ONELETRAN RESEARCH CENTER MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON FACULTY'S RESEARCH CAPABILITY AND PRODUCTIVITY

Edessa G. Flordeliz, PhD[1]

[1]Collegiate Department, Colegio de San Juan de Letran – Bataan

ABSTRACT

The current ineffectuality of most higher education institutions in the Philippines necessitated the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to be in full swing by postulating research procedures and strategies that direct HEI to efficiently work towards their research capability and production. The HEIs in the country have positively act in response by creating a visible and functioning research center. On this note, research became evidently one of the pillars of higher education. Considering these literatures, the study focused on four variables of research center management practices and aims to examine the statistical associations between the management practices of research center and the research capability and productivity of ONELETRAN faculty. The null hypothesis that research center management practices do not influence faculty's research productivity has been accepted. However, the null hypothesis that research center management practices do not influence faculty's research competence has been rejected. The findings of the study emphasized the major responsibility of the Colegio through its research centers to elevate faculty's competence by way of improving its management practices.

***Keywords**: research management, productivity, capability, research commitment*

INTRODUCTION

The landscape of higher education has witnessed many changes. The notion of education restructuring became prevalent in the late 1980s and early 1990s for higher education institutions in Asia (Trow, 2005). This is largely in response to the prior failed attempts to improve existing higher education structures. Three main areas were the focus of restructuring school reform efforts during this period, teachers, student-learning and policy.

But a distinctive feature of research and development in Korea, China and Indonesia was seen played a strong part in boosting the economy (Bok, 2003). This context of a national concern to improve the contribution of research and development to economic performance, raises crucial optimisms about the role that tertiary education should play in national research policies. This shift has put universities and colleges under new pressures in term of incorporating instructions and research in connection with national policy development.

These factors, intruction, research and extension, surrounding the higher educations institution are methodoligicaly interconnected (Quimbo & Sulabo, 2014). Critically paving way for the existence of research centers in most colleges and universities to accentuate research development in the tertiary academes. Research centers aslo represents the organizational commitment (the academe in this case) to the research mission of the institution or as an individual faculty member's resource for expansion of a specific agenda (Flynn, Brekke, & Soydan, 2008). Given this statement, front runners in education identified that research activities enhance faculty knowledge in general.

This emphasis on research output of universities has prompted the establishment of research centers, with numerous committed to domain extents of responsiveness (Kumar, 2017). This only shows that university research centers can clearly command academic standing and not to mention monetary takings to the institutions of higher education. Cooperating with the concerned government, business organizations and institutes, research centers can provide services to organizational leaders, policy makers, and

communities. This is the reason why university research centers unceasingly continue to rise in figure and impact (Kelly Hall, 2011).

In Thailand, national government currently expects universities to become both more efficient and effective in all they do, especially in the area of research. Government policy has focused on attempts to persuade universities to be more selective in research by identifying areas of research strength (Arvizu et al., 2014). In India on the other hand, despite the growing emphasis on research in management schools and other academic institutions of higher learning, management schools have not yet met world standards in research (Sahoo, Singh, Mishra, & Sankaran, 2015). Thus, research productivity of the management institutions continues to be a matter of vexing concern for academics and policy-makers in India. Given the continued interest in research productivity of management scholars in India, we set out to develop a composite index of research productivity that could gauge how creative and productive faculty members of management schools have been over the years.

The Philippines is not excluded in this situation. As evaluated by Bernardo (2003) in his study on the typology of HEIs in the Philippines, 'only 15 out of 223 HEIs in the model met the requirements for the graduate-capable HEI category, and only two HEIs met the criteria for doctoral/research university categories (Clemeña, 2007).

The Philippine Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has been keenly persuasive for a stronger research orientation among the HEIs. In fact, the 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. In the report submitted to Zonall Research Centers from 1996 to 2001, there are only 13, 8589 which is considered as a a very low research turn out for a period of five years

Moreover, illustrating the research turn out, seventy two percent (72%) were conducted individually. This far exceeded collaborative and institutional research. About 69% of these individual studies were done by graduate students (master's and doctorate) initially as one of degree requirements (Vicencio, Bualat, et.al, as cited in Salazar-Clemeña, 2006).

