



RESEARCH CAPABILITY AND ITS INFLUENCE ON TEACHERS' INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE

RUFO MARTINIANO F. SANTOS, MAEd-EM

Teacher III

Virginia Ramirez Cruz-National High School

rufomartiniano.santos@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

The main concern of the study was to assess the influence of the research capability on the instructional performance of secondary school teachers in a public vocational high school in Guiguinto, Bulacan during the First Semester of School Year 2019-2020. Results of the regression analysis revealed that research capability in terms of capacity, training, support/assistance, and environment contribute to the instructional performance of the junior and senior teachers but not to a significant extent as evidenced by the Beta coefficients of .087, .375, -.034, and .018 respectively with p-values less than the .05 alpha. Though insignificant, the B coefficient values signify that in every unit increase in the employment of research capability in terms of capacity, support/assistance, and environment will mean .778, 5.823, -1.208, and .611 respective increase in the instructional performance of the respondents. However, the obtained F-ratio of 7.499 is found significant since the associated probability of .000 is less than .05 alpha. The results suggest that the particular variables jointly influence the instructional performance to a significant extent. Thus, the study rejected the null hypothesis which states that research capability does not exert significant influence on the instructional performance of the teachers.

Keywords: *Research Capability, Teacher's Instructional Performance*

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Introduction

Teaching has been the primary function of higher education institutions since their emergence in the medieval era, and the research function was proposed by the German model in the early 1800s in the hope of integration of teaching and research in Berlin University, academics have believed that research and teaching produce synergy when both are integrated in a university. Conversely, the belief of research integration in the higher educational institution has been challenged by empirical research showing a weak or negligible relationship between teaching and research. Faculty research productivity is a key component to the mission of universities around the world with the aim of being at par with other colleges and universities around the world. In large part, faculty members are hired and promoted because of their expertise and potential for knowledge production (Webber, 2012).

On research productivity, Quimbo (2014) believed that there is a difference in productivity, yet do not have adequate information on how much of the difference is due to individual or institutional characteristics. However, the teaching-research relationship has remained a controversial issue in higher education research and policy practice. Tensions around combining research and teaching tasks affect not only the profile of universities but also the task portfolio of individual academics. A recent international study on the academic profession Changing Academic Profession (CAP) demonstrates a clear trend towards a research-centered task definition at the expense of teaching-centered or a balanced research-teaching model. In many countries, there is an increasing tendency to use research grants to avoid teaching tasks. Major multi-year research grants free academics from most or all teaching.

Furthermore, an increasing proportion of adjunct staff in several countries means that teaching tasks may get 'contracted out' and such positions rarely include a research component. On the other hand, it is increasingly difficult to retain an academic position without some research output, which means that the majority of academics nowadays have both teaching and research in their portfolio indeed.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



There is broad recognition that faculty members represent one of the most important elements of research capacity for an institution and that university policies, practices, and resources greatly shape the productivity of researchers. The importance placed on higher education within public policy in relation to social and economic development has continued to increase over time. Universities and colleges are now positioned as key institutions that provide the highly educated/skilled human resources required for a rapidly changing economy.

The study aimed to assess the research capability of the teachers and its significant influence on their instructional performance. Also, it provided a detailed description of the strengths and weaknesses of teachers in public schools in conducting scholarly researches.

At the same time, the study described the present level of the research capability of the teachers and the extent of the research conducted towards creating significant changes in their teaching practices.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the method and techniques, population and sample of the study, an instrument of the study, and the data processing and statistical treatment that were applied in the conduct of the study.

Method and Techniques Used

This study utilized the descriptive correlation type of research because it is concerned with the description of the present situation, current practices, characteristics of individuals, as well as their behavioral patterns, attitudes, and opinions. Specifically, this study assessed the research capability and its influence on the instructional performance of the teachers. The direction of the effect of the independent variable to the dependent variable was described using this approach. The Research Capability Instrument designed by Nuqui & Cruz (2012), which was used in the study of Valdez (2018) on research capabilities, was used as a primary data-gathering tool.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Respondents of the Study

The respondents of this study were the Secondary School teachers of a national vocational high school in Guiguinto, Bulacan. Universal sampling was used in this study wherein the researcher included all the junior and senior high school teachers of the public vocational high school during the First Semester of School Year 2019-2020. The distribution of the respondents is summarized in Table 1.

It can be seen from Table 1 that the respondents of the study were one hundred seventy-three (173) secondary school teachers selected through universal sampling from the total population/faculty members of the public vocational high school located in Guiguinto, Bulacan during the First Semester of School Year 2019-2020.

