



RESEARCH ORIENTATION AND PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE OF LSPU SCC FACULTY: BASIS FOR 21st CENTURY FACULTY RESEARCH INTERVENTION WORK PLAN

Regina E. Gloria, Ph.D.

Laguna State Polytechnic University, Sta. Cruz Laguna, 4009, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine the research orientation and professorial performance of LSPU SCC faculty in the nine (5) Colleges and considered the result as the basis of developing an acceptable intervention work plan for them. In particular, it described the demographic profile of the respondents, their research orientation, and research performance. It also ascertained the difference in the research orientation and performance of the respondents based on their profile and by colleges. Using the mixed method of research, a checklist survey questionnaire, and structured interview, data were gathered from the 59 professors. Percentage, weighted mean, multiple regression, and ANOVA were also used to analyze the statistical data gathered in the study. It was revealed that the LSPU- SCC professors have very high levels of awareness on the research agenda, self-motivation, research capabilities, and methodological skills and have high levels of community engagement and fund generation. Further, there is a significant difference in the research awareness, research capabilities, and community engagement of the LSPU-SCC professors; but there is no significant difference in their self-motivation and methodological skills. Only a few of the professors have published in refereed or non-refereed journals, presented papers in different levels, have research copyright, research utilized, and awards received. Thus, an intervention work plan was developed and evaluated as highly acceptable in all its parameter. The LSPU – SCC professors, being aware of the research agenda are motivated to do research using a very high level of methodological skills and research capabilities, and community partnership.

KEYWORDS: *LSPU-SCC Professors, Research Orientation, Research Performance, Colleges, Work Plan*

INTRODUCTION

In many countries, the role and functioning of universities are changing and so is what is expected of the faculty, the university is increasingly perceived not only as a source of intellectual progress, but also as a transversal problem solver that can produce solutions to the problems that challenge the world (Bloom et al, 2008). Moreover, the faculties are not only the proper administrators of the university but are the primary components of the university itself (Sellari, 2015). Thus, the professors have the usual responsibility, as part of their employment, to be creative and independent outside of class in their intellectual scholarly life. The position of a professor requires an “employee” who researches and writes not to promote a particular viewpoint of the employer, but one who engages in an independent search for truth and knowledge (Springer, 2010).

In the Philippines, the higher education sector ensures that the academic environment nurtures and supports Filipino research talents. Research is one of the main functions of the higher education sector and policies are crafted to enhance the institutions and the individual capacity to conduct independent, collaborative, and productive research. The professors at LSPU – SCC is encouraged, oriented, trained, mandated, and are expected to conduct disciplined-based, policy-oriented, technology-directed, or innovative/creative research that is locally responsive and globally competitive. They do this not only for personal and professorial advancement but also to uplift the prestige of the university and contribute to national development.

As a result, the success as a university faculty member is dependent on having a clear understanding of how to combine the elements of teaching, research, and original creative work, and service in a way that makes the best use of the time and resources available (Sampson et al, 2010). Individual faculty are expected to demonstrate significant contribution in the areas of research activity, teaching effectiveness, and service to the university. LSPU-SCC professors are expected to perform high in research more than their counterparts in the other learning areas and value its importance in contrast with business and some other fields.



STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study specifically intended to answer the following objectives: Determine the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, length of service, educational attainment, academic rank, and training in research. Find the research orientation of the respondents in terms of awareness on research agenda, self-motivation, research capabilities, community engagement, methodological skills, and fund generation. Assess the research performance of the respondents in terms of research publication, paper, presentation, patent/copyright, research utilization, and awards received. Determine which demographic profile of the respondents can predict their research orientation and performance. Establish the significant difference in the research orientation of the respondents by colleges. Determine if there is a difference in the performance of the respondents by colleges. Develop an intervention work plan for the LSPU – SCC Professors. Evaluate the intervention work plan for the LSPU – SCC Professors

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The research orientation of the LSPU-SCC professors is reflected in their awareness of research and self-motivation to conduct research activities, research capabilities, community engagement, methodological skills, and fund generation.

Higher education in the Philippines is expected to strengthen their research productivity. This follows the mandate of the UNESCO World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st Century that accents the important role of research in higher education. HEIs employ different strategies to strengthen their research productivity in all disciplines, including the human and social sciences and arts, given their relevance for development (NHERA2, 2009).

With the new typology mandated by CHED, particularly putting research as an agent towards human and social development, research productivity among educational institutions has significantly become an important criterion for gaining university status, the center of excellence, autonomous/deregulated statutes, institutional quality, and opening of graduate programs (CHED Memorandum Order No. 25, Series of 1998, Priority Research Areas). Therefore, universities and colleges that are serious in transforming themselves into research institutions must look at the elements of research culture that contribute to research productivity (Clemeña & Acosta, 2008).

The research orientation of the LSPU-SCC professors pertains to their ability to display research writing confidence (Bay & Clerigo, 2013) and having self-motivation, essential skills and experience to do research (Lertputtarak, 2008). This also pertains to the professors' commitment to participate in both external and internal research activities (Bland *et al.*, 2008) and sharing of research-related values and practices. This entails courage, determination, and enthusiasm (Itaas & Mirasol, 2011) to participate in collaborative training in research (Zea & Belgrave, 2009) and the ability to identify sources of funds.

The performance of a university is measured by the number of publications of its individual faculty members. For individual performance, the professor benefits from their publications in refereed or CHED-recognized journals. They earn points for every publication whether in local, national, regional, or international journal. In the study of Garcia- Gallego *et al.*, (2012), it was found that professors who conduct research are better professors than those who do not.

