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Abstract

In view of the paucity of research in Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs), the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has provided policies and mandates that are largely geared towards the improvement of research productivity. The HEIs in the country have responded in varied ways to the call for a stronger research orientation among the universities. In this context, this paper aimed at understanding the prevailing research culture in Philippine HEIs, as viewed by the university faculty. A conceptual framework of research culture was developed in order to analyze the dynamics of the interaction of the policies and mandates of the CHED, the practices of HEIs in relation to developing a research orientation in their institutions, and the perspectives of faculty who are tasked to do research along with their other functions (i.e., teaching and community service). Forty faculty members from 14 universities and colleges in the country responded to a survey questionnaire and 10 were interviewed using open-ended questions. The study found that the faculty did not consider any of the aspects of research culture in their institutions as being strong. They deemed the following indicators of research culture as present only to a moderate extent: (a) the impact of research, (b) administrative practices, (c) inter-institutional collaboration, (d) institutional research strategy, (e) financial reward system, (f) infrastructure, (g) the presence of ethical policies, and (h) the availability of research funding. The faculty further perceive that factors necessary for improving research productivity include: time, strong belief in research endeavor, faculty involvement, positive group climate, working conditions and organizational communication, decentralized research policy, research funding, and clear institutional policy for research benefits and incentives. As a result of these findings, the study recommends that developing a research culture should take into account the dynamics of the interaction of the trifocal function of HEIs, the researcher’s mind, and the body of institutional policy.
Introduction

Universities in the developed world have a firm tradition of research. Recognizing research as an important part of their responsibilities, faculty members of higher education institutions (HEIs) have consistently evidenced research productivity together with other factors that contribute to the process. On the other hand, universities in the developing world have retained strong teaching functions and weak research functions (Sanyal & Varghese, 2006).

The Philippines is not an exemption to this. As observed by Bernardo (2003) in his study on the typology of HEIs in the Philippines, ‘only 15 out of 223 HEIs in the sample met the requirements for the graduate-capable HEI category, and only two HEIs met the criteria for doctoral/research university categories.’ This shows that majority of the HEIs are teaching institutions.

In light of this reality, the Philippine Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has been zealously pushing for a stronger research orientation among the HEIs. Its National Higher Education Research Agenda (NHERA), formulated in 1996, articulates goals of higher education research as well as the mechanics and concrete steps for achieving these goals. CHED has likewise established 12 Zonal Research Centers (ZRC) in the country to further promote and encourage research in the 1,605 public and private HEIs.

A study on the status of research in these institutions showed a low turnout (13,859 research reports submitted to the ZRCs from 1996-2001). Among these studies, those conducted by individuals (72%) far exceeded collaborative and institutional research. About 69% of these individual studies were done by graduate students (master’s and doctoral) as part of their degree requirements (Vicencio, Bualat, et.al, as cited in Salazar-Clemeña, 2006). Considering that CHED (2000) reported having funded only 16 research projects with a total approved budget of about PHP9million, it can be inferred that much of the research conducted were not dependent on the miniscule grants available from CHED.

Despite the CHED initiatives, therefore, the current state of higher education research in the Philippines leaves much to be desired in terms of quantity, quality, thrusts, and contribution to national development (Salazar-Clemeña, 2006).

It must be noted, however, that Philippine HEIs manifest varied research capabilities, a diversity that can be explained by differences in university type, faculty profile, as well university locale. This diversity notwithstanding, the ability to respond to the call to develop research-oriented institutions of higher learning is also dependent on the HEIs’ human capital. The minimal involvement of faculty in research activities, as reflected in the figures cited above, can be attributed to the lack of firm training from graduate studies that would make them consistent producers of research. This may be due to the fact that many HEIs in the country are formerly secondary schools that have been upgraded to tertiary level, thus largely focusing on sustaining the teaching function. Among the 34% of the faculty who are graduate degree holders (CHED, 1997), few have done research beyond their master’s theses or doctoral dissertations. This implies that the graduate degree papers ‘were one-shot short-term projects that did not build on earlier findings or lead to further investigations’ (Salazar-Clemeña, 2006).

Because faculty members are expected to be the primary producers of research in a university, it would be useful to discover their perceptions of the institution’s efforts to enhance research productivity as well as of their own ability to meet the expectations of their institution. Their voices must be heard as they contribute to the dialectic of research culture. To what extent do they accept and adopt research as an integral part of their functions? What is the existing
research culture in their institutions and how do they themselves contribute to the development of such a culture? From their standpoint, how does the prevailing research culture in their respective universities contribute to research productivity? This paper therefore focuses on understanding the research culture from the perspective of faculty in selected HEIs in the Philippines.