Table 1

Respondents of the Study

Respondents	Population
Administrators/Head Teachers	18
Master Teachers	14
Teacher III	38
Teacher II	9
Teacher I	94
Total	173

Instruments of the Study

This study utilized a standardized instrument in assessing the research capability of the secondary school's teachers in a public vocational high school. The standardized instrument on Research Capability with a reliability index of .80 designed by Nuqui & Cruz (2012) as utilized in Valdez (2018) was used in the study. The research instrument is divided into four parts: Research Capacity, Research Training, Research Support / Assistance and Research Environment.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



This was used in determining whether or not the two variables are correlated, which means to study whether an increase or decrease in one variable corresponds to an increase or decrease in the other variable. Teachers' research capability was assessed in terms of their responses to the indicators on research capacity, research training, research support/assistance, and research environment. On the other hand, a documentary analysis of the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) was done to present the instructional performance of the teachers.

Data Gathering Procedure

The mode of data gathering was the questionnaire method. Each of the respondents was given a structured set of questions. In gathering the data, the researcher carried out the following procedure:

1. A letter was sent to the District Superintendent to ask permission in the conduct of the proposed study.
2. With the approval of the District Superintendent, the researcher distributed the questionnaire to the respondents personally.
3. The researcher collected the questionnaires from the respondents and checked whether all the questions were answered.

Data Processing and Statistical Treatment

The data collected were tabulated and processed using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings were presented using the necessary tables and figures. In order to analyze and interpret the data gathered, the following statistical measures were used:

- The independent variable, research capability, was quantified and described using the rating scale, range of scoring, and descriptors suggested in the instruments.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Rating Scale	Range	Interpretation
5	4.50 – 5.00	Very High
4	3.50 – 4.49	High
3	2.50 – 3.49	Neither High or Low
2	1.50 – 2.49	Low
1	1.00 – 1.49	Very Low

- The dependent variable, instructional performance, was quantified and described using the rating scale, range of scores, and descriptions contained in the succeeding table.

Rating Scale	Range	Interpretation
5	4.50-5.00	Outstanding
4	3.50-4.49	Very Satisfactory
3	2.50-3.49	Satisfactory
2	1.50-2.49	Unsatisfactory
1	Below-1.49	Poor

- Regression Analysis was used in assessing the influence of the research capability on the instructional performance of teachers.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents analyses and interprets the data collected in the study. For an organized presentation and consistent discussion, the data are presented following the order or sequence of the questions raised in Chapter 1, to wit: (1) the research capability of the respondents; (2) the instructional performance of the teacher-respondents; (3) the influence of research capability on instructional performance; and (4) the educational management implications drawn based from the findings of the study.

The Research Capability of the Respondents

The research capability of the respondents was described based on the following indicators: research capacity, research training, research support/assistance, and research environment.

Research Capacity. Table 2 shows the research capability of the respondents based on their research capacity. The same table reveals the *great extent* of the research capability of the respondents based on the research capacity. Specifically, the teachers showed the *great extent* of research capacity on advancing faculty members' educational experience and background on four (4) indicators such as the institution's encouragement of the faculty members to become active members in research/professional organization (4.0); the institution's requirement of research appropriateness of major field of specialization (4.0); the institutional support/motivation on the faculty members to publish their research outputs (4.0); and the institution's promotion of consistency in demonstrating professional integrity (4.0). Also, The teachers showed the *moderate extent* of research capability based on their research capacity based on the following indicators: sending faculty members to seminars, workshops, conferences on research (3.0); dissemination of current researches and literature specific to the researcher's field (3.0); and encouragement of the faculty members to seek reviews of current professional literature (3.0).

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 2

Research Capability of the Respondents Based on Research Capacity

Advancing faculty members' educational experience and background	Mean	Interpretation
1. The faculty members were sent to seminars, workshops, conferences on research.	3.0	Moderate Extent
2. The faculty members were encouraged to become active members of a research/professional organization.	4.0	Great Extent
3. Research appropriateness of major fields of specialization was required by the institution.	4.0	Great Extent
4. Faculty members were supported/motivated to publish their research outputs.	4.0	Great Extent
5. Current researches and literature specific to the researcher's field were disseminated by the institution.	3.0	Moderate Extent
6. The faculty members were encouraged to seek reviews of current professional literature by the institution.	3.0	Moderate Extent
7. The institution promotes consistency in demonstrating professional integrity.	4.0	Great Extent
Average	3.57	Great Extent

Research Training. Table 3 shows the research capability of the respondents based on their research training. The same table reveals the *moderate extent* of the teachers' research training, as shown by an average score of 3.29. Specifically, the teachers showed the *great extent* of their research training; familiarity with standards, format and technical research writing style, including working knowledge of statistics (4.0); organization (4.0); correction of choice of words and organization of ideas (3.5); alertness/enthusiasm (4.0); professional in his dealings (4.0); regularity in monitoring his own progress (4.0); willingness to go out on his way when needed (4.0); and promptness with scheduled meetings (4.0).