In addition, the Philipiine Commision on Higher Education (CHED) in year 2000, revealed in a subbmitted report of having funded only 16 research projects with a total approved budget of about PHP9million. This report only shows that research conducted in the country were not reliant on the grants available from CHED.

This current ineffectuality of research in Philippine higher education institutions (HEIs) compelled the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to be in full swing by postulating research procedures and strategies that direct HEI to efficiently work towards their research capability and productivity. The HEIs in the country have responded in varied ways to the call for a stronger research orientation among the universities and colleges. One of which is creation of visible and functioning research Center. On this note, research became evidently one of the pillars of higher education.

Within the past few decades, university-industry research centers have been developed in large numbers and emphasized as a valuable policy tool for innovation. Yet little is known about the heterogeneity of organizational structure within these centers, which has implications regarding policy for and management of these centers (McArthur Hart, 2013). Recent studies examine the processes within research centers, specifically researcher behaviors and center structure and management.

The most prominent affecting factors of research productivity were under personal characteristics, research skills, research competence research management, under research competence such as research skills and technique, funding skill and research management (Wichian, 2009).

With all the literatures both about research management center and faculty's research capability and productivity, limited studies have been done, however, on examining the influence of the later variable to former variables from the perspective of the faculty.

The overall purpose of this study is to find the extent of influence of the research center management practices on faculty's research capability and productivity. Specifically, the objectives of the study were to assess:

1. the extent of ONELETRAN Research Center implementations of its management practices using the parameters of strategic management, organizational management, financial management, human resource management and research output management.
2. the level of research capability of the Colegio's faculty be described in terms of conceptual, computational, and technical skill
3. the status of research productivity of the college be described in terms of completed research, presented articles, published articles

4. the extent of implementation of research center management practices significant influence on faculty's research capability
5. the extent of implementation of research center management practices significant influence on faculty's research productivity

Theoretical Background

This study is consequently anchored on dynamic theory of knowledge wherein it states that the capabilities concept has largely been established and influenced by dynamic capabilities. This is said to be one of an organization's capacities to positively "integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments". This theory explains the two dimensions in assessing knowledge management: tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka, 2011).

All of these are seen as an all-encompassing outline that clarify how different procedures and progressions such as administrative processes that clearly affect the stable occurrence and aid innovativeness to sustain compelled improvement in an organization. This is when capabilities are taking into account on the premise of constructed executive processes, information systems, learning, and definite abilities (Lumpkin, & Eisner, 2010). This model advocates that administrative learning and modernism are two of the significant processes that intercede the dynamic capabilities and secure implementation.

Consequently, this theoretical model adopts that driven proficiencies will certainly affect organizational learning processes wherein in this study concerns with research center management practices. The aforementioned tacit and explicit knowledge on the other hand can be linked to faculty's research capability and productivity which are anticipated to develop an in-depth learning environment. Also, it might be discerned that the projected model concerning both direct and indirect relation between dynamic capabilities and progress were exceedingly acknowledged. This idea also support the idea of up surging administrative center ability to revolutionize, and are seen as fundamental factors that affect improvement. It should also be noted that administrative learning might become an intermediary in their capabilities and innovation relation. It is also assumed that innovation working this way would developed as an optimistic conclusion of an effective dynamic capabilities and organizational learning relation.

Literature Review

On Research Center Practices

Prior addressing the effectiveness of a university-based research center, it is composed of people, organization, and technology (Cassidy, 2009). The number of people directly involved can range from a few to two people to several hundred people. The core composition of a research center includes administrators, research staff, and support and service staff. Each individual frequently performs multiple duties and responsibilities.

Higher training institutions have recognized the want to toughen research ability and capability as imperative to their institutional mission and to their survival as an institution. Accordingly, HEIs are busy devising strategies in order to grow research undertaking and to organizationally support and manipulate the lookup business enterprise inside the institution (Hystra, 2014).