METHODOLOGY

The mixed method of research is used in this study. It is a sequential explanatory design that involves collecting, analyzing, and integrating quantitative and qualitative research (Creswell & Plano, 2008); (Kennedy, 2009) to predict likely outcomes. This design will help explain, interpret, or contextualize quantitative study, hence, allowing the proponents to easily describe the gathered data and report the corresponding results. The quantitative findings will base on the gathered data using the questionnaires. In this study, 59 faculties who have an academic rank from assistant professor, associate professor and full – pledge /university professor will be chosen. Gathered data will be analyzed using frequency and percentage, weighted mean, multiple regression analysis, and ANOVA.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, data were gathered that describes the research orientation and research performance of LSPU – SCC Professors with the aim of developing an intervention work plan for faculty.

**Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

Demographic profile	N	Frequency	Percentage
Sex			
Male	57	11	18.3%
Female		46	76.7%
No Response	4		5%
Age			
24 – 31	53	4	6.70%
32 – 39		7	13.21%
40 – 47		16	30.19%
48 – 55		20	37.74%
56 – 63		6	11.32%
No response	8		0.84%
Civil Status			
Single	55	6	10%
Married		49	81.70%
No Response	6		8.3%
Length of Service			
5 – 12	44	9	20.45%
13 – 20		14	31.82%
21 – 28		16	36.36%
29 – 36		4	9.09%
37 – 44		1	2.27%
No Response	17		0.01%
Educational Attainment			
MA/MA units	51	18	30.00%
PhD/PhD units		33	55.00%
No response	10		15%
Academic Rank			
Asst/Asso Prof	53	48	80.00%
Professor		5	8.30%
No Response	8		11.7%
Training in Research			
Local			
1 to 2 trainings	34	14	23.3%
3 to 4 trainings		3	5.00%
Regional			
1 to 2 trainings		6	10.00%
3 to 4 trainings		3	5.00%
International			
1 to 2 trainings		7	11.7%
3 to 4 trainings		1	1.7%
No response	27		66.6%

The demographic profile of the LSPU – SCC Professors covers their age, sex, civil status length of service, educational attainment, academic rank, and training in research. As shown in table eleven (11) of the professors are male while forty-six (46) of them are female. This means that majority of the LSPU -SCC professors are female and most of them are in their middle age and married. Age is one of the determinants of the ability and adeptness of individuals to learn. Regardless of gender, professors are expected to perform well in research, publish research papers, and patent/copyright their research outputs. This may be implied that the LSPU -SCC professors had very little exposure to research-related training. As highlighted by Salazar – Clemena & Almonte-Acosta (2006), both the faculty and students must be exposed to research activities on how to publish academic works or present papers in conferences. in this way, they may better contribute to the development of research institutions.

**Table 2. Frequency and Weighted Mean Distribution on the Level of Research Orientation of the Respondents as to Awareness on Research Agenda**

Awareness on research agenda	VHA (5)	HA (4)	MA (3)	LA (2)	VLA (1)	Mean	QD
1. I am oriented that research agenda may help me in my short-and-long-term professional goals.	37	23	0	0	0	4.62	VHA
2. I believe research agenda are plan that focuses on issues and ideas in my field of education.	30	29	0	0	0	4.51	VHA
3. My research agenda is constantly changing due to the constantly changing demands in my specialization.	30	22	6	2	0	4.33	VHA
4. I habitually engage in productive conversations with my colleagues about viable research agenda.	19	32	7	2	0	4.13	HA
5. I am aware of the research agenda of my college and institution	29	25	6	0	0	4.38	VHA
6. the university research agenda is disseminated in different colleges through meetings, announcements in bulletin boards, and other forms of media dissemination.	18	35	6	1	0	4.17	HA
7. I am aware of the DOST Research Agenda.	13	32	11	4	0	3.90	HA
8. I am aware of the CHED Research Agenda.	14	31	13	2	0	3.95	HA
9. The research I conduct are aligned with the research agenda of my college and institution.	21	32	4	0	0	4.30	VHA
10. As a professor, I consider DOST research agenda in conducting my research.	22	26	6	0	0	4.30	VHA
Average Weighted Mean						4.26	VHA

The faculty are very highly aware of the college or institution's research agenda and that the research agenda is constantly changing due to the changing demands in their specialization, as this focuses on current ideas and issues in their field of education. They are also very highly aware that they must conduct research aligned with the college and institution's research agenda while also taking into consideration the research agenda of the DOST.

Also, the faculty is highly aware that the university research agenda is disseminated in different colleges through meetings, announcements in bulletin boards, and other forms of media dissemination and they habitually engage in productive conversations with their colleagues about viable research agenda. Moreover, they are highly aware of the CHED research agenda as well as the DOST research agenda.

The overall weighted mean of 4.26 signifies that the LSPU SCC faculty have very high research orientation as they are aware of the college institutions, CHED, and DOST 's research agenda.

Table 3. Frequency and Weighted Mean Distribution on the Level of Research Orientation of the Respondents as to Self-Motivation

Self-motivation	VH (5)	H (4)	MH (3)	L (2)	VL (1)	Mean	QD
1. I have high level of self-motivation in doing research.	16	33	5	3	0	4.09	H
2. I believe that I have the potential skills to conduct significant research in my field of specialization such as commitment, content knowledge, autonomy, and work habits.	22	33	4	0	0	4.31	VH
3. I am determined and enthusiastic to participate in collaborative research.	24	31	4	0	0	4.34	VH
4. I display research-writing confidence in coming up with relevant research.	18	34	4	3	0	4.14	H
5. I understand the norms and expectations in conducting research.	19	36	4	0	0	4.25	VH
6. I am motivated to contribute to society through my innovation, discovery, and creative works.	19	33	7	0	0	4.20	VH



7. I have passion to do research even beyond the call of service.	18	33	5	3	0	4.12	H
8. I believe that I have the commitment to share significant knowledge with my students, colleagues, and other stakeholders in my research.	22	35	2	0	0	4.34	VH
9. I feel proud whenever I present papers here and abroad.	22	31	4	0	1	4.26	VH
10. I am now more confident as I willingly participate in research mentorship.	25	29	4	1	0	4.32	VH
Average Weighted Mean						4.24	VH

The items with the highest weighted mean are on the determination and enthusiasm of the faculty to participate in collaborative research as well their commitment to sharing knowledge with students, colleagues, and other stakeholders. The faculties' self-motivation is very high particularly in being confident to participate in research mentorship, believing in their own potentials, content knowledge, and work habits, and being proud whenever they present papers in different venues.