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 3

Research Capability of the Respondents Based on Research Training

Uplifting Researchers' Cognitive Competencies, Technical Skill, and Activating Characteristics	Mean	Interpretation
A. The institution makes a provision for improving researcher's cognitive competencies manifested by the researcher's:		
1. Functional knowledge of the research process.	3.0	Moderate Extent
2. Knowledge of area of the research content.	3.0	Moderate Extent
3. Knowledge of methodologies.	3.0	Moderate Extent
4. Working knowledge of statistics.	4.0	Great Extent
5. Knowledge of existing literature on the problem.	3.0	Moderate Extent
6. Awareness of current literature in his field.	3.0	Moderate Extent
7. Knowledge of resources supportive of a. Research linkages	3.0	Moderate Extent
b. Scholarship of thesis	3.0	Moderate Extent
B. The institution hones the researcher's technical skill, as evidenced by the researcher's.		
1. Familiarity with the use and resources of the library.	3.0	Moderate Extent
2. Familiarity with standards, format and technical writing style, including a. Organization	4.0	Great Extent
b. Documentation	3.0	Moderate Extent
c. Style of Writing	3.0	Moderate Extent
3. Corrections of choice of words and organization of ideas.	3.5	Great Extent
4. Skill in statistical design appropriate to the problem.	3.0	Moderate Extent
5. Clarity of computational aspect of the problem.	3.0	Moderate Extent

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



6. Knowledge in the use of research design, techniques, and measuring devices. 3.0 Moderate Extent

C. The institution develops the researcher's activating characteristics, as shown by the researcher's:

- 1. Patience and perseverance. 3.0 Moderate Extent
- 2. Real concern. 3.0 Moderate Extent
- 3. Intellectual honesty. 3.0 Moderate Extent
- 4. Commitment to the scholarship. 3.0 Moderate Extent
- 5. Alertness/enthusiasm. 4.0 Great Extent
- 6. Professional in his dealings. 4.0 Great Extent
- 7. Constructiveness of his criticism 3.0 Moderate Extent
- 8. Regularity in monitoring his own progress. 4.0 Great Extent
- 9. Willing to go out of his way when needed. 4.0 Great Extent
- 10. The promptness with scheduled meetings. 4.0 Great Extent

Average 3.29 Moderate Extent

Also, the teachers showed a *moderate extent* (3.29) of research capability on all other indicators of the research training, such as:

- functional knowledge of the research process;
- knowledge of the area of the research content;
- knowledge of methodologies;
- knowledge of existing literature of the problem;
- awareness of current literature in his field;
- knowledge of resources supportive of research linkages;
- knowledge of resources supportive of the scholarship of the thesis;
- familiarity with the use and resources of the library;

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- familiarity with standards, format, and technical writing style including the style of writing;
- skill in statistical design appropriate to the problem;
- clarity of computational aspect of the problem;
- knowledge in the use of research design, techniques, and measuring devices;
- patience and perseverance;
- real concern;
- intellectual honesty;
- commitment to the scholarship; and
- constructiveness of his criticism?

Research Support/Assistance. Table 4 shows the *moderate extent* of the research capability of the respondents based on their research support/assistance as shown by the average score of 3.00. The same table reveals a *moderate extent* on all indicators of research capability based on research support/assistance from research conceptualization, data gathering, data analysis and interpretation, preparation of the research report, and other assistance.

Table 4

Research Capability of the Respondents Based on Research Support/Assistance

A. Research Conceptualization	Mean	Interpretation
1. Care is going over the research title, major and specific problems, theoretical and conceptual frameworks, and methodology of the study submitted by the researcher.	3.0	Moderate Extent
2. Assistance to the researcher in the improvement of the research paper.	3.0	Moderate Extent
3. Planning the time table of the research study with the researcher.	3.0	Moderate Extent

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



B. Data Gathering

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------|
| 1. Monitoring and supervising of data gathering procedure / actual fieldwork. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |
| 2. Guidelines in the editing, coding and collating of data gathered. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |
| 3. Clarification of the proper statistical treatment for data gathered. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |

C. Data Analysis and Interpretation

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------|
| 1. Guidance in the methodology of analysis. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |
| 2. Guidance and direction in the mechanics of interpretation. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |

D. Preparation of the Research Report

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------|
| 1. The direction in the use of the proper style and format of the research report. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |
| 2. Regularity in checking the researchers' progress. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |
| 3. Professionalism, system and manner in giving critique. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |
| 4. Judicious examination of the research paper submitted by the advisee. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |
| 5. Encouraging advisee's independence in the process of writing the research paper. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |

E. Other Assistance

Together with the Editor/Reader, the institution provides assistance in the:

- | | | |
|--|-----|-----------------|
| 1. Correction of errors in grammar, spelling and mechanics. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |
| 2. Writing with regards to style and format e.g. clarity, proper use of technical terms, etc. proper footnoting, Biblio, entries, pagination, etc. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |
| 3. Correction of organization of ideas. | 3.0 | Moderate Extent |

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Together with the statistician, the mentor provides assistance in the:

1. Assistance on the statistical aspect of the research design, definition of the statistical treatment to be used.	3.0	Moderate Extent
2. Supervision of the statistical process used in the processing of data.	3.0	Moderate Extent
3. Judiciousness in the certification to the readiness of the write-up.	3.0	Moderate Extent

Average	3.00	Moderate Extent
----------------	-------------	-----------------

Research Environment. Table 5 shows the research capability of the respondents based on their research environment. The same table reveals the *moderate extent* of the research capability of the respondents based on the research environment, as shown by an average score of 3.04.