While research is structured upon the work of individuals, research undertaking is now a serious enterprise for each faculty and their institutions. This is reflected in institutional priority setting activity, the institution of a lookup office and graduate school, and an emphasis on sustainable lookup companies working via centers and in partnerships with other establishments or corporation.

The expression research center is used to encompass a variety of organizations involved in research. It is in part to convey information about the core of the center. Often, major national research centers and especially the universities that house them are seen by national governments as global indicators of the prestige of the country's research, graduate education and innovation (Expert Group on Assessment of University-Based Research, 2010; Wendler et. al., 2010). Despite the assertion that research centers enhance collaboration and interdisciplinary, the fact remains that centers in some medical schools operate more collaboratively than in others (Mallon, 2006).

The idea that research centers cultivate cooperation and scholarly exchange among individual faculty or the formal interactions that exist through academic departments (Mallon, 2006) exhibited, to varying degrees, organizational habits or behaviors or systems that contributed to collaborative research environments.

First, a positive organizational culture demanded that people "play nice in the sandbox." In several situations, centers and institutes had control over significant financial and physical resources, but center directors had to use their

resources to promote institutional goals and not build individual empires. In terms of research structure, an interdisciplinary approach drives a successful research center (Kumar, 2017).

An extensive body of research has also documented the role that differences in management practice play in research and development capabilities (Pisano, 2015). Pisano cited the study of Clark and Fujimoto on the global automobile industry in 1990. They both illustrated the significant differences in product development lead times, engineering productivity, and development quality could be traced to specific management practices.

On Research Capability

The core business of universities is teaching, and research and their reputations are built on the quality of those activities. One of the big challenges universities face is developing and maintaining a strong research profile, and to do this they need high quality research staff (Thompson & Dawson, 2016).

There are valid arguments supporting the claim made by Sen (2009) that it is necessary for the capabilities list to be context-sensitive and therefore cannot be pre-given (Jancic, 2015). On the other hand, it is understandable to have the pre-defined capabilities that are the product of the debate and mutual consent. They help in identifying what a "good life" is and what should be the goal of policies (Nussbaum, 2000).

On the other hand, faculty productivity analysis in Augustinian's HEIs in Luzon is considerably influenced by the extent of research promotion of establishments in terms of promotion of the research surroundings and providing mentors' help. like the other Philippine HEIs, faculty haggle similar issues and problems on analysis productivity like budget convenience and institutional support mechanism (Nuqui & Cruz, 2012).

The teachers' capacity to pursue, analytically assess and assimilate apposite data from research and innovation is acknowledged as an imperative feature of operative development in professional practice (Pati, 2014). It is dominant to the capability to cope with the briskly growing knowledge base and the cumulative stride of modification distinctive of an information society.

Capabilities the various functioning that a person can attain, where functioning are constitutive elements of living, that is, doing and being (Robeyns, 2006). Budi Prasetyo A.P (2010) stated that teachers' capability to undertake classroom action research is influenced by their educational background. He stated that teachers' educational background influenced significantly the capability to undertake classroom action research especially in Central Java, Indonesia.

The incessant development of knowledge could signify that the younger breed of academicians are more capable in research activities than the older ones (Levin & Stephan, 2011). Moreover, progressively competitive higher education systems are more challenging in terms of research performance for innovative educators (Abramo & Angelo, 2013).

Research productivity has been and remains to be one in each of the most extraordinarily appreciated elements of a university faculty's life, with every university promotion and tenure, classroom assessment, and university objectives being considered significantly. Some in the field want university administrators to place consequential importance on various types of study on research productivity (Kotrlik, Bartlett, II, Higgins, & Williams, 2002).

Terzi (2007) similarly argues that capability to be educated presents the basic capability because the absence of the opportunity to access informal and formal education can cause harm to the individual's well-being. She further points out that capability to be educated is also the basis for development of other, more complex capabilities. Not only that it enables formation of informed choices about valued beings and doings, but it also provides basis for career opportunities, civic participation etc. Vaughan (2007, p. 115).

Universities that are strong performers in research capability and reputation are well placed to recruit and retain high quality researchers who deliver high quality research outcomes and, in turn, enhance their reputation.

