be used in another study to test them in different higher education institutions. Last, further studies in other institutions are needed for a more complete understanding of factors preventing faculty members from conducting research in general and from publishing (or publishing enough) in particular.

References

- Acar, B. C. (2012). Research capability of the selected public and private higher education institutions in Cebu City, Philippines. *IAMURE International Journal of Education*, 4, 58-101. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7718/iamure.ije.v4i1.449>
- Bero, L. A., Grili, R., Grimshaw, J., Harvey, E., Oxman, A. D., & Thomson, M. A. (1998). Closing the gap between research and practice: An overview of systematic reviews of interventions to promote the implementation of research findings. *MBJ*, 317, 465-468. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.317.7156.465>
- Boyer, E. L., Moser, D., Ream, T. C., Braxton, J. M., & Associates. (2016). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Boykin, A. W., & Noguera, P. (2011). *Creating the opportunity to learn: Moving from research to practice to close the achievement gap*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Brown, D. H. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching: A course in second language acquisition*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Calma, A. (2009). The context of research training in the Philippines: Some key areas and their implications. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 18(2), 167-184. doi: 10.3860/taper.v18i2.1321
- Calma, A. (2010). Funding for research and research training and its effects on research activity: The case of the Philippines. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 19(2), 213-228.
- Commission on Higher Education. (2009). *National higher education research agenda-2: NHERA 2: 2009-2018*. Manila, Philippines: CHED.
- Commission on Higher Education. (2015). *HEDF fund utilization: Summary of programs and projects as of September 30, 2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/HEDF-Fund-Utilization-as-of-Sept-30-2015.pdf>
- DeCapua, A., & Wintergerst, A. (2004). *Crossing cultures in the language classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University.
- Dumbrique, J. S., & Alon, T. D. (2013). Research productivity of business administration and accountancy faculty, university of Norther Philippines, Vigan City. *IAMURE International Journal of Education*, 6, 178-195. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7718/iamure.ije.v6i1.502>
- Fox, M. F. (1992). Research, teaching, and publication productivity: Mutuality versus competition in academia. *Sociology of Education*, 293-305. doi: 10.2307/2112772
- Greybeck, B., Gomez, M. O., & Mendoza, S. O. (2004). The impact of curriculum redesign in a Mexican university on students' abilities, attitudes and values. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 7(3), 243-255. doi: 10.1080/1360312042000213868
- Hardé, P. L. (2014). Raising the bar on faculty productivity: Realigning performance standards to enhance quality trajectories. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 28(1), 25-32.
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288. doi: 10.1177/1049732305276687
- Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *Plos Medicine*, 2(8), e.124. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124

- Japos, G. V. (2012). Technology-based quality assurance of international researches adopted by the Asian scientific journal publications. *IAMURE International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3, 335-348.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7718/iamure.2011.3.1.335350>
- Justimbaste, B. S. (2004). *Improving the Philippine research and development statistical system*. Retrieved from http://www.nscb.gov.ph/ncs/9thncs/papers/energy_Improving.pdf
- Leon, M. W. (2011). Philippine education ranked 'poor'. *ABS-CBN News*.
<http://www.abs-cbnnews.com/business/06/14/11/philippine-education-ranked-poor>
- Ma, S. Y. (2003). The Christian college experience and the development of spirituality among students. *Christian Higher Education*, 2, 321-339.
doi: 310.1080/15363750390246097.
- McInnes, W. (2012). *Culture shock: A handbook for the 21st century business*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Murray, H., Gillese, E., Lennon, M., Mercer, P., & Robinson, M. (n.d.). *Ethical principles in university teaching*. Retrieved from <http://www.stlhc.ca/awards/3m-national-teaching-fellowships/initiatives/ethical-principles-in-university-teaching/>
- Nuqui, A., & Cruz, R. (2012). Determinants of faculty research productivity in Augustinian higher education institutions in Luzon. *IAMURE International Journal of Education*, 3, 56-74. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7718/iamure.ije.v3i1.191>
- Orlich, D. C., Harder, R. J., Callahan, R. C., Trevisan, M. S., Brown, A. H., & Miller, D. E. (2013). *Teaching strategies: A guide to effective instruction* (10th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Phillips, S. L., Dennison, S. T., & Cox, M. D. (2015). *Faculty mentoring: A practical manual for mentors, mentees, administrators, and faculty developers*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Salazar-Clemeña, R. M. (2006). Higher education research in the Philippines: Policies, practices, and problems. In V. L. Meek & C. Suwanwela (Eds.), *Higher education, research, and knowledge in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 185-200). New York, NY: Pelgrave Macmillan.
- Salazar-Clemeña, R. M., & Almonte-Acosta, S. A. (2007). *Developing research culture in Philippine higher education institutions: Perspectives of university faculty*. Paper presented at the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge, Hangzhou, China.

- Saxena, S., Pratap, S., & Saraceno, B. (2004). Research for change: The role of scientific journals publishing mental health research. *Scientometrics*, 98(1), 583-618.
- Sherman, G. (1999). *Instructionist versus constructionist web-based collaborative learning environments*. Paper presented at the National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, (Report No. IR019784). Houston, TX.
- Smith, D., & Ayers, D. F. (2006). Culturally responsive pedagogy and online learning: Implications for the globalized community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30, 401-415.
- Thayer, A., Evans, M., McBride, A., Queen, M., & Spyridakis, J. (2007). Content analysis as a best practice in technical communication research. *Technical Writing and Communication*, 37(3), 267-279. doi: 10.2190/TW.37.3.c
- Titler, M. (2007). Translating research into practice. *The American Journal of Nursing*, 107(6), 26-33. doi: 10.1097/01.NAJ.0000277823.51806.10
- Tucker, S. Y., Stewart, D., & Schmidt, B. J. (2003). Teaching and learning styles of community college business instructors and their students: Relationship to student performance and instructor evaluations. *New Horizons in Adult Education*, 17(2), 11-18. doi: 10.1002/nha3.10163
- Twale, D. J. (2013). *A faculty guide for succeeding in academe*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2014). *Higher education in Asia: Expanding out, expanding up: The rise of graduate education and university research*. Retrieved from <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/higher-education-asia-graduate-university-research-2014-en.pdf>
- Valencia, M. N., & Gonzalez, R. (2007). *Bibliometric analysis of international scientific publications from the Philippines*. Retrieved from <http://ched-zrc.dlsu.edu.ph/pdfs/valencia2007.pdf>
- Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2012). Teaching in extreme conditions: A study of refugee teachers in Central Africa. *International Forum*, 15(1), 59-73. Retrieved from http://internationalforum.aiias.edu/images/vol15no01/infojournalvol15no1_wa-mbaleka.pdf
- Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2014). *Publish or perish: Fear no more*. Quezon City, Philippines: CentralBooks.
- White, E. G. (2010). *Education*. Battle Creek, MI: International Tract Society.

Wichian, S., Wongwanich, S., & Bowarnkitiwong, S. (2009). Factors affecting research productivity of faculty members in government universities: Lisrel and neural network analyses. *Kasetsart Journal*, 30, 67-78.

*Safary Wa-Mbaleka, EdD, PhD
Associate Faculty, Education Department &
Editor of International Forum journal
Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies
Silang, Cavite, Philippines
Wa-MbalekaS@aiias.edu*