The average weighted mean of 4.24 indicates that the faculties have a very high level of self-motivation to participate in research undertakings.

Table 4. Frequency and Weighted Mean Distribution on the Level of Research Orientation of the Respondents as to Research Capabilities

Research Capability	VH (5)	H (4)	MH (3)	L (2)	VL (1)	Mean	QD
1. I participate in research training and conferences either at the local, regional, national, or international levels.	21	28	10	0	0	4.19	H
2. I believe that participating in research training and conferences strengthen my research capability.	31	24	4	0	0	4.46	VH
3. I participate in in-house reviews to evaluate and improve my research output.	30	25	4	0	0	4.44	VH
4. I conduct research works aligned with the thrusts, vision, and mission of the institution in which I am affiliated with.	27	26	5	0	0	4.38	VH
5. I endeavor on research works addressing the most urgent issues of the country at present time.	19	32	8	0	0	4.19	H
6. I help foster strong personal and professional relationships among colleagues in the context of research development.	22	31	6	0	0	4.27	VH
7. I have the knowledge and skills to utilize the results of my research training.	14	37	7	0	0	4.12	H
8. I can provide technical assistance, guidance, and encouragement to any of my colleagues seeking to fulfill and enhance their research expectations.	17	37	5	0	0	4.20	VH
9. I am adept with strategies on how to gather necessary data effectively and efficiently for my research endeavor.	17	35	6	0	0	4.19	H
10. I know I can effectively disseminate the key findings of my research works to my colleagues in the discipline and the community.	20	30	8	0	0	4.21	VH
Average Weighted Mean						4.27	VH

As reflected in the table, the LSPU faculty have a very high level of research capability as they participate in research training and in in-house reviews. They conduct research aligned with the thrust of the institution, foster strong personal and professional relationships with colleagues, disseminate key findings from research conducted while providing corresponding guidance and encouragement to their colleagues.



On the other hand, the faculty perceive that they have a high level of research capability when it comes to research strategies, addressing societal issues, participation in training and conference whether locally or abroad, and the use of knowledge gained during training. The overall weighted mean of 4.27 indicates a very high level of research capability among LSPU faculty.

Table 5. Frequency and Weighted Mean Distribution on the Level of Research Orientation of the Respondents as to Community Engagement.

Community Engagement	VH (5)	H (4)	MH (3)	L (2)	VL (1)	Mean	QD
1.I communicate about the latest research inquiry from senior researchers in the community.	13	30	14	0	0	3.96	H
2. I share research-related values and practices within the community.	10	31	16	0	0	3.69	H
3. I can easily adapt the linkage mechanisms with the community partners.	9	33	15	1	0	3.86	H
4. I follow definite resource allocation procedures with partners in the community.	11	33	12	1	0	3.95	H
5. I collaborate with community stakeholders or with outside partners to improve my research.	13	30	13	2	0	3.93	H
6. I am determined to improve my research skill through the help of experts in the community.	25	25	7	0	0	4.32	VH
7. I maintain a strong sense of commitment to the community-based researchers, whether these are conducted personally or institutionally, through sustained monitoring and upgrading.	19	32	7	0	0	4.21	VH
8. I participate in the community engagement of the academic institution such as community-based participatory research, training, and technical assistance.	14	33	9	2	0	4.02	H
9. I can improve my research in partnership with community stakeholders.	21	30	8	0	0	4.22	VH
10. I can provide technical assistance to my colleagues in the community in terms of conducting research.	16	33	10	0	0	4.10	H
Average Weighted Mean						4.03	H

It can be gleaned from the table the LSPU faculty have a very high level of community engagement as they seek the help of experts to improve their research skills and try to improve their research partnership with the community. The faculty maintains a strong sense of commitment to the community-based researchers, whether these are conducted personally or institutionally, through sustained monitoring and upgrading.

Table 6. Frequency and Weighted Mean Distribution on the Level of Research Orientation of the respondents as to Methodological Skills

Methodological Skills	VH (5)	H (4)	MH (3)	L (2)	VL (1)	Mean	QD
1.I have deep knowledge of quantitative methods that can improve my research.	21	28	10	0	0	4.19	H
2. I have the skills to understand and evaluate research-based information.	21	30	8	0	0	4.22	VH
3. I have a high understanding of the procedures in conducting research.	22	29	7	0	0	4.26	VH
4. I know how to approach a research problem and which methods correspond to it.	21	33	5	0	0	4.27	VH
5. I have the knowledge on how to gather the necessary data for my research.	25	29	3	0	0	4.34	VH



6. I can identify the prospective respondents and sources of research information.	24	31	4	0	0	4.34	VH
7. I can do confirmatory and exploratory data analyses.	20	31	8	0	0	4.20	VH
8. I am aware of new approaches in research analysis like data mining and theory development.	19	34	6	0	0	4.22	VH
9. I can draft effective research proposals which are approved by a panel of experts.	19	35	5	0	0	4.24	VH
10. I am proficient in constructing data-gathering instruments, doing statistical treatments, interpreting findings, and writing research manuscripts.	16	35	8	0	0	4.14	H
Average Weighted Mean						4.24	VH

It can be noted from the data, that the extent of research orientation in terms of methodological skills is very high as the LSPU SCC faculties have the knowledge on how to gather the necessary data and identify the prospective respondents and sources of research information. This may be hypothesized that the very high level of methodological skills of the LSPU SCC faculty that they learned how to analyze available data and the procedures in conducting research and can consume which comprises the skills to find, read and understand the previous research and know-how to approach a research problem.

