FACULTY RESEARCHERS AND NON-RESEARCHERS IN THE CONTEXT OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE AND PERSONAL PROFILE

[1]JAKE M. LAGUADOR, [2]JOSEPH CEZAR L. DELIGERO, [3]CECILIA C. PRING

[1,2,3]Lyceum of the Philippines University, Batangas City, Philippines
E-mail: [1]jakelaguador@gmail.com

Abstract— Every Higher Education Institution needs to develop faculty researchers from its faculty line up who can share their time and expertise to produce research outputs while performing their responsibilities as classroom teachers and sometimes as school managers. This study aims to compare the result of faculty performance evaluation from students and the faculty profile when they are categorized based on their research involvement. Descriptive type of research method with inferential statistics using Chi-square test and Guttman's Coefficient of predictability as statistical tools was utilized to describe the result of the study. Results showed that there are more female master's degree holders with hourly rate from Php 251 to 350 who have active research involvement than males and bachelor's degree and doctorate degree holders. Faculty researchers have significantly higher performance evaluation rating from the students compared to non-researchers. Those with higher Instructional and Diagnostic expertise among faculty members showed higher possibility of becoming faculty researcher. Faculty members may also be required to write books or instructional manuals as a form of research output. If they will be written their own material to be utilized in their own respective classes, mastery or the subject expertise may be fully achieved. They were encouraged to conduct more funded researches from the government and private agencies during the transition period of the Philippine Education in the K-12 implementation.

Index Terms— Faculty Member, Researcher, Non-Researcher, Teaching Performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Research cannot be taken away from the important functions of teachers especially in higher education institutions. Being the facilitators of learning process, they are equipped with various teaching strategies and research skills on how to address educational problems and issues of the academic community. Elton [1] emphasized that it has become increasingly clear over the past decade that the question of a positive link between research and teaching has no simple or general answer. At the same time, there may well be a positive link under particular conditions. Borg and Liu's [2] study problematizes the notion of teacher as researcher by highlighting many interactive personal, interpersonal, and institutional factors which shape the extent to which teachers can be research-engaged.

Teaching effectiveness and research productivity are complementary. Much of the rationale for the existence of research universities is that these two activities are so mutually reinforcing that they must co-exist in the same institutions [3]. Studies have assumed the nature of this relation and characterized it as one that exists between externally defined indicators such as teaching effectiveness and research productivity [4].

Aside from delivering instruction, teachers are also responsible in conducting research for personal and professional growth as well as part of the continuous improvement of the university where they belong. This is also an important part of the faculty performance evaluation aside from teaching performance. Teaching performance could not only be measured through classroom instruction. In fact, Lyceum of the Philippines University – Batangas (LPU-B) has continually enhancing its faculty evaluation instrument through the initiative of Human Resource Management and Development Office and Research and Statistics Center wherein research involvement is part of the consideration in assessing the performance of faculty members. Candidates who may be effective classroom teachers may not be as skilled in writing about their instructional practice [5]. Teachers' engagement in doing research is less frequent, with three main reasons given: lack of time, interest and motivation. The motivations for doing research, however, tend to be more extrinsic than intrinsic; the majority reported doing research for promotion or graduation, while few do it to improve teaching or out of personal interest [6].

Determining if the majority of researchers are dominated by young ones or old ones, single or married, with doctorate, master's or just bachelor's degree holders. Sometimes, age doesn't matter in conducting research, but others might believe that the older teachers with higher educational attainment and experience in teaching and research could contribute and conduct better research outputs than young ones. According Reid et al.[7] that large numbers of teacher education research academics nearing retirement; a diminishing capacity among faculties to recruit young academics in the discipline who are both 'research ready' and 'teaching ready'.

Viewing the image of research benefits not as a whole but through its part specifically during its production process where great learning occurs and transpires to the team members of the organization would create clear reflections on how to become critical thinkers as

well as systematic, organize, innovative, creative, dynamic and proactive professionals.