On Research Productivity

Research productivity has been defined as the relationship between the outputs generated by a system and the inputs provided to create those outputs (Arvizu et al., 2014). It may also include the term 'efficiency' and more importantly 'effectiveness', which measures the total output or results of performance (Turnage 1990). Print and Hattie (1997) define research productivity as 'the totality of research performed by academics in universities and related contents within a given time period' and research efficiency has been defined as the productivity of research per unit of input resource (Daily 2005).

Research productivity is very important not only for the university but also for the community surrounding the university and the nation at large (Okendo, 2018). There are two rivulets of research on faculty research productivity. The first route examines the changes of research publication requirements in faculty tenure and promotion decisions (Cargile and Bublitz 2006; Campbell and Morgan 2007; Milne and Vent 2007).

These studies have recognized that publication necessities for advancements and tenure have improved over time. The second stream of research has studied individual or institutional features that most meaningfully impelled the research productivity of faculty members.

Workforce members' certainty about their research capacities is related to workforce certainty about research productivity. Bean's workforce model investigates about research efficiency included the seen level of authenticity in one's investigate as an informative calculate. Increments in capacity and self-efficacy were too related to expanded research efficiency (Pfeffer and Langton, 2007).

Universities in the industrialized countries have a well-founded principle of research. Distinguishing research as an imperative measure of their accountabilities, faculty members of higher education institutions (HEIs) have unswervingly proved research productivity together with other factors that contribute to the process. Contrariwise, universities in the developing world have retained sturdy instruction functions and feeble research functions (Sanyal & Varghese, 2006).

METHODOLOGY

Methods and Techniques Used

The descriptive-correlational method of research was utilized in the study to determine the relationship between research center management practices of the four Letran campuses and their faculty's research capability and productivity. Descriptive-correlational research design is a systematic investigation of the relationship present between two or more variables. The study made use of a quantitative research approach in analyzing and understanding the predictor and criterion variables. Standardized but modified questionnaire on research center management center practices and assessment questionnaire on faculty's research capability and productivity will be used as primary data gathering tools.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study were the faculty of four Letran campuses in the school year 2018-2019. Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents in each corresponding school which has been correspondingly coded for their anonymity. Utilizing Raosoft sample size calculation using the following standards: The margin of error of 5% and confidence level of 95%, the calculated sample size can be seen from the table 1.

Table 1. Sample Size

School	Population	%	Respondents
A	136	42.0	75
B	101	31.86	55
C	42	13.25	23
D	38	11.99	21
Total	**317**	**100.00**	**174**

Instrument of the Study

The study utilized a four-part survey questionnaire as the instrument of the study. Part 1 of the research instrument is lifted from the validated research instrument of Dr. Gloria Abrazado which intends to measure the research management of the center. The instrument is a 40-point Likert type questionnaire that ranges from 1 (not at all) to 4 (Very Great extent). This part of the questionnaire itemizes important components of management of the research center of the Colegio. The items were drawn up from current resources on the best practices in managing research. The inventory aims to determine the management practices of the research center in the Colegio. The parameters included in this questionnaire are: Strategic management, Organizational management, Human Resource management, Financial management and Research Output management.

Part II of the questionnaire, on the other hand, measures the extent of the research capability of the respondents. This part of the questionnaire is derived from the published work of Dr. Jonathan dela Cruz. The part of the questionnaire is composed of the following parameters: Computational skills, Conceptual Skills and Technical skills. This 4-point Likert type questionnaire is composed of 35 questions that ranges from 1 (Not Competent) to 4 (Highly Competent).

Part III of the question was utilized to answer the question raised in the statement of the problem regarding research productivity. This a tabular type wherein respondents will be asked to fill out the column and rows. After authors' approval, the questionnaire underwent reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha. The most common measure of internal consistency.

Forming the crux of this research, not only is validity an essential issue for integrity of the data to be analyzed but also for the valid representation of the result of this study for the population utilized in this study.