Specifically, the research capability based on the research environment was to a *great extent* on one (1) indicator: the institutional development and maintenance of a distinctive culture, positive group climate, decentralized organization, participative governance, and frequent communication that would enhance research among faculty members (3.50).

All the other indicators of the research environment of the respondents were observable to a *moderate extent* (3.0) particularly on: the institution development 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; the departmental research programs and strategies are designed to encouraged and sustain research productivity among the full-time and part-time faculty members; the institutional provision of training and exposure to research in order to build research capacity among the faculty members; the research capability as one of the criteria for recruitment and promotion of faculty member; the institutional allocation of adequate funds for research; the institutional search for external sources and obtains research grants; the institutional provision for a research unit, research staff, adequate research services, and facilities in different disciplines for the conduct of

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



research; the institutional provision for means of linkages with other institutions, local or international, in order to create intellectual synergy; the institutional clarity of rules and procedures on the granting of financial and non-financial rewards for research; the institution of a research monitoring body that screens the types of research conducted and looks into the ethical dilemmas involved, especially in sensitive fields; and the institution's production of quality researchers as evidenced by the number of published researches in local and international journals, awards attained by faculty, and patents, among others.

Table 5

Research Capability of the Respondents Based on Research Environment

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The institution develops a 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.	3.0	Moderate Extent
2. The departmental research programs and strategies are designed to encourage and sustain research productivity among full-time and part-time faculty members.	3.0	Moderate Extent
3. The institution develops and maintains a distinctive culture, positive group climate, decentralized organization, participative governance, and frequent communication that would enhance research among faculty members.	3.5	Great Extent
4. The institution provides training and exposure to research in order to build research capacity among the faculty members.	3.0	Moderate Extent

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



5. Research capability is one of the criteria for recruitment and promotion of faculty members.	3.0	Moderate Extent
6. The institution allocates adequate funds for research.	3.0	Moderate Extent
7. The institution looks for external sources and obtains research grants.	3.0	Moderate Extent
8. The institution provides research units, research staff, adequate research services, and facilities in different disciplines for the conduct of research.	3.0	Moderate Extent
9. The institution provides means for linkages with other institutions, local or international, in order to create intellectual synergy.	3.0	Moderate Extent
10. The institution has clear rules and procedures on the granting of financial and non-financial rewards for research.	3.0	Moderate Extent
11. The institution institutes a research monitoring body that screens the types of research conducted and looks into the ethical dilemmas involved, especially in sensitive fields.	3.0	Moderate Extent
12. The institutions produce quality researchers as evidenced by the number of published researches in local and international journals, awards attained by faculty, and patents, among others.	3.0	Moderate Extent

Average	3.04	Moderate Extent
----------------	-------------	------------------------

Research Capability. Table 6 shows the research capability of the respondents. As can be observed in the same table, the research capability of the respondents was observable to a *moderate extent*, as revealed by its Average score of 3.23. Specifically, the research capability of the respondents was observable to a *great extent* on one (1) parameter on research

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



capacity with a Mean score of 3.57. Moreover, the research capability of the respondents was observable to a *moderate extent* on all other parameters, including research training (3.29); research support/assistance (3.00); and research environment (3.04).

Table 6

Research Capability of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
Research Capacity	3.57	Great Extent
Research Training	3.29	Moderate Extent
Research Support / Assistance	3.00	Moderate Extent
Research Environment	3.04	Moderate Extent
Average	3.23	Moderate Extent

The Instructional Performance of the Teacher-Respondents

The instructional performance of the teacher-respondents was described in terms of the following adjectival rating equivalences: outstanding, very satisfactory, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and poor. Table 7 shows the instructional performance of the teacher-respondents. The same table revealed the *outstanding* instructional performance of the following teacher-respondents, as shown by the Grand Mean of 4.54. Specifically, the *outstanding* instructional performance of the following teacher-respondents was observable among administrators/headteachers (4.67); master teachers (4.54); teacher III (4.56); and teacher II (4.52). The *very satisfactory* instructional performance was observable among the teacher I (4.41). The best instructional performance was observable on the highest mean of 4.67 among the administrators/head teachers, while the poorest instructional performance was observable on the lowest mean of 4.41 among the teacher I.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 7