The Functions of University Faculty

The work of the faculty in higher education institutions has traditionally been trifocal, consisting of teaching, research and community service/extension. University faculty members are required to become teachers, researchers, and service-oriented professionals. This traditional trinity is expected to operate in relation to the specific goals and mission of the college or university. The strategic directions of the institutions influence the level of concentration on each task to be given by faculty members. Moreover, each institution develops criteria to assess the extent to which a faculty member is an efficient teacher, productive researcher, and active university citizen. The challenge is in maintaining the trinity in sustaining one’s academic career. It is undeniable that faculty discretion is exercised within the three functions, but the questions of compliance and productivity become the heart and soul in understanding the academic profession. Literature largely focuses on the teaching and research nexus in exploring faculty functions, productivity, and university academic culture (e.g. Fairweather, 1999; Tierney, 1999; Layzell, 1999; Shanklin, 2001). Fewer studies have been done, however, on examining the research culture and the issues within certain educational contexts that advance or inhibit research productivity, particularly from the perspective of the faculty.

The Problem

With the aim of understanding the research culture in Philippine HEIs and how this affects research productivity of the faculty, this paper sought to find out what research means for teachers in these institutions. In this light, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

- How do the faculty members view the prevailing research culture in their respective institutions?
- What characteristics of research culture do they perceive as contributing to research productivity?

Responses to these questions could lead to implications for policy-making concerning the development of research institutions in the Philippines.

Research Culture: Operational Construct

Studies on research culture have focused on the kind of environment that leads to research productivity among faculty members in HEIs. Bland and Ruffin (as cited in Pratt, Margaritis, & Coy, 1999) identified 12 factors present in high performing research environments. These are: clear goals for coordination, research emphasis, distinctive culture, positive group climate, decentralized organization, participative governance, frequent communication, resources (particularly human resources), group age, size and diversity, appropriate rewards, recruitment emphasis, and leadership with both research skill and management practice. On the other hand,
DeHaven, Wilson, and O’Connor-Kettlestrings (1998) identified unanimous and extremely important characteristics of successful research environments in family medicine residency training programs. The unanimous characteristics are: program director support, time, faculty involvement, didactic curriculum/journal club, professional support and guidance, forum/opportunities for presenting. The extremely important characteristics include: early start, integrative curriculum, required projects, broad research definition, visibility, and research committee. Dundar and Lewis (1998) found that individual attributes, institutional and departmental attributes, as well as departmental culture and working conditions affect research productivity. Additional indicators of research culture, derived from the broad criteria evident in CHED’s NHERA, are: research agenda, policies and guidelines on research incentives, services and facilities for research, publications, and research capable faculty.

This study operates on the assumption that attitudes and values concerning research within the institutional and organizational levels affect research productivity. Moreover, the indicators of a supportive research environment from the sources cited above are adopted as the operational construct of research culture in this study. These indicators are explained below.

**Institutional research policies and agenda.** This includes the presence of research agenda based on the institution’s philosophy, goals, mission and vision, as well as its research emphasis and strategies for supporting and promoting research.

**Departmental culture and working conditions.** This refers to departmental research programs and strategies designed to encourage and sustain research productivity among the faculty (full time and part-time) and graduate students. This also includes development and maintenance of a distinctive culture, positive group climate, decentralized organization, participative governance, and frequent communication that would enhance research among faculty members. Further, it involves human resource development in terms of providing training in and exposure to research in order to build research capacity among the faculty. Criteria for recruitment of faculty that would contribute to the aim and thrust of the department are taken into consideration here.

**Budget for research.** This pertains to the funds allotted by the institution for research. This also takes into account the ability of the institution and its departments to tap external sources (e.g., international donor agencies, non-profit organizations, industry) and obtain research grants.

**Infrastructure.** This includes the provision of a research unit, adequate research services, and facilities in different disciplines for the conduct of research.

**Collaboration with and access to research professionals in other institutions.** This refers to the ability to provide means for linkages with other institutions, local or international, in order to create intellectual synergy.

**Policies and guidelines on research benefits and incentives.** This pertains to rules and procedures on the granting of financial and non-financial (e.g., professional recognition) rewards for research.

**Research committee.** This refers to the research monitoring body that screens the types of research conducted and looks into ethical dilemmas involved, especially in sensitive fields.