Table 2. Reliability Statistics (Research Center Management Practices)

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	No. of Items
.964	.968	49

Table 3. Reliability Statistics (Research Capability)

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	No. of Items
.988	.988	35

Table 3 shows the reliability result of the items/indicators used to measure the extent to which the research center management practices are evident in the Colegio. On the other hand, table 3 denotes the reliability result of the items/ indicators used to measure the capability of the respondents of this study regarding different research skills.

The Cronbach's Alpha value of .964 and .988, for research center management practices and research capability respectively, indicate that the internal consistencies of the components of research center management practices and research capability as part of the research instrument is excellent since the computed value is greater than 0.9.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher personally disseminated the survey questionnaire. Each of the respondent was given a structured set of questions. In gathering the data, the researcher carried out a letter of permission to conduct the questionnaire dissemination (which was approved by the Rectors of the four Letran campuses. was sent to the Rector of each Colegio. After approval was given, the researcher with the help of research center in each Colegio, distributed the questionnaire to the respondents. personally. The researcher collected the questionnaires personally so as to have a follow up interview in case there are vague answers or clarifications. But the initial bulk of questionnaire was sent thru a courier.

Data Processing and Statistical Treatment

As for the quantitative evaluation of the gathered and collected data and information, the following statistical tools are employed. For the quantitative description of the research center management practices, mean and standard deviation were utilized. To find the quantitative influenced of research center management practices to the faculty's research capability and productivity, multiple correlation and Pearson was utilized. To measure to what extent there is a linear relationship between search center management practices and faculty's research capability and productivity and explore the forms of these relationships, linear regression was utilized. *Statistical Package for Social Science is used for the immediate and accurate calculations with license #f677081ef0bb02478d8e and lock code 4-21940.

Ethical Considerations

All information that will be gathered from the respondents will be treated as confidential. The results consist of data that does not lead to the identification of the respondents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For an organized presentation and consistent discussion, the data are presented following the order or sequence of the questions raised in the statement of the problem, to wit: (1) extent have the college research center implemented management practices, (2) level of research capability of faculty, (3) status of research productivity of faculty, (4) correlational influence of research center implemented management practices on faculty's research capability and productivity.

Table 4 shows the extent of how ONELETRAN Research Centers implemented management practices. Research management indicators strategic management,

organizational management and human resource management got a mean score of 3.340, 3.331 and 3.290 respectively. This mean that very great extent was also given on the aforementioned indicators by the research centers of the institution with standard deviation of .567, .543 and .683 correspondingly. This result means that clear intent of the research centers is translatable into specific objectives as well as effective means of achieving these objectives by deliberate action involving the use of human resources.

On the other hand, indicators, financial management got a mean score of 3.202 with standard deviation of .574 and research output management has a calculated mean of 3.228 supported by a .649 standard deviation. This means that great extent was given to the mentioned indicators. Clearly, financial management within the context of the knowledge management in the One Letran research centers counteract some of the limitations in the key area of research that may affect the broad-spectrum characterization of research centers.

This is also reflected in their research output management wherein they view research outputs as assets, stemming from its mission to support quality research productivity.

Table 4. Research Center Management Practices

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Strategic Management	3.340	.567	Very Great Extent
Organizational Management	3.331	.543	Very Great Extent
Human Resource Management	3.290	.686	Very Great Extent
Financial Management	3.202	.574	Great Extent
Research Output Management	3.228	.649	Great Extent

Legend: 3.26 - 4.00 = Very Great Extent; 2.51 - 3.25 = Great Extent; 1.76 - 2.50 = Slight Extent; 1.00 - 1.75 = Not at All

As for the faculty's research capability indicated by table 5, faculty's assessed themselves as higly competent on the conceptual, computational and technical skills. This is evident in the calculated means of the said indicators, 3.393, 3.339 and 3.440, respectively.

The statistical results prove that research centers constantly look for new areas to shed light on and bring to the attention of the academic community, with a focus on rigor, relevance, and actionable implications process (Boden, 2012).

Faculty's research capability can be described , based on the statistical results, being able to provide in depth information, detailed analysis and suitable assessment on a given topic after researching extensively on that topic that is aligned with a designated format (Santos et al., 1994). It includes formulating the problem statement, referring to good sources, and explaining your findings and observations in the form of a report. These are pertinent components of the research process that characterizes scholarly empirical research.