Table 7. Frequency and Weighted Mean Distribution on the Level of Research Orientation of the Respondents as to Fund Generation

Fund Generation	VH (5)	H (4)	MH (3)	L (2)	VL (1)	Mean	QD
1. I participate in beneficial research that are organized as networks, instead of standalone projects.	8	38	8	3	0	3.89	H
2. I conduct research that dovetails and complements with R&D initiative of other government agencies.	8	37	12	2	0	3.86	H
3. I can convince prospective donors on the achievability of my research.	5	38	11	1	4	3.66	H
4. I have tried outsourcing and resource generation prior to conducting a research study.	6	30	16	3	4	3.53	H
5. I use available information in the University as a basis to maximize resource utilization.	12	35	10	1	1	3.95	H
6. I am familiar with the procedures to be followed in requesting to the securing of research funds from funding agencies.	9	35	13	1	1	3.85	H
7. I generate assistance from the university in terms of the research facilities and materials.	12	35	7	0	4	3.88	H
8. I use available University amenities and honorarium in my research.	12	32	10	1	1	3.80	H
9. I coordinate with the universities R&D Center in identifying possible sources of funds for my research projects.	20	26	9	0	4	3.98	H
10. I have been a part of block grants, grants-in-aid, or commissioned research.	8	18	20	3	9	3.22	MH
Average Weighted Mean						3.76	H

The source of funds for research is an important aspect that would help the faculty in SUCs come up with quality research. The extent to which the LSPU SCC faculty generate funds for their research is shown in the table. The items rated as high include the ability of the faculty to coordinate with the university's R&D Office in identifying possible sources of funds and using the available information in the University as a basis to maximize resource utilization.



In this study, the indicators of research performance of the LSPU SCC faculty include the number of research publications, paper presentation, patent/copyright, the extent of research utilization, and the number of awards received in research.

Table 8. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Research Performance of the LSPU SCC Faculty

Performance	N	Frequency	Percentage
Publication in Refereed Journal			
1 to 3		12	20.00%
4 to 6	16	3	5.00%
More than 6		1	1.67%
No responses	45		72.33%
Publication in a non-refereed journal			
1 to 3	19	16	26.67%
4 to 6			5.00%
No responses	42	3	68.33%
Paper Presentation local/international)			
1 to 3		18	30.00%
4 to 6	36	14	23.33%
7 to 9		2	3.33%
10 to 12		2	3.33%
No responses	25		40%
Paper presentation international			
1 to 3	26	23	38.33%
4 to 6		3	5.00%
No responses	35		56.67%
Number of copyrights			
1 to 3	21	20	33.33%
More than 3		1	1.67%
No responses	40		65%
Number of research with patent			
1 to 3	1		1.67%
No responses	60	1	98.33%
Number of pending patents			
1 to 3	3	2	3.33%
4 to 6		1	1.67%
No responses	58		95%
Local utilization of research output			
1 to 3	19	17	28.33%
4 to 6		2	3.33%
No responses	42		68.34%
National utilization of research output			
1 to 3	3		5.00%
No responses	58	3	95%
International utilization of research output			
1 to 3	3		5.00%
No responses	58	3	95%
Local awards			
1 to 3	7	6	10.00%
More than 3			1.67%
No responses	54	1	88.33%
National awards			
1 to 3	6		10.00%
No responses	55	6	90%



International award			
1 to 3	2	1	1.67%
More than 3		1	1.67%
No responses	59		96.66%

In terms of publication, in a refereed journal it may be interpreted that the faculty lack confidence in publishing journals in local, national, and even international since there are not enough funds given to faculty and more work are tasked to the faculty when it comes to instruction and even other assignments tasked to them.

Lack of motivational support to the faculty is one of the problems that beset the faculty in publishing journals in refereed and even in non-refereed journals and less dissemination of publications is also a problem. Also, high subscription rates and limited circulation are also considered.

This may be inferred from less dissemination when it comes to presentation and lack of funding and even high rates in presetting and even in publishing research papers in local, national, and international. On the contrary, the faculty present their research outputs in national or international conferences due to different reasons.

In terms of the number of copyrighted materials, there were fewer training, seminars, and conferences given to the faculty when it comes to copyright and patents. This may be interpreted that not all faculty members could do research and have patent/copyright due to lack of skills to find, read and understand what to do and produce or to know what methods are needed and when and where to go (Itaas & Mirasol, 2011).

This may be hypothesized that not all faculty received awards in their research outputs because they are not encouraged and even motivated to conduct and invest in research because of their overworked in their assignments and even their family responsibility.

Demographic Profile as Predictors of Respondents Research Orientation and Performance

Table 9. Regression on the Demographic Profile as Predictor of the LSPU SCC Faculty Research Orientation as to Methodological Skills

Profile	beta	t-value	p-value	Analysis
sex	.372	2.082	.047	Significant
age	.166	0.847	.405	Not Significant
Civil status	-.211	-1.158	.257	Not Significant
Length of service	.158	0.815	.422	Not Significant
Educational qualifications	.046	0.250	.804	Not Significant
Academic rank	.144	0.796	.433	Not Significant

Adjusted R-square = .106

F-value = 4.336

Sig. = 0.047

Based on the findings, the hypothesis which states that the demographic profile of the respondents does not predict their research orientation is rejected.