**Publications.** This consists of the quality and quantity of research produced by the faculty members. This is evident in the number of published researches in local and international journals, awards attained by faculty, and patents, among others.
The Proposed Framework

Research Culture is concerned with the dynamics of the interrelationships among three domains (See Figure 1). **Domain 1**, the Trifocal Function, comprises the university faculty’s trifocal task of Teaching, Research, and Community Service or Extension. These tasks interact in different ways for each faculty member. **Domain 2**, the Individual Attributes and Output, refers to the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that the faculty members possess relative to the conduct of research. This also includes their readiness, capacity, and experience as regards research. **Domain 3**, the Institutional Attributes and Policies, refers to the policies set by the institution for the purpose of developing a research orientation. This includes all other policies and measures concerning faculty members of the entire institution.

Research culture involves the interaction between Domain 1 and Domain 2. Although a balance among the three tasks in Domain 1 would be ideal, the nature and extent to which faculty members focus on each task depends on their discretion, which is influenced by their own perception of these tasks. Their output in Domain 2, on the other hand, is based on their knowledge about producing research. This also interacts with the way they view the trifocal function—Domain 1—and the issues that they address in their research activities. Thus there is an interaction between Domain 1 and Domain 2.
Research culture is also concerned with the interaction operating between Domain 2 and Domain 3, which involves reciprocal processes. Domain 3 influences the nature and extent of research productivity in Domain 2. The reality in Domain 2 must pave the way for the improvement or changes in Domain 3. The research activities resulting from Domain 2 develop knowledge that would provide context for Domain 3.

A double dynamism is involved in understanding research culture. The interaction between Domain 1 and Domain 2 implies the frame of meaning derived by the faculty members from their trifocal function. The interaction between Domain 2 and Domain 3, on the other hand, implies a second frame of meaning constructed by the faculty members as they view the institutional policies and assimilate their research function. These frames of meanings occur in the interaction between Domain 1 and Domain 3 as well. As represented by the double-headed arrows, the faculty members’ research knowledge and skills as well as their performance of their trifocal task should also influence institutional policies, in the same way that institutional policies affect the other two domains.

It should be noted that the CHED plays a level of influence in policy formulation at the institutional level. The interpretation of CHED directives is based, however, on the context of the institution. As represented by the dotted line, policies, mandates, and principles are open to interpretation, which is done both for the interest of the institution and of its major players—the faculty members.

Method

Forty faculty members from 14 universities and colleges, both public and private, with representations from the three biggest island groups of the Philippines, accomplished a questionnaire. Ten additional respondents from 10 universities were interviewed using open-ended questions.

Item and categorical means were computed for the fixed-response survey questionnaire, which asked the participants to rate their extent of agreement or disagreement to 25 statements reflecting indicators of research culture. The rationale behind this was to be able to identify what the faculty might consider as weak and strong aspects of research culture in the Philippine HEIs. Responses to the open-ended questions were content analyzed within the framework and operational construct of the study.

Results and Discussion

The questionnaire data revealed that the faculty members did not consider any of the aspects of research culture in their institutions as being strong. They deemed the following indicators as present only to a moderate extent: (a) the impact of research, (b) administrative practices, (c) inter-institutional collaboration, (d) institutional research strategy, (e) financial reward system, (f) infrastructure, (g) the presence of ethical policies, and (h) the availability of research funding. The survey participants clearly acknowledged the high importance their institutions give to research and the influence of research on the promotion and marketing of any institution. They further showed awareness of the provision of different types of administrative support and encouragement to faculty for research. It must be noted, however, that about 62% of the respondents replied “Do not know” to the statement on administrative encouragement of faculty research. They likewise concurred that institutional strategies and plans were in place for the
managing and development of research-related activities as well as for improving prospects for inter-institutional collaboration. They were also cognizant of the existence of an institutional office that handles research concerns. To a lesser extent, the faculty acknowledged the provision of research incentives and other types of rewards to celebrate research achievement, libraries, laboratories, and other research facilities.