Favilla and Bloch [8] found out that researchers were more likely to have received research training than non-researchers, spent more hours a week on research at the time of the survey and during the previous 5 years. Researchers devoted more time to academic teaching and acquisition of higher degrees. Twice as many researchers as non-researchers had published peer-reviewed articles; the average number was substantially greater. The researchers had obtained funding for their studies far more often than their non-researching counterparts; the average amount was 100 times greater.

Sharing what they have learned through conducting researches to the students and to the academic community would make them better learners, effective teachers and nation builders while reaching the borders of competitive world.

This study is intended to determine the significant relationship and differences of faculty researchers and non-researchers. On this context, it is delimited to the concept that faculty researchers are those faculty members who fervently conducting institutional research studies for their respective departments with at least one completed research either institutional or college for the last three years while the result of students' evaluation on teaching performance will be taken for the last three years. Non-researchers are faculty members without completed institutional research and they will be drawn randomly from the roster of faculty members of different colleges to compare their faculty performance evaluation results against the performance of considered active researchers.

There is also consideration in civil status and gender issues between single and married faculty members. Singles have fewer responsibilities against mothers with more obligations and tasks to attend to at home than fathers with also lots of responsibilities but more on related to their job which is also in teaching profession. These could somehow be their reasons for engaging or rejecting research undertakings of the university.

Furthermore, educational attainment has something to contribute to the amount of hourly rate. Could it be true that faculty members with higher hourly rate have more number of completed institutional researches than with lower salaries or maybe the full-time teachers specifically the plain teachers have more time to conduct researches than those part-timers?

There are few studies differentiated the teaching performance and profile between faculty researchers and non-researchers, thus this study was pursued. The findings of the study would serve as a reference for the faculty members to enhance or improve their teaching strategies through conducting either action or institutional research. Since it is not only the responsibility of the Faculty members to focus on instruction but also to engage their quality time in providing substantial research outputs to be utilized by the students, the organization and the community at large.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to determine the preliminary identity sketch of the faculty researchers and non-researchers in terms of age, gender, civil status, employment status, educational attainment and hourly rate; and students' evaluation of teaching performance result from 2010 – 2013; to compare the result of the teaching performance and test the differences between researchers and non-researchers; to test the difference in the profile variable between two the groups; to determine the differences between faculty researchers and non-researchers when they were grouped according to profile variables; and to determine which profile variable included in the study and which teaching performance criteria best predicts the possibility of becoming a faculty researcher.

Ho: There is no significant difference between faculty researchers and non-researchers when they were grouped according to profile variables.

III. METHODS

A. Research Design

The study will use a descriptive type of research method using documentary analysis in data gathering wherein the names of the faculty members with completed and on-going Institutional researches were obtained from the Research and Statistics Center of the University while the results of faculty performance evaluation result were obtained from the Human Resource Management and Development Office through the assistance of Management Information System (MIS).

B. Participants

This study focuses on the faculty members with at least one institutional research conducted for the last three years is considered as faculty researcher and those without any recorded research output from the Research and Statistics Center is considered as non-researcher. The faculty non-researchers were chosen from the roster of faculty members from different colleges and obtained to compare their faculty performance evaluation results with those of faculty researchers. Personal profile like age, gender, civil status, employment status, educational attainment and hourly rate were considered. Total population of 107 faculty researchers was used in the study while random sampling technique was used to identify the sample respondents for 109 non-researchers which number is closely the same with the other group.

C. Procedure

Documentary analysis was used as data gathering procedure for the study. The result of students'

evaluation of teaching performance from SY 2010-2011 to SY 2012-2013 was obtained from the Management Information System (MIS) of the university while the records of the research outputs of the faculty members were taken from the Research and Statistics Center.

D. Data Analysis

Frequency count and percentage were used to analyze the result of the profile variables while arithmetic mean was used to interpret the teaching performance of the faculty members. T-test was used to determine the difference on teaching performance between the non-researchers and researchers. Chi-square test was used to determine the differences between the two groups when they were grouped according to profile variables. Guttman's Coefficient of predictability was used to determine which profile variable included in the study best predicts the possibility of becoming a faculty researcher.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Relationship with the profile variable and category of faculty members

There is a difference of 9.7 percent in favor of male non-researchers while there is 8.8 percent difference in favor of female researchers. Therefore, female faculty members have significantly higher tendency of becoming researchers than males in the university since they have certain characteristics between genders in terms of writing communication skills that females have more adept than males.