Difference in the Research Orientation of the LSPU SCC Faculty by College

The difference in the research orientation of the faculty is reflected in the table. There is a significant difference in the level of research orientation of the faculty in colleges as to research awareness.



Table 10. Summary of Values on the Difference of the Research Orientation Among LSPU SCC Faculty wen grouped by the colleges

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Analysis
Awareness Research Agenda	Between groups	342	4	85.740	3.737	.009	Significant
	Within groups	1261.97	55	22.945			
	Total	1604.933	59				
Self-motivation.	Between groups	246.685	4	6.671	1.030	.400	Not Significant
	Groups	3292.165	4	59.858			
	Within groups	3538.850	5				
	Total		59				
Research Capabilities	Between groups	27.565	4	156.891	3.122	.022	Significant
	Within groups	2764.085	5	50.256			
	Total	3391.650	59				
Community Engagement	Between groups	648.315	4	162.079	2.618	.045	Significant
	within groups	3405.419	5	61.917			
	Total	4053.733	59				
Methodological Skills	Between groups	160.409	4	40.102	0.634	.640	Not Significant
	Within groups	3479.525	5	63.264			
	Total	3639.933	59				
Fund Generation	Between groups	910.141	4	227.535	3.612	.011	Significant
	within groups	3465.109	5	63.002			
	Total	4375.250	59				

With these findings, therefore the hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the research orientation of the faculty by colleges is partially rejected. This may be inferred that there are allocated funds in a period of ten years specifically to provide a conducive policy environment for the management and administration of research, for technical assistance for research, and funding/financial assistance for research in higher education in the form of block grants, grants-in-aid, and commissioned research (NHERA, 2009).

Difference in the Performance of the LSPU SCC Faculty by Colleges

The difference in the performance of the LSPU SCC faculty by colleges is presented in the table.

Table 11. Difference in the Performance of the LSPU SCC Faculty by Colleges as to the Number of Training in Local/Reg¹/ Nat¹/ International Level.

Number of local trainings	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	2	14.3	4	36.4	0	0.00	3	20.0	0	0.00
2	1	7.1	2	18.2	0	0.00	2	13.3	0	0.00
3	0	0.00	3	27.3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	3	21.4	9	81.8	0	0.00	5	33.3	0	0.00
No answer	11	78.6	2	18.2	9	100	10	66.7	7	100



Number of regional/national training	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	1	7.1%	1	9.1%	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	0	0.00	1	9.1%	0	0.00	2	13.3	1	14.3
3	0	0.00	1	9.1%	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
4	1	7.1	1	9.1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	2	14.3	4	36.4	0	0.00	2	13.3	1	14.3
No answer	12	85.7	7	63.6	9	100	13	86.7	6	85.7

Number of international training	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	0	0.0	5	45.5	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	0	0.0	6	54.5	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
No answer	14	100	5	45.5	9	100	14	93.3	7	100

It can be gleaned from the table that the faculty from college B attended the most local training, followed by those in college D and college A. The finding indicates that the faculty from college B had more local training than their counterpart from other colleges, particularly from college C and college E who disclosed that they did not attend any local training related to research. This implied that more training, workshop, and conferences were given and faculty are allowed and given time to attend for it will give the faculty a chance to improve and enhance themselves in providing more knowledge, confidence, and self-development when it comes to doing research.

Table 12. Difference in the Performance of the Faculty by Colleges as to Number of Publications in Refereed/Non-Refereed Journal

Number of Publication In Refereed journal	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	2	14.3	0	0.0	3	33.3	3	20.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	2	13.3	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	13.3	0	0.0
16	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	3	21.4	1	9.1	3	33.3	8	53.3	0	0.0
No answer	11	78.6	10	90.0	6	66.7	7	46.7	7	100
Number of Publication in Non-refereed journal	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	1	7.1	0	0.0	4	44.4	2	13.3	1	14.3
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	13.3	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	2	18.2	2	22.2	1	6.7	0	0.0
4	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
total	2	14.3	3	27.3	6	66.7	6	40.0	1	14.3
No answer	12	85.7	8	72.7	3	33.3	9	60.0	6	85.7

This may be hypothesized that their research showed no evidence or are not in line with the thrusts of the research agenda they must publish. At the University of the Philippine system, an assistant professor must publish or produce creative of the quality and quantity necessary to satisfy the standards for tenure and promotion and in the required capacity as lead author or co-author of creative work (UP System Manual, 2004).

Table 13. Difference in the Performance of the LSPU SCC Faculty by Colleges as to the Number of Paper Presentations in the Local/National/International Level



Number of Presentation (local/national)	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	0	0.0	2	18.2	1	11.1	2	13.3	0	0.0
2	3	21.4	1	9.1	2	22.2	2	13.3	1	14.3
3	1	7.1	1	9.1	3	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	1	0.0	1	9.1	1	11.1	1	6.7	1	14.3
5	0	0.0	2	18.2	0	0.0	4	26.7	1	0.0
6	0	21.4	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
7	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
12	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
total	7	50.0	8	72.7	7	77.8	10	66.7	3	42.9
No answer	7	50.0	3	27.3	2	22.2	5	33.3	4	57.1
Number of Presentation (international)	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	2	14.3	1	9.1	5	55.6	4	26.7	1	14.3
2	1	7.1	2	18.2	0	0.0	2	13.3	0	0.0
3	2	14.3	0	0.0	1	11.1	1	6.7	1	14.3
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	1	6.7	0	0.0
6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
total	5	35.7	3	27.3	8	88.9	8	53.3	2	28.6
No answer	9	64.3	8	72.7	1	11.1	7	46.7	5	71.4

As the data reflect, the performance of the faculty for the last three years, one faculty from college A had a total of 12 paper presentations. The faculty disclosed that they participate in in-house reviews in their respective colleges, this is counted as local paper presentations. The table also shows the difference in the performance of the faculty by colleges as to the number of paper presentation in the international level. The faculty from college C and college D had the highest number of paper presentation in the international level.