The specific facets of research culture that the faculty members found present but least evident among the indicators were: (a) faculty publications in international journals, (b) large percentage of funding allotted to research-related activities, (c) faculty awareness of available funding for research, (d) research training for faculty, (e) focus on the different types of research, and (f) provisions for researcher’s accountability. The fact that some 25% of the interviewees admitted not knowing about the last three indicators further reinforces the view that these are not clearly discernible in the universities. While observing that there are faculty members engaged in research collaboration with colleagues in other universities (with 25% unable to respond to this statement), the respondents did state, too, that faculty members themselves could take the initiative to know more about research and to actually do research. The overall sentiments of the survey participants can be summed up in one respondent’s comment: ‘There is a desire to develop a culture of research in the institution. However, we are still in the process of strengthening the programs we have at this time.’

The in-depth interviews, on the other hand, showed that research culture is influenced by two sets of faculty. First is the “pro research” faculty who contribute to productivity. Second are those who are ambivalent towards the research endeavor yet may be willing to be involved if properly oriented and supported. From these two sets of faculty emerged common characteristics of a research culture that would, in their perception, enhance research productivity in Philippine HEIs. These are: time, strong belief in research endeavor, faculty involvement, positive group climate, working conditions and organizational communication, decentralized research policy, research funding, and clear institutional policies about research benefits and incentives.

Dynamics of Research Culture

Domain 1 (Trifocal Function) and Domain 2 (Individual Attributes and Output). The study participants understand the trifocal function of university faculty, namely, teaching, research, and community service/extension. Many of them consider teaching as their main task whereas research is only an add-on activity. Teaching occupies most of their time in their respective colleges or universities; consequently, there is not enough time for the conduct of research. One stated that committee work (an aspect of community service/extension function) also serves as a hurdle in doing research. Time is therefore considered as a factor that affects research activity. Maintaining a balance among the three functions is obviously impossible. Identifying one’s priority and passion would determine the time that one would allot to every function. The fact that the teachers interviewed give more time to teaching only proves that teaching is the priority for many university faculty. Moreover, they believe that not all teachers have a passion for research: there are teachers who are meant for teaching alone and there are those who are meant for research. Respondents claim that good researchers are not necessarily good teachers and vice versa. Parallel to this, research is not deemed necessary in order to become an excellent teacher. One may be excellent in teaching in the absence of research activity. In this case, time that is supposedly spent for research is allotted instead to teaching preparation and development of teaching materials. This assertion shows that the pairing of teaching and research is dysfunctional, since one distracts the other. From the perspective of
these university faculty, therefore, the ‘teaching/learning-research nexus’ ideal becomes problematic.

The interviews also indicated that many faculty members are generally not comfortable doing research. Some describe it as cumbersome, a difficult task, and a constant exposure to scrutiny and pressure. Although many of them have a graduate degree, they believe that they do not have sufficient training in research and therefore lack confidence to pursue further research. They consider their master’s thesis as their only research output so far.

Although the university faculty members recognize their trifocal function (Domain 1), the reality of research productivity is dependent on the amount of training, which influences their level of confidence in doing research. Understanding Domain 1 is simply not enough for one to become productive in research. A weak belief in the importance of research certainly affects productivity and the trifocal function in general. The active researchers among the faculty interviewees disclosed that their involvement in research had sometimes reached a point when they began neglecting other functions. They admitted that there are instances wherein they lack time to prepare for their classes. Teaching, to a certain extent, suffers due to involvement in research. This shows that good researchers may not necessarily be good teachers, contrary to the claim that research enhances teaching. One respondent stated that research could enhance teaching if and only if the topic is relevant to the subject matter. The research conducted and the subject being taught must be related so as to enhance learning. This once again challenges the teaching-research nexus concept and suggests disciplinary differences in the pattern of relationships between these two.

The observed disjunction of teaching and research from the perspective of the university faculty may partly be a consequence of the historical development of many private and state colleges and universities in the Philippines, most of which were established as teaching rather than research institutions (Gonzalez, 2006).

**Domain 2 (Individual Attributes and Output) and Domain 3 (Institutional Attributes and Policies).** The interview respondents revealed that they appreciate the value of research in the teaching profession. Faculty from private universities emphasized that the policies in their universities pertaining to criteria for faculty promotion are very clear. The quality and quantity of research that they produce are given appropriate merit and have a bearing in their promotion. It is evident that there are research incentives to sustain research productivity in these private universities. On the other hand, for those in public universities, wherein promotion is dependent on available funding from the government, research is not necessarily an incentive for promotion. Nevertheless, research outputs have corresponding external incentives, no matter how minimal. On top of these are the intrinsic research rewards (e.g., opportunity for intellectual synergy, professional growth, and professional recognition) that influence research productivity among faculty members in public universities.