There is no significant difference between the category of faculty members and their age bracket. There is a greater number of researchers in the 31-40 age bracket but lesser number in 21-30 and 41 and above age brackets compared to non-researchers. Age cannot be considered a factor in determining the possibility of faculty members in becoming a researcher compared to educational attainment because there are faculty members belong to 31 years old and above who are still pursuing their graduate studies.

Civil status is not also a factor that determines the involvement in research as denoted by the p-value of .153 which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance. There is a difference of 3.8 percent in favor of unmarried researchers but there is a difference of 2.9 percent in favor of married non-researchers wherein the differences do not signify any distinct attribute from single and married faculty members.

There is a significant relationship between non-researcher and researchers in terms of their educational attainment. There are more Bachelor's and Master's Degree holders who are non-researchers compared to Doctorate Degree holders. There is a difference of 10.2 percent among Bachelor's degree holder in favor of non-researchers but there is a little difference of 3.9 percent in favor of non-researchers who are master's degree holders while 12.1 percent difference in favor of researchers who are doctorate degree holders. The computed differences marked distinct characteristics where those faculty members who finished their graduate studies and those who still pursue advanced studies are more involved in research. Therefore, the higher the educational attainment of the faculty members, there is also a higher tendency of engaging into research activities.

There are more part-time faculty members who are not providing research output to the university with a difference of 6.3 percent compared to faculty researchers while there is 3.9 percent difference of full time faculty members in favor of the researchers. It is good to note that four (4) in every ten part time faculty members are already engaged in research activities of the university while there is only 5 out of 10 full time faculty members who were engaged in research wherein the university is expecting to have more than this figure. Therefore, employment status is not a strong factor but can still be considered to determine the research involvement of the teachers because the computed p-value of 0.079 is already closed to 0.05 level of significance. This signifies that both part-time and full-time faculty members can either contribute to the research production of the university or not.

The educational attainment of the faculty members is one of the bases of the amount of their Hourly rate but there are other factors included in the faculty classification which are not part anymore of the profile variable. The hourly rate is considered a factor that can possibly determine the research involvement of the faculty members as denoted by the computed p-value of .004 which is less than the 0.05 level of significance. There are more faculty members with hourly rate of P200-250 who are non-researchers but there are more researchers who belong to hourly rate with P251 and above. This signifies that the higher the hourly rate of the faculty, they have higher tendency in becoming faculty researchers also considering their educational qualification which is somehow related to their hourly rate.

B. Difference of Students' Evaluation on Teaching Between Researchers and Non-researchers

Faculty researchers (4.24) have significantly higher faculty performance rating in all areas of evaluation from students than non-researchers (4.10) as denoted by the computed p-value of 0.001 which is less than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. This signifies that the faculty researchers really perform better in delivering instruction and other academic related expertise to effectively transfer and share the knowledge and skills from one person to another.

The faculty researchers (4.25) obtain significantly higher teaching performance rating than non-researchers (4.10) on subject expertise specifically on stating clearly the objectives of the lesson, presenting ideas or concepts clearly and

relating subjects to other fields and life situation. Faculty researchers may have this characteristic of making clear the purpose of certain teaching and learning activity before starting doing it like what in research process of understanding the objectives to justify the most appropriate methodology and data analysis. Findings of related researches to the topic being discussed may also be shared by the teachers to relate the subject to the real life scenario. Faculty researchers may somehow adapt the same in delivering classroom instructions.

Classroom management including instruction may also be associated in any research activity because it is one of the attributes of researchers as being keen observer especially when it comes to students' behavior. Lattimer [9] found out that doing action research had helped the participants to gain greater ownership over their instructional practice in the classroom and they became more confident making instructional decisions and more independent in their lesson planning, implementation, and assessment process.