Table 14. Difference in the Performance of the LSPU SCC Faculty by Colleges as to the Number of Research Copyright, Research Patent and Pending Research Patent

Number of Research Copyright	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	1	7.1	2	18.2	3	3.33	8	53.3	1	14.3
2	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	2	13.3	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
16	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
total	2	14.3	4	36.4	3	33.3	11	73.3	1	14.3
No answer	12	85.7	7	63.6	6	66.7	4	26.7	6	86.7
Number of Research Patent	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
total	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
No answer	14	100	11	100	9	100	14	93.3	7	100
Number of Pending Research patent	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
total	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	13.3	0	0.0
No answer	14	100	11	100	9	100	13	86.7	7	100

The faculty from college D had the greatest number of research copyright. The five colleges follow a system of innovation and one of these is creating a mechanism for intellectual property rights (UNESCO, 2009). This only showed that the faculty in



college D, as well as the R&D Office and even the administration, had provided training, seminars, and workshop with regards to copyright, and even funding is also given to those who are and are willing to do so.

Table 15. Difference in the Performance of LSPU SCC Faculty by College as to the Number of Research Utilized in the Local/National/International Level

Number of Research utilized	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	3	21.4	1	9.1	1	11.1	6	40.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	11.1	1	6.7	0	0.0
total	3	21.4	3	27.3	2	22.2	8	53.3	0	0.0
No answer	11	78.6	8	72.7	7	77.8	7	46.7	7	100
Number of Research Utilized (national)	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
total	0	0.0	2	18.2	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
No answer	14	100	9	81.8	9	100	14	93.3	7	100
Number of Research Utilized (International)	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.7	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	6.7	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
total	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	13.3	0	0.0
No answer	14	100	10	90.9	9	100	13	86.7	7	100

the table shows that faculty from college B reported that there is research in their university that was utilized at the national level while there is one from college D. The three other disclosed that there is no research in their university that were utilized in the national level.

Table 16. Difference in the Performance of the LSPU SCC Faculty by Colleges as to the Number of Research Awards in the Local/ National/ International Level

Number of Research awards (Local)	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	2	14.3	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
9	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
total	3	21.4	3	27.3	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
No answer	11	78.6	8	72.7	9	100	14	93.3	7	100
Number of Research Awards (National)	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	11.1	2	13.3	0	0.0
total	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	11.1	2	13.3	0	0.0
No answer	13	92.9	10	90.9	8	88.9	13	86.7	7	100
Number of Research Awards (International)	College A		College B		College C		College D		College E	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0
total	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	13.3	0	0.0
No answer	13	92.9	11	100	9	100	11	93.2	7	100

The faculty from colleges C and E disclosed that they did not receive research awards in the local level. This means that college A and D of the faculty invest and conduct research that led to the enhancement of academic programs as well as contribute to



the country's initiatives towards inclusive and globally competitive development. The faculty's awards reflect the characteristics that are most important to an institution.

This may be hypothesized that faculty have built a sense of community such that all faculty and students have access to the current research and vitality of the university. This recognition also serves as models for other faculty to emulate and to aspire to as well (Silverman *et al.*, 2011).

Developed Intervention Work Plan for the LSPU SCC Faculty

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher developed a series of activities that focus on an intervention work plan for the research performance of the LSPU SCC Faculty in the five colleges.

Evaluation on the Intervention Work Plan for the LSPU SCC Faculty

The intervention work plan for the LSPU SCC Faculty was evaluated by the faculty from the five colleges of LSPU system. It was then validated, and pilot tested by the faculty from Eulogio Amang Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology (EARIST), Manila. The following discussions revealed its evaluation based on the objectives, content, significance, usability, and ethical values.

From the table, the respondents find the objectives of the research intervention work plan highly acceptable for being specific and clear, providing techniques for continuous development, and achievable within the specified time.

Table 17. Weighted Mean Distribution on the Evaluation of the Intervention Work Plan as to Objectives.

Objectives	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
1. Specified and clearly stated.	3.40	0.490	Moderately acceptable
2. designed to respond to the needs of the College faculty to improve research performance.	3.45	0.497	Highly acceptable
3. Provide techniques for research and publication of information necessary for the continuous development of the faculty.	3.55	0.497	Highly acceptable
4. objectively measures the improvement of the research skills of the faculty.	3.45	0.497	Highly acceptable
5. achievable within the specified time.	3.60	0.490	Moderately acceptable
Overall Weighted Mean	3.49 Highly Acceptable		

Legend:

4.20 – 5.00 Very Highly Acceptable

3.40 – 4.19 Highly Acceptable

2.60 – 3.39 Moderately Acceptable

1.80 – 2.59 Lowly Acceptable

1.00 – 1.79 Not at all Acceptable

The overall weighted mean of 3.49 reveals that the objectives of the research intervention work plan are highly acceptable. Being clear and specific, it provides techniques for continuous development among the faculty.

Table 18. Weighted Mean Distribution on the Evaluation of the Intervention Work Plan as to Content.