Research funding among universities and colleges varies. Many expressed the difficulty of getting research funding and support for paper presentations especially for international conferences. For those who work in well-endowed universities, funding support is not a problem. There are also a few resourceful respondents who tap external funding directly. The shortage of university funds for research purposes may be explained by the fact that most of the private HEIs in the country depend largely on students’ tuition fees as their source of income. The public HEIs (about 11% of the 1,605 institutions), on the other hand, rely mainly on government subsidy, which continues to decrease as more public universities are established (Salazar-Clemeña, 2006). Considering that much of the operations budget of schools (90% and
Respondents who are active producers of research revealed that the graduate training program they had attended enhanced their productivity. They emphasized that being trained in research universities abroad contributed a lot to their success in research. The attitude of being independent, “be on your own, create your own project” was seen as crucial. One pointed out that, as a homegrown academic, serving as research assistant and pursuing his passion have directed his research path.

Domain 1 (Trifocal Function) and Domain 3 (Institutional Policies and Attributes). Respondents acknowledged that research is given emphasis by their respective institutions. One concrete proof of this is the policy of allowing the reduction of the teaching load when one has an approved research project, with the number of units of deloading commensurate to the nature and scope of the project.

Respondents commented that what they see as a weakness of the institutional policies is the lack of provision for means to develop working conditions and environment that enhance research. Although they believe that their institutions have adequate provisions for research facilities, they see the need, particularly at the departmental level, for leadership and management programs that would promote research skills. They propose a kind of governance that is decentralized in order to respond better to the research capacity of faculty members. A positive group environment, good coordination, and communication among novice and expert researchers are necessary. They further point out the need to foster unity towards clear goals instead of maintaining the \textit{kanya-kanya} (to each his/her own) system. There should be a means to reach out to those who are less knowledgeable in research. Faculty involvement in the real sense of the word must be developed.

Commission on Higher Education (CHED). Majority of the respondents consider the indirect influence of CHED on their research endeavor. If CHED has to affect research among faculty, however, it has to pass through the institutional level first. The faculty members are aware of the research incentives offered by CHED, but they do not show much interest in availing themselves of these. They also believe that whatever policies are created by CHED have to be translated into institutional policies in order for these to become germane to the faculty members.

Research Culture: Policy Implications

The perspectives of the faculty on the prevailing research culture in their respective universities provide implications for research policies. Development of a research culture cannot take place overnight. It entails careful planning and constant process of development. From the point of view of university faculty, the necessary components of a research culture that would enhance research productivity are: (a) time, (b) strong belief in the research endeavor, (c) faculty involvement, (d) positive group climate, working condition and organizational communication (e) faculty development program, (f) research infrastructure, (g) decentralized research policy, (h) research funding, and (i) clear institutional policy for research benefits and incentives. These can be classified into the elements of the framework proposed in this paper.

Domain 1 (Trifocal Function). The first of these components, \textit{time}, has to do with the trifocal task of university faculty. Lack of time is an obstacle to research. Strategies for addressing the time problem must therefore be planned and evaluated. Deloading for research...
activities is usually provided for full time faculty. A range of strategies is needed in order to encourage not only the full time faculty but also the part-time faculty; not only the full professors but those from the lower ranks as well, to spend more time on research. Strategies should also address the nature of research being done by the faculty in order to distribute the workload. For instance, provisions for research assistants or junior researchers can be made. The faculty should likewise observe proper time management, to enable them to allocate their time appropriately among their three functions. Moreover, institutions could look into the percentage of workloads assigned in teaching, research, and community service.

Domain 2 (Individual Attributes and Output). The second recommended component, strong belief in the research endeavor, is an important attribute to develop. Because many faculty members are focused on teaching and consider themselves as teaching faculty, there must be strategies to address their belief in the research endeavor. Not all universities have clear and definite policies that would lead to the transformation of the set of beliefs among the faculty. Motivational factors and situational contingencies must be considered to change the belief of these faculty members towards research. Efforts must be made to enhance the faculty’s understanding of the importance of research beyond the assumed or presumed importance as articulated in the existing institutional policies. The role and importance of research in relation to other HEIs functions must be explicit in the policies and concretely understood by faculty. This also involves role modeling. For more teachers to see the value of research, the senior faculty should translate their productivity into a form of encouragement to others to pursue research.