Instructional Performance of the Teacher-Respondents

Respondents	Mean	Interpretation
Administrators / Head Teachers	4.67	Outstanding
Master Teachers	4.54	Outstanding
Teacher III	4.56	Outstanding
Teacher II	4.52	Outstanding
Teacher I	4.41	Very Satisfactory
Grand Mean	4.54	Outstanding

The Influence of Research Capability on Instructional Performance

Table 8 showed the regression analysis of the significant influence of research capability on the instructional performance of teachers. Results of the regression analysis in Table 8 revealed that research capability in terms of capacity, training, support/assistance, and environment contribute to the instructional performance of the junior and senior teachers but not to a significant extent as evidenced by the Beta coefficients of .087, .375, -.034, and .018 respectively with p-values less than the .05 alpha.

Though insignificant, the B coefficient values signify that in every unit increase in the employment of research capability in terms of capacity, support/assistance, and the environment will mean .778, 5.823, -1.208, and .611 respective increase in the instructional performance of the respondents.

However, the obtained F-ratio of 7.499 is found significant since the associated probability of .000 is less than .05 alpha. The results suggest that the particular variables jointly influence the instructional performance to a significant extent. Thus, the study *rejected* the null hypothesis, which states that *research capability does not exert a significant influence on the instructional performance of the teachers.*

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 8

Regression Analysis of the Influence of Research Capability on Instructional Performance

Research Capability	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient T		
	B	S.E	Beta	T	P-value
(Constant)	-15.587	9.999		-1.559	.121
Capacity	.778	.637	.087	1.222	.224
Training	5.823	1.110	.375	5.244	.000*
Support	-1.208	2.800	-.034	-.431	.667
Environment	.611	2.651	.018	.231	.818
R-squared - .151					
F – 7.499					
p-value - .000					
alpha - 0.05					

The result corroborated with the observation of the University of North Carolina Wilmington (2010) as cited in Galbraith & Merrill (2012), which acknowledged the essential role of research, scholarship, and artistic achievement in vitalizing the teaching of its faculty. Competent teachers must be conversant with current developments in the field to anticipate future concerns of students and to inculcate in them, by their own example, the spirit and methods of inquiry. Faculty members’ efforts to broaden their understanding through habitual inquiry and the publication of their findings enhance their power of articulation of ideas. Moreover, the result reiterated what Chen, Gupta & Hoshower (2016) proved on the impact of the various potential rewards from research on faculty motivation.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
 Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
 Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



The Educational Management Implications Drawn Based From the Findings of the Study

Based on the findings of the study, the following implications were drawn:

- Educational managers define the institutional research culture anchored on administrative support and assistance that enhances the research capacity of the organizational staff.
- The educational managers, like principals, provide enhancement on the instructional performance of teachers through various ways of personal growth and professional development including attendance to seminars and conferences
- Research capability and instructional performance of the teachers similarly provide opportunities for personal growth and professional development.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations concerning the influence of research capability on the instructional performance of the respondents from the public vocational high school during the First Semester of School Year 2019-2020. The descriptive-correlational method of research was utilized in the conduct of the study in which the primary data gathering tools were standardized questionnaires. The respondents of the study were 173 secondary school teachers of the public vocational high school

The following null hypothesis was subjected to testing at 0.05 level of significance.

"The research capability does not exert significant influence on the instructional performance of the teachers."

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Summary of Findings

Problem No. 1: The research capability of the respondents

The research capability of the respondents was observable to a *moderate extent*, as revealed by its Average score of 3.23. Specifically, the research capability of the respondents was observable to a *great extent* on one (1) parameter on research capacity with a Mean score of 3.57. Moreover, the research capability of the respondents was observable to a *moderate extent* on all other parameters, including research training (3.29); research support/assistance (3.00); and research environment (3.04).

Problem No. 2: The instructional performance of the teacher-respondents

The instructional performance of the teacher-respondents was described in terms of the following adjectival rating equivalences: outstanding, very satisfactory, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and poor. Table 7 shows the instructional performance of the teacher-respondents.

The same table revealed the *outstanding* instructional performance of the following teacher-respondents, as shown by the Grand Mean of 4.54. Specifically, the *outstanding* instructional performance of the following teacher-respondents was observable among administrators/headteachers (4.67); master teachers (4.54); teacher III (4.56); and teacher II (4.52). The *very satisfactory* instructional performance was observable among the teacher I (4.41). The best instructional performance was observable on the highest mean of 4.67 among the administrators/head teachers, while the poorest instructional performance was observable on the lowest mean of 4.41 among the teacher I.

Problem No. 3: The influence of research capability on instructional performance

Results of the regression analysis revealed that research capability in terms of capacity, training, support/assistance, and environment contribute to the instructional performance of the junior and senior teachers but not to a significant extent as evidenced by the Beta coefficients of .087, .375, -.034, and .018 respectively with p-values less than the .05 alpha.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Though insignificant, the B coefficient values signify that in every unit increase in the employment of research capability in terms of capacity, support/assistance, and the environment will mean .778, 5.823, -1.208, and .611 respective increase in the instructional performance of the respondents.