Meanwhile, understanding the individual differences of each member of the class can also be addressed through undertaking action research. Attendance and class performance can be considered as the results of the measures and assessment done inside or outside the classroom which can be utilized as important primary data for research. Uncovering the attitude of the students towards any school related factors may better explain their actions.

They obtained high performance in communication skills (4.19) with 4.27 for researchers and 4.11 for non-researchers followed by a total computed mean of 4.17 for subject expertise and instructional expertise while relational expertise obtained the least total score of 4.15. Communication skills of teachers either in oral or written should be demonstrated appropriately during the delivery of instruction. Expression of thoughts, ideas and suggestions related to the issues being discussed should always reach a certain level of expertise and professionalism.

Researchers have higher ability to identify the needs or problems of the students because it is one of the basic processes in conducting a research study. Determining what supposed to achieve is being identified first before giving anything to the receiver. Effective instruction would be supported by the result of diagnostic.

Everything happens in the classroom boils down to addressing the needs of the students. Therefore, being approachable and answerable to their needs and providing them their expectations would really demonstrate the relational expertise of the teachers. Being keen observant and sensitive to their needs would give numerous data and how to process them one by one would lead the faculty researcher to formulate research questions on how to address these effectively and efficiently. Faculty researchers who understand the problem are the teachers with longer patience.

Faculty Researchers have significantly higher teaching performance based on the students' evaluation for the last three years compared to the performance of non-researchers.

C. Predictor of Research Involvement from the Profile

Educational Attainment is considered a factor that affects the faculty members to be involved in the research activities of the university. If gender will also be considered as well as the age of the faculty members would increase the possibility of having engaged in the research undertakings. Those middle aged female master's degree holders have the higher tendency to get involved in research. The ability to write is closer to the characteristics of female than male; therefore, there are more female faculty members who were engaged into research writing than their male counterpart. Knowledge and experience in writing research is being developed during the completion of baccalaureate degrees but it is sometimes being enhanced in continuing advanced studies in the Graduate School and most of the teachers have already completed their master's degree during the middle age.

D. Predictor of Research Involvement from the Faculty Performance Evaluation

Instructional Expertise is considered as the best predictor of having possibility of becoming a researcher with combined diagnostic expertise. Knowing through assessing the existing or current knowledge of the students before providing any additional information would give the preliminary profile of a larger image of what still needs to be improved from the students. Giving them pretest and post test and analyzing the result after giving some sort of intervention measures based on the pretest to enhance the specific skills or expertise of the students is considered an action research which only needs to put into writing. Therefore, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the students through research would provide better understanding on their individual and group differences.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Faculty Researchers have significantly higher teaching performance based on the students' evaluation for the last three years compared to the performance of non-researchers. Female faculty members have significantly higher tendency of becoming researchers than males. Age, civil status and employment status were not factors that influence the faculty members to have an active research involvement. Faculty members with higher educational attainment at the same time with higher hourly rate have significantly higher possibility to be involved in research activities. Since research is an important part of the faculty performance evaluation, teachers who really maintain their position within the upper 25% in the Annual Top

Faculty Performer Award given by the university would pursue to accomplish researches before the evaluation period starts so that they would be given higher scores in the area of research while those teachers who wanted to be included in the reclassification to increase their hourly rate, they also tend to produce researches for them to be included in the upper 50% of the faculty performance evaluation. Some of them conduct researches for monetary reward after the completion of the research as honorarium and the chance to go abroad for research presentation.

However, those teachers who may not have any intention to be an awardee, to go abroad and be reclassified, they tend not to submit any research proposal given all the benefits provided for them by the university. Other factors may still hinder their participation like teaching work load, inadequate research writing skills, attitude or interest towards research. The orientation of research interests, however, is only the first step to becoming a researcher [6].

Teachers manage personal, workplace, and socio-cultural influences with their agency. With or without external support, teachers need to rely more on themselves to cultivate their research interest, seek professional advice and establish their own position in the academy by publishing their work [6].