Domain 2 (Individual Attributes and Output) and Domain 3 (Institutional Attributes and Policies). The third suggested research culture indicator, Faculty involvement, straddles Domains 2 and 3. Many of the faculty members are not doing research due to a lack of confidence in their research capabilities. Appropriate policies are needed to reach out to the novice faculty in order for them to be involved in research. Mentoring is seen as essential for faculty involvement. The administration must provide opportunities for junior faculty to work together with expert researchers. The kanya-kanya (to each his/her own) syndrome must be eliminated, initially at the department level. Prospects for collaborative research projects must be provided.

Domain 3 (Institutional Attributes and Policies). Four important elements of a research culture, from the perspective of the faculty, may be classified under Domain 3. These are: Positive group climate, working condition and organizational communication; Faculty development program; Decentralized research policy; and Research Infrastructure. To create a positive group climate, research must be presented as a requirement to the faculty in non-intimidating ways. Expectations for research should be made clear to faculty aspirants, initially at the department level. Research should be broadly defined on the basis of the identified departmental research thrusts and priorities. Standards for research must be expressed explicitly. Successful research activities and individual research projects should be tracked and publicized in order to serve as motivation to every constituent. Such initiatives could provide a sense of motivation both for the researchers themselves and others who are not involved in research. An environment of “intellectual synergy” (Shanklin, 2001) can then be created.

Providing appropriate research training for the faculty is absolutely necessary. The enhancement of research capacity among faculty members should be an essential part of the faculty development program. Human resource development focusing on the needs of junior faculty and novice researchers is vital in enhancing research productivity.
There is likewise a need for strong leadership that supports research within the department. The department should interpret and implement institutional policies that are appropriate to the kind and level of the faculty members’ research capability. The creation of a distinct departmental research culture should evolve. Having some decentralized policies on research, in addition to institutional policies, could be empowering.

Continuous development, updating, and advancement of facilities for research are important in the development of a research culture. Although respondents considered research infrastructure in their universities (e.g., libraries, laboratories) as sufficient, they may not be aware of the sophistication of research infrastructure of some research extensive and intensive universities.

**Domain 3 and CHED.** The component of Research funding involves both the institution and the Commission on Higher Education. Enhancing and supporting research productivity necessitates allotment of funds. For example, apart from funding research projects, supporting paper presentations in international conferences would demonstrate to the faculty that what they have produced is valuable. Appropriate linkages with external funding agencies should be pursued more actively. Because only a few institutions in the country have access to sufficient funding for research, the CHED should plan strategic ways of offering financial assistance or grants for individual and institutional research projects.

Clear policies for research benefits and incentives also concern both the institution and CHED. Given the low salaries for faculty in majority of the HEIs in the country, providing adequate incentives becomes crucial in sustaining and enhancing research productivity. Institutions should strengthen research benefits and incentives that could serve as motivational factors for doing research. A well-defined body of policies that demonstrates the relevance of research to professional advancement and growth is needed. Universities should align their graduate programs with the thrust of developing research institutions in order to produce research capable graduates. Early exposure to research (e.g., publishing academic works, presenting in conferences) must be provided. Particularly in the faculty of education, the goal should be clear in developing not only teaching teachers but teaching researchers as well. Moreover, the CHED should review its guidelines for granting benefits and incentives to researchers, so as to have a stronger impact.

**Concluding Statements**

The policies on research in the Philippine HEIs, as initiated by CHED through the National Higher Education Research Agenda, need to be bolstered by measures and strategies to eliminate the common idea that research is only an ‘additional’ rather than an integral function of HEIs. Universities and colleges that are serious in transforming themselves into research institutions have to look at the elements of research culture that contribute to research productivity, as viewed by the faculty members themselves. The results of this study are surely not a panacea to the state of research productivity in Philippine HEIs, but it is hoped that they point a direction to tap strengths, identify weaknesses, explore opportunities, and eliminate the threats to the development of a research culture.

On the other hand, it may be useful to evaluate whether all colleges and universities in the country should be transformed into research-intensive institutions of higher learning. Considering the historical traditions of HEIs in the country, most of which were created as teaching institutions, and the tremendous resources needed to develop a research culture, it may
well be imperative for the Commission on Higher Education and the leaders of colleges and universities to determine the appropriateness of emphasizing a uniform research orientation among all HEIs. At the very least, different ways of building and strengthening the teaching/learning-research nexus could be explored for different types of HEIs—from teaching-only universities on one end to research-intensive universities on the other. This may mean being guided by Boyer’s (1990; Glasick et al., 1997) expanded notion of scholarship, which challenges traditional concepts of teaching and research.
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