However, the obtained F-ratio of 7.499 is found significant since the associated probability of .000 is less than .05 alpha. The results suggest that the particular variables jointly influence the instructional performance to a significant extent. Thus, the study *rejected* the null hypothesis, which states that *research capability does not exert a significant influence on the instructional performance of the teachers.*

The result corroborated with the observation of the University of North Carolina Wilmington (2010) as cited in Galbaraitis & Merrill (2012), which acknowledged the essential role of research, scholarship, and artistic achievement in vitalizing the teaching of its faculty. Competent teachers must be conversant with current developments in the field to anticipate future concerns of students and to inculcate in them, by their own example, the spirit and methods of inquiry. Faculty members' efforts to broaden their understanding through habitual inquiry and the publication of their findings enhance their power of articulation of ideas. Moreover, the result reiterated what Chen, Gupta & Hoshower (2016) proved the impact of the various potential rewards from research on faculty motivation.

Problem No. 4: The implications are drawn based on the findings of the study

Based on the findings of the study, the following implications were drawn:

- Educational managers define the institutional research culture anchored on administrative support and assistance that enhances the research capacity of the organizational staff.
- The educational managers, like principals, provide enhancement on the instructional performance of teachers through various ways of personal growth and professional development including attendance to seminars and conferences

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- Research capability and instructional performance of the teachers similarly provide opportunities for personal growth and professional development.

Conclusions

In light of the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

- That teacher possesses the research capacity, as well as interest and enthusiasm; however, the institutional research environment, support, assistance, and training, boost the teachers' capacity.
- That the best instructional performance was observed among the administrators/head teachers, while the teacher I showed the poorest performance.
- That the research capability exerts a significant impact on the instructional performance of the teachers.
- That there are educational management implications drawn based on the findings of the study.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, the following recommendations were hereby offered:

1. Educational institutions should create a supportive research culture that encourages teachers to engage in research endeavors.
2. The best practices on the instructional performance of the administrators/headteachers should be shared with the Teacher I who needs to raise their instructional performance level.
3. Educational institutions should create strategies to provide opportunities for research training of the teachers due to its significant influence on the instructional performance of the teachers.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue II

November 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



4. The school heads and teaching staff of an educational institution should consider the educational management implications drawn based on the findings of the study.



Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



References

Adu, Kemi O., Olatundun, S.A. & Adu, Emmanuel O. (2016) *Factors Hindering Teachers' Productivity in Public Secondary Schools*, *Journal of Social Sciences*, 49:1-2, 70-76, DOI: 10.1080/09718923.2016.11893599

Arnold, Ivo J.M. (2008). *Course Level and the Relationship between Research Productivity and Teaching effectiveness*. *Journal of Economic Education*; Fall 2008 - Heldref Publications

Barner, John R.; Holosko, Michael J.; Thyer, Bruce A. & King, Steve Jr. (2015). *Research Productivity in Top-Ranked Schools in Psychology and Social Work: Does Having a Research Culture Matter?*. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 51: 5–18, 2015 Copyright © Council on Social Work Education ISSN: 1043-7797 print / 2163-5811 online DOI: 10.1080/10437797.2015.977123: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (2006). *A Look at Research in Education* (Tenth Edition). Singapore: Pearson Education, Inc.

Bland, Carole J.; Center, Bruce A.; Finstad, Deborah A.; Risbey, Kelly R.; Staples, Justin (2006). *The Impact of Appointment Type on the Productivity and Commitment of Full-Time Faculty in Research and Doctoral Institutions*. *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 77, No. 1 (January/February 2006); Copyright 2006 by the Ohio State University.

Bradley, Steve; Johnes, Jill and Little, Allan (2010). *Measurement and Determinants of Efficiency and Productivity in the Further Education Sector in England*. 2010TheAuthors.Journalcompilation; 2010BlackwellPublishingLtdandtheBoardofTrusteesoftheBulletinofEconomicResearch.PublishedbyBlackwellPublishing,9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK and 350 Main St., Malden, MA 02148, USA.; *Bulletin of Economic Research* 62:1, 2010, 0307-3378 DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8586.2009.00309.x

Brew, Angela. Boud, David. Namgung, Sang Un. Lucas, Lisa & Crawford, Karin (2016). *Research Productivity and Academics' Conceptions of Research*. *Higher Education*, (2016) 71:681-697; DOI 10.007/s10734-015-9930-6. CrossMark

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue II

November 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Bujaki, Merridee L & McCoconomy, Bruce J (2016). *Productivity in Top-10 Academic Accounting Journals by Researchers at Canadian Universities at the Start of the 21st Century*. AP Vol. 16 No. 4 — PC vol. 16, no 4 (2017) pages 269–313 © CAAA/ACPC doi:10.1111/1911-3838.12153

Chen, Yining; Gupta, Ashok & Hoshower, Leon (2016). *Factors that Motivate Business Faculty to Conduct Research: An Expectancy Theory Analysis*. Journal of Education for Business; March/April 2016 - Heldref Publications

Clegg, H. (2013). *Building an Outsourced Research Capability*, *Business Information Review*. 302920, 71-77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266382113489866>.