Content	Weighted mean	Standard deviation	Verbal interpretation
1. Clearly expresses goals and the means to express goals and objectives.	3.50	0.500	Highly acceptable
2. Appropriate for all the concerned individuals.	3.50	0.500	Highly acceptable
3. Present topics in scientific and orderly manner.	3.70	0.458	Highly acceptable
4. Develop College faculty researchers' passion for continuous learning.	3.65	0.477	Highly acceptable
5. Reflect strategies to complete tasks on time.	3.55	0.497	Highly acceptable
Overall Weighted Mean	3.58	Highly Acceptable	

Legend:

4.20 – 5.00 Very Highly Acceptable

3.40 – 4.19 Highly Acceptable



2.60 – 3.39 Moderately Acceptable

1.80 – 2.59 Lowly Acceptable

1.00 – 1.79 Not at all Acceptable

The evaluation on the content of the intervention work plan was all highly acceptable which means that they are all acceptable and meaningful for the intervention work plan of the faculty that provide information, strategies, and techniques to the development of the faculty as well.

Table 19. Weighted Mean Distribution on the Evaluation of the Intervention Work Plan as to Significance

Significance	Weighted mean	Standard deviation	Verbal interpretation
1.It is designed to allow faculty researchers to participate in activities that are consistent with the college research agenda	3.60	0.490	Highly acceptable
2. It is designed to support training activities for all LSPU faculty.	3.55	0.497	Highly acceptable
3. It specifies human and non-human resources to be employed in the achievement of goals.	3.55	0.497	Highly acceptable
4. It is designed to complement other government and non-government agencies' research agendas.	3.60	0.490	Highly acceptable
5. It has provisions for the gradual improvement in the research performance of the faculty in the college.	3.45	0.497	Highly acceptable
Overall Weighted Mean	3.54	Highly Acceptable	

Legend:

4.20 – 5.00 Very Highly Acceptable

3.40 – 4.19 Highly Acceptable

2.60 – 3.39 Moderately Acceptable

1.80 – 2.59 Lowly Acceptable

1.00 – 1.79 Not at all Acceptable

This may be implied that the intervention work plan gives full support, knowledge, and confidence in the research performance. The emphasis on research productivity in the faculty enhances teaching and faculty members and administrators support this belief (Neumann in Prince *et al.*, 2007)

Table 20. Weighted Mean Distribution on the Evaluation of the Intervention Work Plan as to Usability.

Usability	Weighted mean	Standard deviation	Verbal interpretation
1.Useful to the current needs and practices of the college.	3.45	0.497	Highly acceptable
2. Is applicable to the college's current trends mission, vision, goals, and objectives.	3.70	0.458	Highly acceptable
3. Encourage university, faculty, staff, students and community as well to be more aware and equipped of the research agenda of the institution.	3.35	0.477	Highly acceptable
4. Provide clear information in an efficient and effective plan to be used.	3.55	0.497	Highly acceptable
Give long-term benefits to University's Administrative and staff, faculty, students, and community as well.	3.60	0.490	Highly acceptable
Overall Weighted Mean	3.53	Highly Acceptable	

Legend:

4.20 – 5.00 Very Highly Acceptable. 3.40 – 4.19 Highly Acceptable 2.60 – 3.39 Moderately Acceptable 1.80 – 2.59 Lowly Acceptable 1.00 – 1.79 Not at all Acceptable



From the table, the faculty rated the research intervention work plan as highly acceptable. It is applicable to the university's current trends, mission, goals, and objectives and provides clear information in an efficient and effective plan to be used. This means that all statements are acceptable as to faculty and are highly acceptable in all the research undertakings that would lead them to a higher level of research performance.

Table 21. Weighted Mean Distribution on the Evaluation of the Intervention Work Plan as to Ethical Value

Ethical Value	Weighted mean	Standard deviation	Verbal interpretation
1.The intervention work plan recognizes ethical implications.	3.75	0.497	High
2. Develop the capability of the University's administrative and research staff in improving the institution's research performance..	3.70	0.458	High
3. Seek truth in order to improve the competence of the faculty to present or publish their scholarly works.	3.40	0.477	High
4. Take safe and spiritual concerns to improve the required scholarly writing skills of the faculty in the University.	3.50	0.497	High
5. Encourage the development value competence, and practices in writing and engaging in research.	3.65	0.490	High
Overall Weighted Mean	3.60	High	

Legend:

4.20 – 5.00 *Very Highly Acceptable*

3.40 – 4.19 *Highly Acceptable*

2.60 – 3.39 *Moderately Acceptable*

1.80 – 2.59 *Lowly Acceptable*

1.00 – 1.79 *Not at all Acceptable*

The table reveals that the ethical value of the research intervention work plan is high. It develops the capability of the University's administrative and staff in improving the institution's research performance and recognizes ethical implications. This may be inferred that the developed intervention work plan gives importance and may be of great help in writing and engaging faculty in doing research and that they may be guided spiritually and morally.

CONCLUSIONS

From the results of the study, the following conclusions are stated as most of the faculty are female, most of them in their late adulthood, married, and are enjoying either Assistant or Associate Professor rank. Most of them have been in the service for a considerable length of time and are pursuing a higher level of education. They are exposed to minimal training either in the local, national, or international training. The faculty is aware of the research agenda is motivated to do research, using a very high level of methodological skills and research capabilities. they have less ability to generate funds for their research and build community partnerships. The faculty have few publications in refereed or non-refereed journals and paper presentation in the local, national, or international level. Only a few have research copyright and research utilized or awards received in the different levels. The methodological skills of the faculty correlate with their sex. However, regardless of age, civil status, length of service, educational qualifications, and academic rank the faculty are motivated to do research and aim to enhance their research capabilities. There are variations on how the faculty from the five colleges were oriented on the research agenda of the institution and other partner agencies and on how their research capabilities, community engagement, and fund generation are enhanced. The faculty in college B has the greatest number of local /regional/international training. Those from college A have the greatest number of papers published in a refereed journal, paper presentations at the local/national level, and awards at the local level. The greatest number of publications in non-refereed journals, papers presented at the international level, research copyright, research utilized at the local level, patent and pending patents, awards at the national or international level came from college D. the developed intervention work plan is commendable for implementation and/or adoption. The intervention work plan has well-defined objectives, comprehensive content, is significant to the target beneficiaries, is highly usable, and carries high ethical values.