The results of this study may serve as an eye-opener for faculty members who are not interested to adapt the research culture of the University. They may somehow realize the benefits and advantages of being Faculty Researcher and get involved in the research endeavors of the academic community. Male faculty members may be provided greater attention in making them interested to write research papers either for classroom use or institutional development. Bachelor's degree holders or the younger faculty members may do collaborative research to let them learn from faculty members with Master's degrees or those from the middle age group.

It is recommended that faculty members may provide necessary diagnostic test if applicable before to start giving lecture or demonstration just to determine the extent of knowledge they still need to obtain certain student outcomes. This is the initial step on gaining curiosity; learning how to identify the problems and finding solutions to make every student's life meaningful inside the classroom.

Faculty members may also be required to write books or instructional manuals as a form of research output. If they will be written their own material to be utilized in their own respective classes, mastery or the subject expertise may be fully achieved. Sending them to seminars and training workshop that would develop their skills in book or module writing may encourage them to contribute in the content of the manual to be developed in their respective discipline.

In the advent of K-12, most of the teachers from Higher Education Institutions may not be given enough teaching load compared to the previous years due to some general education subjects which will now be transferred to senior high school. This is a national dilemma of most General Education and even Professional Education Faculty members. They do not know definitely where to go but to teach in senior high school but they may not be given the same teaching rate. With that given scenario, faculty members may now have enough time due to lesser teaching load to conduct researches funded by the government or from any private agencies that provide research grants.

It is clear that strengthening the preparation of educational researchers in all fields is vital if meaningful empirical contributions to the collective knowledge of teaching and teacher education are to be made through research [10].

The findings also provide insights whether they wanted to enhance their performance and share some experiences of the research process to their students. The culture of research must start within the circle of Faculty Members before it proliferates down to the students. Research is one of the keys in achieving and sustaining excellence and quality in education. Therefore, there is no way but to adapt and make research as a way of life and a habit to contribute in the advancement of knowledge towards the achievement of the true essence of quality through continuous improvement.

The new evaluation instrument was proposed with the end view of increasing the awareness of the teachers that they will be evaluated not only based on their one-time big-time participation in research but even their little contribution and involvement related to research activity will be accounted for their evaluation. This is to concretize the areas of evaluation and defining other research related activities where the teachers might be involved that would help them improve their research performance.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Elton, "Research and teaching: conditions for a positive link," Teaching in higher education, *6*(1), 43-56, 2001.

[2] S. Borg, Y. D. Liu, "Chinese College English Teachers' Research Engagement," TESOL Quarterly, *47*(2), 270-299, 2013.

[3] H.W. Marsh, J. Hattie, "The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: Complementary, antagonistic, or independent constructs?," *Journal of Higher Education*, 603-641, 2002.

[4] J. Robertson, C. H. Bond, "Experiences of the relation between teaching and research: what do academics value?." *Higher Education Research and Development*, *20*(1), 5-19, 2001.

[5] J. H. Sandholtz, L. M. Shea, " Predicting performance a comparison of university supervisors' predictions and teacher candidates' scores on a teaching performance assessment." Journal of Teacher education, 63(1), 39-50, 2012.

[6] Y. Xu, "Becoming researchers: A narrative study of Chinese university EFL teachers' research practice and their professional identity construction. Language Teaching Research, 18(2), 242-259, 2014.

[7] J. Reid, N. Santoro, A. McMaugh, D. Saltmarsz, "Building and sustaining a research culture in teacher education", Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, (14 January

2010), url: http://www.informaworld.com , date retrieved: May 21, 2011.

[8] A. Favilla & S. Bloch, Women psychiatrists and research: so far, no further? An Australasian perspective on factors that encourage and hinder women psychiatrists' involvement in research. *Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry*, *38*(6), 470-476, 2004.

[9] H. Lattimer, "Action Research in Pre-service Teacher Education: Is There Value Added?" *ie: inquiry in education*, *3*(1), 5, 2012

[10] E. Lin, J. Wang, E. Spalding, C. L. Klecka, S. J. Odell, "Toward strengthening the preparation of teacher educator-researchers in doctoral programs and beyond," Journal of Teacher Education, 62(3), 239-245, 2011.

★★★