Table 5. Faculty's Research Capability

Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Conceptual Skills	3.393	.514	Highly Competent
Computational Skills	3.339	.555	Highly Competent
Technical Skills	3.440	.528	Highly Competent

Legend: 3.26 - 4.00 = Highly Competent; 2.51 - 3.25 = Competent; 1.76 - 2.50 = Somewhat Competent; 1.00 - 1.75 = Not at All

Research evidently nurture a scholarly community that is equipped to rethink in both academic and institutional terms which is the very nature of the higher education institutions.

As for the faculty's research productivity, table 6 shows that the completed basic research has a frequency of 52. Its equivalent percentage of 27.51% is based on the number of respondents of the study. Whereas the number of completed applied research is 16. The equivalent percentage of completed applied research is 8.47%.

For institutional presentation, it has a frequency of 33 with equivalent percentage of 48.33 based on the completed research while national presentation got a frequency of 11 with an equivalent percentage of 16.18% considering also the number of completed research. For international research presentation, it has a frequency of 6 with equivalent 8.82% based on the number of completed research.

Faculty's research publication, the calculated percentage is also based on number of completed research. For non-refereed journal, it has a frequency of 8 published research with an equivalent percentage of 11.76%, for local refereed journal, 4 research have been published with equivalent percentage 5.88% and for ISI publication, there is 1 published research with 1.47% equivalent.

Journals are evidently the centerpiece of the scientific enterprise of faculty's research productivity and serve as a focal point for the description of scientific results.

Because publication is central to the activity of faculty, it can result into scientific progress, principles and standards that govern faculty's responsibilities related to publication.

Table 6. Faculty's Research Productivity

Completed Research		
Indicators	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Basic Research	52	27.51%
Applied Research	16	8.47%
Total	**68**	**35.98%**
Research Presentation		
Indicators	**Frequency**	**Percentage (Based on Completed research)**
Institutional	33	48.53%
National	11	16.18%
International	6	8.82%
Total	**50**	**73.53%**
Completed Research		
Indicators	**Frequency**	**Percentage (Based on Completed research)**
In Non-refereed Journal	8	11.76%
In Local Refereed Journal	4	5.88%
In ISI	1	1.47%
Total	**12**	**19.12%**

The result of the analysis of variances of the multiple regression of research center management practices influence on faculty's research capability in table 7 revealed an F ratio of 35.211 significant at 0.05 alpha. This is up ported by the calculated sig value of 0.000. Since that the associated probability does not exceed 0.05 alpha, it is, therefore, safe to conclude that the combined effect of the strategic, organization, human resource, financial and research output management form a set of significant predictors on faculty's research capability.

Table 7. ANOVA[b]: Research Capability

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	23.319	5	4.664	35.211	.000[a]
Residual	24.239	183	.132		
Total	47.558	188			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Research Output, Strategic, Financial, Organizational, Human Resource

b. Dependent Variable: Research Capability

The result of the analysis of variances of the regression of research center management practices on faculty's research productivity indicated an F ratio of 0.354 not significant at 0.05 alpha. This assumption is strengthened by the sig value of.879 which is greater than 0.05 alpha. This means that the five parameters does not collectively influence faculty's research productivity.

Table 7. ANOVA[b]: Research Productivity

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	.318	5	.064	.354	.879[a]
Residual	32.902	183	.180		
Total	33.221	188			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Research Output, Strategic, Financial, Organizational, Human Resource

b. Dependent Variable: Research Productivity

DISCUSSION

It is highly evident that it is a great responsibility of the research center to implement appropriate research management policies align with the Colegio's research goals and objectives. These policies must advocate the commitment to the research goals and that consequently produce high research productivity.

As the college transitions to a research-based institution, the Colegio must look at research output expectations for faculty and create policies to help faculty manage their time. Strategies for balancing workload may include library resources such as scholarly journals, research grant writing support; and offering required research training. The data also clearly states that that Colegio's support is directly correlated with the researchers' capability and productivity

thus creating institutional research competence by research-promoting characteristics of its faculty.

The emphasis on the research productivity of the Colegio is a timely response to the changing research context of international higher education. Faculty's level of research capability cannot be equated with number of researches produced or even published. The gathered data also imply that faculty who have research skills and technique, funding skills paired competent research management practices would likely produce high research productivity

CONCLUSION

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

Great extent in the utilization of research center management practices reflects the commitment of the Colegio to foster a research-oriented learning environment through its research centers. Also, competent description of research skills possessed by the faculty reveals the need for continuous developments and refinements that an institution with a culture of research must attend to. These initiatives are designed to support and strengthen faculty's research skills that is already in place.

Faculty's level of research productivity, undoubtedly in this study is caused by the faculty's level of research capability.

Since the null hypothesis that research center management practices do not influence faculty's research competence has been rejected, the findings of the study emphasized the major responsibility of the Colegio through its research centers to elevate faculty's competence by way of improving its management practices

Since the null hypothesis that research center management practices do not influence faculty's research productivity has been accepted, the indicated number of research outputs declared by the faculty and its equivalent dissemination through presentation and publication implies that faculties have the sufficient knowledge and competencies needed to conduct and publish research papers but they do not put this knowledge into practice.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the foregoing findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are made.

First is the use the existing faculty strengths and encourage active researchers to take on new research activities as an unconventional alternative that the Colegio must adopt by using several mechanisms. In addition, provide an effective mentoring model that will be feasible and applicable to all faculty members. Another recommendation is to provide financial support from administration to encourage more researchers in the Colegio.

Furthermore, support and encouragement must be extended to boost the research capability of the faculty researchers. Facilities and equipment that are needed in the conduct of research must be provided to motivate further research involvement of faculty. It is also recommended to tap government and other research agencies to further incentivize faculty's research efforts and revisit trainings on research based on the needs of the faculty

Finally, conduct an in-depth analysis on research productivity in order to find out its link to research productivity.

REFERENCES

Abramo, G., & Angelo, C. A. D. (2013). The relationship among research productivity, research collaboration, and their determinants, *11*(2017), 1016–1030. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.09.007

Arvizu, D. E., Droegemeier, K. K., Abbott, M. R., Sciences, A., Bassler, B. L., Benbow, C. P., … Agarwal, N. K. (2014). The Idea of a University: Rethinking the Malaysian Context. *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management*, *4*(03), 1650024. https://doi.org/10.1080/10438599.2014.988501

Bai, L. (2010). Enhancing Research Productivity of TEFL Academics in China.

Bok, D. (2003), Universities in the marketplace. Princeton: Princeton

Burisch, R., & Wohlgemuth, V. (2016). Journal of Innovation

Conceptual paper Blind spots of dynamic capabilities: A systems theoretic perspective. *Suma de Negocios*, *1*(2), 109–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2016.01.015

Cassidy, F. D. (2009). Developing Operational Definition of Effectiveness for University Based Research Centers. *Dissertation*, (May).

E. Bay Jr., B., & C. Clerigo, M. E. (2013). Factors Associated with Research Productivity among Oral Healthcare Educators in an Asian University. *International Education Studies*, *6*(8), 124–135. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n8p124

Good Practice Guide: What is good practice in the development of research capability? (2012).

Goodall, A. H., Mcdowell, J. M., Singell, L. D., Goodall, A. H., Mcdowell, J. M., & Singell, L. D. (2014). Leadership and the Research Productivity of University Departments, (7903).

Golden, J., & Carstensen, F. V. (1992). Academic research productivity, department size and organization. Economics of Education Review, 11(2), 153-160. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0272-7757(92)90005-N

Horodnic, I. A., & Zaiţ, A. (2015). Motivation and research productivity in a university system undergoing transition. *Research Evaluation*, *24*(3), 282–292. https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvv010

Horowitz, R., & Potter, L. (2013). Recommendations for Fostering Research Productivity and Creating a Research Culture at the University of Texas at San Antonio Committee members: Recommendations for Fostering Research Productivity and Creating a Research Culture at the University of Texa.

Hystra, A. (2014). University Research Management: Developing Research in New Institutions, (April), 12–16.

Jancic, R. (2015). Teachers' Capability -Related Subjective Theories in Teaching and Learning Relations, (March).

Jung, J. (2012). Faculty Research Productivity in Hong Kong across Academic Discipline, *2*(4), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v2n4p1

Kawulich, B. (2009). The role of theory in research. *Teaching Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, 37–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2001.10779034

Kelly Hall. (2011). University Research Centers: Heuristic Categories, Issues and Administrative Strategies. *Journal of Research Administration*, *42*(2), 25–41.

Kotrlik, J. W., Bartlett, II, J. E., Higgins, C. C., & Williams, H. A. (2002). Factors Associated With Research Productivity Of Agricultural Education Faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *43*(3), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2002.03001

Kumar, V. (2017). The role of university research centers in promoting research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *45*(4), 453–458. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-016-0496-3

Mallon, W. T. (2006). The benefits and challenges of Research Centres and Institutes in Academic Medicine: Findings from six universities and their Medical Schools. *Academic Medicine*, *6*, 502–512.

Mary Spor. (2013). KSU Research Capability. *Kentucky State University*.

Na Wichian, S., Wongwanich, S., & Bowarnkitiwong, S. (2009). Factors affecting research productivity of faculty members in government universities: LISREL and Neural Network analyses. *Kasetsart Journal - Social Sciences*, *30*(1), 67–78.

Nonaka, I. (2011). Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation. *Zeitschrift Fur Naturforschung - Section B Journal of Chemical Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1515/znb-1961-1011

Nuqui, A. V., & Cruz, R. C. (2012). Determinants of Faculty Research Productivity in Augustinian Higher Education Institutions in Luzon. *IAMURE International Journal of Education*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.7718/iamure.ije.v3i1.191

Okendo, O. evans. (2018). Constraints of Research Productivity in Universities in Tanzania, *6*(3), 201–210.

Pati, P. (2014). Indonesian Foreign School Teachers' Perception And Capability To Undertake Classroom Action Research : Basis For Capability Building Program, *4*(1), 67–89.

Pisano, G. P. (2015). A Normative Theory of Dynamic Capabilities: Connecting Strategy, Know-How, and Competition. *HBS Working Paper 16-036*, 42. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2667018

Postiglione, G. (2011). Establishing a research university: The case of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. In P. G. Altbach & J. Salmi (Eds.), The road to academic excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities. Washington DC: World Bank.

Quimbo, M. A. T., & Sulabo, E. C. (2014). Research productivity and its policy implications in higher education institutions. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39*(10), 1955–1971. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.818639

QS-Asian University Rankings. (2012). Asian University rankings 2005-2012. Retrieved from http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/asian-university-rankings/2012

Robeyns, I. (2005). The Capability Approach: a theoretical survey. *Journal of Human Development*, *6*(1), 93–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/146498805200034266

Robeyns, I. (2006). Three Models of Education: Rights, Capabilities and Human Capital. *Theory and Research in Education*, *4*(1), 69–84. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878506

Rose Marie Salazar-Clemeña, S. A. A.-A. (2007). Developing Research Culture in Philippine Higher Education Institutions: Perspectives of University Faculty. *UNESCO On Higher Education and Knowledge*, (September).

Sahoo, B. K., Singh, R., Mishra, B., & Sankaran, K. (2015). RSahoo, B. K., Singh, R., Mishra, B., & Sankaran, K. (2015). Research productivity in management schools of India: A directional benefit- of-doubt model analysis. Omega, 0–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2016.02.004esearch productivity in management. *Omega*, 0–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2016.02.004

Santos, G., Cristina, M., Veiga, M., Alberto, C., Melo, F. De, Maria, T., … Gomes, S. (1994). Functions of basic research centers and applied research centers, (1), 10004.

Streete, T., Henry, M., Ivey, P., & Oliver, G. (2013). A case study on the state of research management in the Caribbean.

Thompson, A. K., & Dawson, D. (2016). Growing Your Own: Building Research Capability in Challenging Times, (September)