RECOMMENDATIONS



From the findings and conclusions, the recommendations states that the faculty may be exposed to training that focus on writing skills and the use of statistical tools for quantitative research, and the methodologies for qualitative research for them to be intensified. The R&D Office and other university officials may assist faculty researchers, particularly those with less ability to generate funds for their research and build community partnerships. Tapping the expertise of senior researchers from other colleges and universities with good track records is also a viable means to upgrade the research capabilities of the faculty from the five colleges. Of LSPU SCC. The faculty may be exposed to training on intellectual property and other related laws to better guide them in copyrighting or patenting their research outputs. Financial assistance may be granted by the university particularly in paper presentation, publication, and patenting. The faculty career advancement may be given a push by the administration through scholarships grants, to elevate their level of education. Participation in research activities is a relevant means for their professional advancement. It is suggested to include the faculty in the roster for collaborative researchers. Holding orientation among the faculty in the university is a big help to advocate the institution's research agenda. Collaboration with partner agencies will likewise boost the research capability of the faculty and better inform them of the partner agencies' research agenda. The faculty must be guided and supervised by the concerned authorities from the drafting of the proposal, writing the manuscript, paper presentation, and publishing the output in a prestigious refereed journal. The research incentive scheme may be communicated well to them to inspire and to venture into research activities. Bestowing awards to deserving researchers is also a good motivational strategy. The implementation and/or adoption of the developed intervention work plan in the five colleges are likewise recommended. It is highly suggested that the developed intervention work plan be subjected to another evaluation by future researchers, taking into consideration other aspects aside from its objectives, content, significance, usability, and ethical values.

REFERENCES

1. Acero, V.O., et al. (2024). *Human Growth and Development and Learning: Manila Rex Book Store*.
2. Akl, E., et al. (2012). *Effects of Assessing the Productivity of Faculty in Academic Medical Centres: A Systematic Review*. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, May 2012. P 5. Accessed at: <http://www.cmj.ca/content/early/2012/05/28/cmj.111123.full.pdf+html>
3. Bepco, G.L. (2004). *Taking A Long View. University Leadership in Urban School Renewal*. USA: American Council on Education, Praeger Publishers.
4. Bland, C., et al. (2005). *A Theoretical, Practical, Predictive Model of Faculty and Department Research Productivity*. *Academic Medicine*, 80(3), p.225-237. Available at <http://www2.massgeneral.org/facultydevelopment/cfd/pdf/Predictors%20of%20Research%20Productivity.pdf>
5. Cameron, R., Ginsburg, H., Michael Westhoff, M. and Mendez, R. V. (2012). *Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behavior and Social Media Use*. *American Journal of Psychological Research*, Volume 8, No.1, 1 – 20
6. Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*, 6th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill International Edition.
7. Gelmon, S.B., Seifer, S.D., Kauper-Brown, J. and Mikkelsen, M. (2005). *Building Capacity for Community Engagement: Institutional Self-Assessment Seattle*. WA: *Community-Campus Partnerships for Health*. www.ccp.hi.edu
8. Intellectual Property Office (IPO). (2014). *Exceptions to Copyright: Research* https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/375954/research.pdf
9. Itaas, E.C. & Mirasol, J. M. (2011). *Managing Research and Development in Higher Education Institution through Collaboration: The Bukidnon State University Experience*. *PHILARM Journal*. Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 21-35. ISSN 1656-1637.
10. Mitchell, M.L. & Jolly, J. M. (2007). *Research Design Explained*. 6th Edition. USA: Thomson Wadsworth.
11. Musiige, G. & Maassen, P. (2015). *Faculty Perceptions of the Factors that Influence Research Productivity at Makerere University. Knowledge Production and Contradictory Functions In African Higher Education*. Edited by Nico Cloete, Peter Maassen & Tracy Bailey. <http://www.chet.org.za/download/file/pdf/848>.
12. Republic Act No. 8293. *Intellectual Property Code of the Philippines*.
13. Roberts, T. G., Dooley, K.E., Harlin, J.F., & Murphrey, T.P. (2006). *Competencies and Traits of Successful Agricultural Science Teachers*. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, 22(20), Fall 2006.
14. Sellari, T.J. (2015). *Difficult Talent: A Conceptual Approach to Managing Academics in Pursuit of Academic Goals*. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 2015, 3, 109-118.
15. Silverman, H.J., Allen, P., Davidson, C., Goodman, N., Kuchner, J., Mayr, A., & Pekarsky, M. (2011). *Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policy Committee (FRRPC) Guidelines Academic and Research Responsibilities of Tenured Faculty in Arts and Sciences Senate Constituencies at Stony Brook University- FRRPC Guidelines/ Approved by the Arts and Sciences Senate*. Available At http://www.stonybrook.edu/frrpc/academic++research-responsibilitiesAcademic+Research_ResponsibilitiesTenured_Faculty-FRRPCGuidelines-final_2011-1015.pdf.
16. UNESCO Report. (2009). *Higher Education, Research and Innovation: Changing Dynamics Report On the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge 2001-2009*. V.Lynn Meek, Ulrich Teichler, and Mary-Louise Kearney (Editors). Published by



SJIF Impact Factor (2023): 8.574 | ISI I.F. Value: 1.241 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016

ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)

EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)

Volume: 8 | Issue: 2 | February 2023

- Peer Reviewed Journal

International Center for Higher Education Research Kassel (INCHER-Kassel), University of Kassel. Available at <http://www.unesco.org/education/researchforum>.