Department of Education, RP (2018). *Statement on Calls to halt RPMS Implementation*. Civil Service Commission (CSC) Memorandum Circular No. 6, series of 2012 and Department of Education (DepEd), DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015; Pasig City September 24, 2018 – DepEd.; www.deped.gov.ph

Fraenkel, Jack R., and Wallen, Norman E., (2003). *How to Design Research in Education* (Third Edition). San Francisco State University: McGraw Hill.

Freedental, Stacey; Potter, Cathryn and Grinsterin-Weiss, Micahel (2008). *Institutional Supports for Faculty Scholarship: A National Survey of Social Works Programs* Social Work Research; Volume 12, Number 4, December 2008: National Association of Social Workers

Galbraith, Craig S. and Merrill, Gregroy B. (2012). *Faculty Research Productivity and Standardized Student Learning Outcomes In a University Teaching Environment: A Bayesian Analysis of Relationships Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 37, No. 4, June 2012, 469–480: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Gray, Carol (2013). *Bridging the teacher/Researcher Divide: Master’s-Level Work in Initial Teacher Education*. European Journal of Teacher Education, 2013 Vol. 36, No. 1, 24–38, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2012.682648>: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Harvey, S & Goudvis, A. (2000). *Strategies that work: Teaching comprehension to enhance understanding*. Markham: Pembroke.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Hassan, Aminuddin; Tymms, Peter and Ismail, Habsah (2008). *Academic Productivity as Perceived by Malaysian Academics*. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management Vol. 30, No. 3, August 2008, 283–296: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Hasselback, James R.; Reinstein, Alan and Abdolmohammadi, Mohammad (2012). *Benchmarking the Research Productivity of Accounting Doctorates*. Issues in Accounting Education, Vol. 27. No. 4 2012; American Accounting Association DOI: 10.2308/iace-50253

Hedrick, David W.; Henson, Steven E. and Krieg, John M; Wassell, Charles Jr. (2010). *The Effects of AACSB Accreditation on Faculty Salaries and Productivity*. JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR BUSINESS, 85: 284–291, 2010 Copyright C Taylor & Francis Group, LLC ISSN: 0883-2323 DOI: 10.1080/08832320903449543: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Hill, Mary F. and Haigh, Mavis A (2012). *Creating a Culture of Research in Teacher Education: Learning Research Within Communities of Practice*. Studies in Higher Education, Vol. 37, No. 8, December 2012, 971-988: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Horwitz, Elaine Kolker. (2013). *Becoming a Language Teacher: A Practical Guide to Second Language Learning and Teaching*. United States of America: Pearson.

Huenneke, Luara F., Stearns, Diane M., Martinez, Jesse D., Laurila, Kelly (2017). *Key Strategies for Building Capacity of University Faculty Members*. Innov High Educ (2017) 42-421-435; DOI 10.007/s10775-017-9394y; CrossMark

James, P., Davis, A., & Borkan J. (2010). *The Challenge to Build Research Capacity in Family Medicine: Is our Discipline Ready?* Annals of Family Medicine, 8(4), 371-373. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1153>

Jones, Glen A (2014). *Building and Strengthening Policy Research Capacity: Key Issues In Canadian Higher Education*. Studies in Higher Education, 2014 Vol. 39, No. 8, 1332-1342, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.949543>; Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue II

November 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Kaasila, Raimo; Lutovac, Sonja (2015). *Developing Research Relationships Toward a Learning Partnership*. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 2015 Vol. 59, No. 2, 177–194, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.904415>; Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Kemi O. Adu, S.A. Olatundun & Emmanuel O. Adu (2016) Factors Hindering Teachers' Productivity in Public Secondary Schools, Journal of Social Sciences, 49:1-2, 70-76, DOI: 10.1080/09718923.2016.11893599

Kocak, Recep (2006). *The Validity and Reliability of the Teachers' Performance Evaluation Scale*. 2006 Eğitim Danışmanlık ve Araştırmalar Akademi Hizmetleri Tic. Ltd. fi. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice

Kozmina, Ia. Ia. (2015). *The Preferences of University Instructors Regarding Research and Teaching Duties*. Russian Education and Society, vol. 57, no. 5, May 2015, pp. 358–375. © 2015 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC ISSN: 1060–9393 (print)/ISSN 1558–0423 (online) DOI: 10.1080/10609393.2015.1082412: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Leech, Nancy L.; Haug, Carolyn A.; Icemand-Sands, Deanna and Moriaty, Jennifer (2015). *Change in Classification Level and the Effects on Research Productivity and Merit Scores for Faculty in a School of Education*. Studies in Higher Education, 2015 Vol. 40, No. 6, 1030-1045, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.881341>: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Leisyte, Liudvika (2016). *New Public Management and Research Productivity – A Precarious State of Affairs of Academic Work in the Netherlands*. Studies in Higher Education, 2016 Vol. 41, No. 5, 828-846, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1147721>: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Magi, Eve & Beekens, Maarja (2016). *Linking Research and Teaching: Are Research-Active Staff Members Different Teachers?* Higher Education, (2016) 72:241-258; DOI 10.1007/s10734-015-9951-1. CrossMark

Middaugh, Michael F.; Kell, Heather A. and Walters, Allison, M. (2008). *The Role of Institutional Research in Understanding and Describing Faculty Work*. New Directions For Higher Education, no. 141, Spring 2008- Wiley Periodicals, Inc. Published online in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com) * DOI: 10.1002/he.292

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue II

November 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Milanowski, Anthony (2011). *Strategic Measures of Teacher Performance*. Kappan April 2011; kappanmagazine.org: Phi Delta Kappan; Phi Delta Kappa International.

Morrison, Timothy G. and Wilcox, Brad (2008). *Institutional Productivity Based on Publication in Nine Literacy Journals: 1992-2005*. Reading Psychology, 29:315-326, 2008 Copyright C □ Taylor & Francis Group, LLC ISSN: 0270-2711 print / 1521-0685 online DOI: 10.1080/02702710802126137: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Nuqui, A.V. & Cruz, R.C. (2012). *Determinants of Faculty Research Productivity in Augustian Higher Education Institutions in Luzon*. Retrieved from <https://doi.10.7718/iamure.ije.v3i1.191>

Ozgenel, Mustafa (2018). *Modeling the Relationships between School Administrators' Creative and Critical Thinking Disposition with Decision Making Styles and Problem Solving Skills*. Copyright 2018 EDAM-Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice; DOI.10.12738/estp.2018.3.0068-2018-18(3)-673-700; www.estp.com.tr

Okutan, Mehmet (2014). *My School Principal is Not a Leader*. Article; Education Fall2014, vol. 135 Issue 1, p93-100. 8p

Quimbo, Maria Ana T. & Sulabo, Evangeline C. (2014). *Research Productivity and Its Implications in Higher Education Institutions*. Studies in Higher Education, Vol. 39, No. 10, June 2011, 1955-1977, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.818639>: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Roit, M. L. (2016). *Effective Teaching Strategies for Improving Reading Comprehension in K-3 Students*. McGraw Hill Education.

Santo, Susan A.; Engstrom, Mary E.; Reetz, Linda; Schweinie, William E & Reed, Kristine (2009). *Faculty Productivity Barriers and Supports at a School of Education*. Published online: 17 February 2009 # Springer Science + Business Media, LLC 2009; Innov High Educ (2009) 34:117-129 DOI 10.1007/s10755-009-9098-z

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue II

November 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Shin, Jung Cheol, (2011). *Teaching and Research Nexuses Across Faculty Career State, Ability and Affiliate Discipline in a South Korean Research University*. Studies in Higher Education, Vol. 36, No. 4, June 2011, 485-503: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).

Tahir, Sumbul and Sajid S.M. (2014). *Job Satisfaction Among College Teachers: A Comparative Analysis*. The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. XIII, No. 1, 2014

Terpstra, David E. & Honoree, Andre L. (2009). *The Effects of Different Teaching, Research, and Service Emphases on Individual and Organizational Outcomes in Higher Education Institutions*. Journal of Education for Business; January/February 2009 - Heldref Publications

Tien, Flora F. (2008). *What Kind of Faculty are Motivated to Perform Research by the Desire for Promotion*. Received: 3 August 2004/Accepted: 31 July 2006/Published online: 2 September 2006 □ Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2006. High Educ (2008) 55:17–32 DOI 10.1007/s10734-006-9033

Trabasso, T. & Bouchard, E (2002). *Teaching readers how to comprehend text strategically*. In Block, C.C. and Pressley, M. (Eds). *Comprehension instruction, research-based best practices*. New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Valdez, Janet-Raymundo (2018), *The Impact of Research Capability, Corporate Social Responsibility, and Internationalization of Education on the School Performance of Higher Education (HEIs)*. A Dissertation Paper Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education Major in Educational Leadership and Management. La Consolacion University Philippine, September 2018, (LCUP Library)

Webber, Karen L. (2012), *Research Productivity of Foreign – and US – born Faculty: Differences by Time on Task* Higher Educ (2012) 64:709-729. DOI 10.1007/s10734-012-9523-6; Published online: 15 April 2012; Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2012

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza
