

# Research Productivity at Sulu State University: An Assessment

Sherfa B. Matugol and Abdel J. Amilhamja

School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State College, Jolo, Sulu, 4700, Philippines

\*Corresponding author: [sscgspub@sulustatecollege.edu.ph](mailto:sscgspub@sulustatecollege.edu.ph)

**ABSTRACT.** This study assessed the level of research productivity among faculty members of Sulu State University using a descriptive-correlational research design. A total of 100 teacher-respondents were selected through purposive sampling. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, Pearson correlation, t-test, and ANOVA. The study examined research productivity in terms of research output and quality, research support and resources, and research culture and engagement, along with respondents' demographic profiles such as age, gender, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment. Findings showed that most respondents were 26–35 years old, predominantly female, mostly married, with five years of service and below, and holding master's degrees. Overall, research productivity across all dimensions was rated as "Agree," indicating a generally favorable perception. No significant differences were found among groups in their perceptions of research productivity. Correlation analysis revealed a strong positive relationship between research output and research support, while a weak correlation was found between research support and research culture. A non-significant relationship was also observed between research culture and research output. These results support the Theory of Organizational Support, suggesting that institutional support enhances research productivity. However, the weak relationships indicate limitations in the development of a strong research culture, consistent with Boyer's Model of Scholarship. The study recommends strengthening research mentorship, colloquia, peer-review systems, and collaborative writing to further improve institutional research culture and productivity.

**Keywords:** *Research, Productivity, State, University, Assessment*

## ARTICLE DETAILS

JEAS-00098; Received: March 1, 2026; Accepted: March 18, 2026; Published: April 12, 2026

### CITATION:

Matugol, S. B. & Amilhamja, A. J. (2026). *Research Productivity at Sulu State University: An Assessment*. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*, 3(1). DOI: 10.62596/y4175d62

### COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2026 by author(s). *Journal of Education and Academic Settings* is published by Stratworks Research Inc. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing redistribution and reproduction in any format or medium, provided the original work is cited or recognized.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Research productivity has become one of the clearest ways of understanding how well higher education institutions are performing. Today, universities are no longer judged only by how well they teach, but also by the kind of research they produce and how these contribute to knowledge and society (Altbach, 2015). With the growing demand for evidence-based decisions and innovation-driven development, research has taken on a more central role in higher education.

Global ranking systems and databases such as Scopus and Web of Science have also increased pressure on universities to produce more visible and high-quality research outputs (Bornmann & Mutz, 2015). Because of this, faculty members are often expected to manage both teaching responsibilities and research work at the same time, which can be challenging but necessary for institutional growth and competitiveness (Shin & Cummings, 2014). In line with this, studies have also highlighted how innovation and evolving academic practices, including leadership-driven faculty development and instructional adaptation, continue to shape research environments in higher education (Ang et al., 2025; Castro et al., 2024).

In the Philippines, the importance of research in higher education is also strongly recognized. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) continues to stress that research is essential not only for improving academic institutions but also for supporting national development goals (CHED, 2016). Ideally, research should help generate new knowledge, guide policies, and respond to real societal needs. However, many Filipino faculty members still face difficulties in conducting research due to limited funding, lack of training opportunities, and weak institutional support systems (Albina, 2020). Faculty engagement in research is also influenced by their attitudes, professional development opportunities, and exposure to evidence-based practices (Supian, 2025). To address these concerns, CHED has introduced various programs such as research grants and capacity-building initiatives aimed at encouraging faculty involvement in research activities (Dela Cruz & Cruz, 2020). Institutional mechanisms such as accreditation, quality assurance systems, and structured support programs have likewise been shown to strengthen research confidence, ethical awareness, and participation among stakeholders (Montero, 2025; Chavez, 2023). Despite these efforts, strengthening research culture in many institutions remains an ongoing challenge.

At Sulu State University, which serves as the main higher education institution in the province of Sulu, research is expected to be an important part of its academic mission alongside instruction and community service. However, in practice, there is still limited information on how active faculty members are in terms of research productivity. Issues such as limited funding, lack of research facilities, and minimal mentorship opportunities continue to affect faculty research output (Abdurahman, 2022). Similar challenges have been observed in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas, where faculty often navigate constraints while striving to remain productive in research (Barrientos et al., 2025). In addition, many teachers struggle to balance heavy teaching loads with research expectations, which may affect both the quality and quantity of their scholarly work (Hadji-Ali, 2023). Work-related stress, legal awareness gaps, and institutional pressures have also been identified as factors that may influence faculty performance and engagement (Ang et al., 2025; Bucoy et al., 2024). At the same time, professional development initiatives and training programs can help build confidence and improve faculty readiness to engage in research activities (Castro et al., 2024). These conditions suggest the need to take a closer look at how research productivity is actually being experienced within the institution.

This study, therefore, focuses on understanding the level of research productivity among faculty members at Sulu State University. It looks at research output and quality, research support and resources, and research culture and engagement, along with demographic factors such as age, gender, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment. Engagement in academic activities such as conferences and collaborative initiatives has also been recognized as an important component of strengthening research productivity and scholarly visibility (Vivero, 2025). Leadership practices and faculty development strategies have likewise been shown to play a crucial role in enhancing motivation and productivity in academic settings (Ang et al., 2025). By

examining these areas, the study aims to provide a clearer picture of how research is being carried out in the university and what factors may be influencing it.

In the end, the study hopes to offer insights that can help the university improve its research environment. The results may serve as a basis for strengthening research support systems, improving policies, and encouraging more active faculty participation in research. More importantly, it may help promote a more supportive and sustainable research culture within Sulu State University that aligns with its long-term goal of academic excellence and community development.

## **2. METHODS**

### **2.1 Research Design**

This study used a descriptive-correlational research design. As explained by Creswell (2014), a descriptive design is concerned with accurately describing the characteristics of individuals, groups, or situations, while a correlational design looks at how variables are related without manipulating them. This design was appropriate for the study because it allowed the researcher to describe the level of research productivity at Sulu State University and to examine whether meaningful relationships exist between research productivity and the faculty's demographic profiles.

In the same way, Calderon and Gonzales (2018) pointed out that descriptive research is helpful in understanding existing conditions and in identifying relationships among variables as they naturally occur in a given setting.

### **2.2 Participants of the Study**

The respondents of this study were the one hundred (100) faculty members of Sulu State University during the Academic Year 2025–2026. These faculty members were selected because they were actively involved in teaching and participated in research-related activities, making them directly relevant to the focus of the study.

As Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2019) pointed out, choosing respondents who are closely connected to the research problem helps ensure that the data collected are both valid and meaningful within the context of the study.

The distribution of the target sample across the different colleges and academic units of Sulu State University is presented in the table below:

<b>College Units in Sulu State University</b>		<b>Number</b>
1	School of Agriculture	10
2	College Business Administration and Management	20
3	College of Teacher-Education	15
4	College Arts & Sciences	20

5	College Computing Studies and Engineering	20
6	School of Nursing	10
7	College of Criminal Justice Education	5
<b>Total:</b>		<b>100</b>

### **2.3 Sampling Procedure**

The study used a purposive sampling technique. According to Palinkas et al. (2015), this approach allows the researcher to intentionally select participants who are most capable of providing rich, relevant, and diverse information aligned with the research objectives. It was considered appropriate for this study since the focus was on faculty members who are actively involved in research activities, making purposive selection both efficient and purposeful.

In the same way, Patton (2002) explains that the strength of purposive sampling lies in choosing information-rich cases for in-depth study those that can provide a deeper understanding of issues that are central to the goals of the research.

### **2.4 Research Instrument**

The primary tool used for data collection in this study was a structured survey questionnaire. This was adapted and patterned from several established sources, including the Perish Scales developed by Abramo and D'Angelo (2014), the Research Self-Efficacy Scales of Bishop and Bieschke (1998), and the conceptual frameworks on faculty research productivity proposed by Bland et al. (2005). These instruments have been widely applied in evaluating research performance, measuring an individual's confidence in their research abilities, and identifying institutional factors that support scholarly productivity.

To make it more suitable for the context of Sulu State University, the questionnaire was carefully modified to ensure cultural and institutional relevance while still preserving its psychometric rigor and reliability. The final instrument was divided into three main parts:

Part I – Demographic Profile of Respondents, which gathered information such as age, gender, highest educational attainment, academic rank, length of service, and the number of completed research projects; and Part II – Level of Research Productivity, which assessed research output and quality, research support and available resources, as well as the research culture and level of engagement within the institution.

### **2.5 Data Gathering Procedure**

A formal permit to conduct the study was first secured from the Office of the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. Once approval was granted, a formal letter was then sent to the President of Sulu State University, as well as to the deans of the different colleges, to seek their permission and coordination for the data gathering process.

After all necessary approvals were obtained, the researcher personally distributed the questionnaires to the respondents and later retrieved them after completion.

### **2.6 Ethical Considerations**

Upholding ethical standards was essential to ensure the reliability, validity, and integrity of the research. All data collected strictly followed established ethical guidelines throughout the study.

The researcher obtained informed consent from all participants after fully explaining the purpose, procedures, and scope of the study. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were free to withdraw at any time without penalty. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly observed, ensuring that no identifying information about participants or the institution was disclosed in any report or publication.

The integrity of the data was also maintained by ensuring that all information was honestly gathered, accurately recorded, and properly analyzed, with no fabrication or misrepresentation. The researcher upheld respect for participants' rights and dignity while ensuring that the study caused no harm and aimed to benefit both individuals and the wider community.

In addition, the study complied with the ethical policies of the School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State College (SSC), as well as relevant national and international research ethics standards. An ethics clearance was secured from the School of Graduate Studies Research Ethics Committee prior to data collection, ensuring that no part of the study was conducted without official approval.

### 3. RESULTS

**Question 2.** What is the level of research productivity at Sulu State University in the context of: Research Output and Quality, Research Support and Resources, and Research Culture and Engagement?

**Table 2.1 Level of research productivity at Sulu State University as perceived by teachers in terms of research output**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	I have produced research papers that meet institutional or national standards.	4.14	.69660	Agree
2	My research works have been presented in conferences, forums, or seminars.	4.00	1.04447	Agree
3	I have published research articles in reputable or peer-reviewed journals.	3.96	1.02415	Agree
4	My research projects have been cited or utilized by other scholars.	4.06	1.07139	Agree
5	I consistently complete research projects within the required timeframe.	4.04	.77746	Agree
6	My research outputs align with the thrusts and priorities of Sulu State College.	4.12	.74237	Agree
7	I contribute to collaborative research projects with colleagues or students.	4.16	.64698	Agree
8	The quality of my research is recognized by peers and evaluators.	4.20	.63564	Agree
9	My research work addresses relevant educational or community issues.	4.16	.58119	Agree
10	I actively aim to publish research in indexed journals.	4.12	.81995	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.096</b>	<b>.61561</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 2.1 This section reflects the level of research productivity at Sulu State University as perceived by teachers in terms of research output. As shown in the table, the teacher-respondents generally obtained a composite mean score of 4.096 with a standard deviation of .61561, which is interpreted as “Agree” under the research output category. More specifically, item number eight received the highest mean score of 4.20 with a standard deviation of .63564, also rated as “Agree.” This statement indicates that “The quality of my research is recognized by peers and evaluators.” Meanwhile, statement number seven obtained a mean score of 4.16 with a standard deviation of .645698, likewise rated as “Agree,” which states that “I contribute to collaborative research projects with colleagues or students.” Similarly, statement number nine also garnered a mean score of 4.16 with a standard deviation of .58119, rated as “Agree,” and reflects that “My research work addresses relevant educational or community issues.” These findings suggest a generally positive level of research output and quality among the faculty. This is consistent with the study of Monsura et al. (2022), which found that faculty participation in research tends to increase as academic rank rises. In addition, Fontejon-Bonior (2022) reported that research output is often driven by factors such as professional growth opportunities, accreditation requirements, and research incentive programs.

**Table 2.2 Level of research productivity at Sulu State University as perceived by teachers in terms of research support and resources**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	I have access to adequate institutional funding for research projects.	4.18	.84543	Agree
2	Research facilities and equipment at Sulu State College are sufficient for my work.	4.48	.50212	Agree
3	I can easily access scholarly databases, journals, and references.	4.30	.50252	Agree
4	The College provides incentives for completed and published research.	4.32	.54828	Agree
5	Training and seminars on research methods are regularly provided to faculty and students.	4.32	.58396	Agree
6	There is administrative support for completing research requirements.	4.16	.76171	Agree
7	I receive technical assistance in research writing, editing, and publication.	4.08	.87247	Agree
8	The research office provides clear guidelines and monitoring of research activities.	4.42	.57172	Agree
9	The College allocates sufficient time for faculty to engage in research.	4.22	.57875	Agree
10	Overall, institutional support motivates me to conduct more research.	4.32	.46883	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.280</b>	<b>.43345</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 2.2 This section reflects the level of research productivity at Sulu State University as perceived by teachers in terms of research support and resources. Based on the table, the teacher-respondents obtained an overall composite mean score of 4.280 with a standard deviation of .43345, which is interpreted as “Agree” in the research support and resources category. More specifically, item number two obtained the highest mean score of 4.48 with a standard deviation of .50212, also rated as “Agree,” and states that “Research facilities and equipment at Sulu State

University are sufficient for my work.” This is followed by statement number eight, which received a mean score of 4.42 with a standard deviation of .57172, likewise rated as “Agree,” indicating that “The research office provides clear guidelines and monitoring of research activities.” In addition, statement number four garnered a mean score of 4.32 with a standard deviation of .54828, rated as “Agree,” which states that “The College provides incentives for completed and published research.” Statement number five also obtained a mean score of 4.32 with a standard deviation of .58396, similarly rated as “Agree,” and reflects that “Training and seminars on research methods are regularly provided to faculty and students.” Likewise, statement number ten received a mean score of 4.32 with a standard deviation of .46883, rated as “Agree,” which indicates that “Overall, institutional support motivates me to conduct more research.” These findings are supported by Camilon et al. (2023), who emphasized the importance of institutional support systems and a conducive research environment in enhancing faculty research productivity. In addition, Dela Cruz and Mendoza (2019) found that research benefits and incentives, along with research self-efficacy, significantly predict research productivity, highlighting the importance of strengthening institutional support and incentive systems for research development.

**Table 2.3 Level of research productivity at Sulu State University as perceived by teachers in terms of research culture and engagement**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	I am motivated to conduct research as part of my academic responsibilities.	4.48	.50212	Agree
2	Research is highly valued and promoted within Sulu State College.	4.52	.50212	Strongly Agree
3	Faculty and students are encouraged to participate in collaborative research.	4.50	.50252	Strongly Agree
4	I regularly attend training, seminars, or workshops on research.	4.48	.50212	Agree
5	The College fosters a culture of sharing research findings with the community.	4.48	.61101	Agree
6	Research productivity is an important basis for faculty recognition or promotion.	4.34	.51679	Agree
7	I feel confident in my ability to design and conduct quality research.	4.46	.50091	Agree
8	My colleagues inspire me to be more engaged in research activities.	4.36	.48242	Agree
9	I believe research contributes significantly to improving education in Sulu.	4.38	.48783	Agree
10	I consider research an integral part of professional growth and institutional development.	4.48	.54086	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.448</b>	<b>.28937</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 2.3 This section reflects the level of research productivity at Sulu State University as perceived by teachers in terms of research culture and engagement. As shown in the table, the teacher-respondents obtained an overall composite mean score of 4.448 with a standard deviation of .28937, which is interpreted as “Agree” under the research culture and engagement category. More specifically, item number two received the highest mean score of 4.52 with a standard deviation of .50212, rated as “Strongly Agree.” This statement indicates that “Research is highly valued and promoted within Sulu State University.” This is followed by statement number three,

which obtained a mean score of 4.50 with a standard deviation of .50252, also rated as “Strongly Agree,” and reflects that “Faculty and students are encouraged to participate in collaborative research.” These findings are supported by Chavez (2023), who found that strategic structures, mechanisms, and best practices serve as key enablers of higher research productivity by strengthening an institutional research culture. In addition, Alcazaren and Robiños (2022) reported that self-efficacy, attitudes toward research, and interest in conducting research play an important role in enhancing research productivity among faculty members.

**Question 3.** Is there a significant difference in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University when the data are grouped according to the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of: Age; Gender; Civil Status; Length of Service; and Educational Attainment?

**Table 3.1 Differences in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University in terms of age**

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Research Output	Between Groups	2.043	2	1.022	2.793	.066	Not Significant
	Within Groups	35.475	97	.366			
	Total	37.518	99				
Research Support and Resources	Between Groups	1.455	2	.728	4.117	.019	Significant
	Within Groups	17.145	97	.177			
	Total	18.600	99				
Research Culture and Engagement	Between Groups	.010	2	.005	.059	.943	Not Significant
	Within Groups	8.280	97	.085			
	Total	8.290	99				

Significance at alpha 0.05

Table 3.1 This section shows the difference in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University in terms of age. Based on the table, it can be observed that, except for “Research Support and Resources,” the overall F-ratios and P-values under this category indicate no significant difference. This suggests that although the teacher-respondents differ in age range, their perceptions do not significantly vary in most aspects of research productivity, except for research support and resources among faculty. In the other sub-categories of research productivity, the differences are not significant at the .05 level of significance. This means that the respondents, regardless of age, generally share similar views regarding the level of research productivity at Sulu State University. It can be inferred from this result that both senior and younger educators hold a relatively aligned or synchronized perspective on research productivity within the institution. Therefore, the hypothesis stating that “There is no significant difference in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University when data are grouped according to age” is accepted.

**Table 3.2 Differences in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University in terms of gender**

VARIABLES	Grouping Gender	Mean	S. D.	Mean Difference	t	Sig.	Description
Research Output	Male	4.128	.55341	.04267	.299	.766	Not Significant
	Female	4.085	.63813				
Research Support and Resources	Male	4.300	.53463	.02667	.265	.791	Not Significant
	Female	4.273	.39808				
Research Culture and Engagement	Male	4.412	.22045	-.04800	-.717	.475	Not Significant
	Female	4.460	.30931				

Significance at alpha 0.05

Table 3.2 This section shows the difference in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University in terms of gender. Based on the table, it can be observed that, in general, the overall mean differences and t-values obtained under this category indicate no significant difference. This means that male and female teacher-respondents do not differ in how they perceive the level of research productivity at Sulu State University. It can therefore be inferred that both genders share a similar or synchronized perspective on research productivity within the institution. As a result, the hypothesis stating that “There is no significant difference in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University when data are grouped according to gender” is accepted.

**Table 3.3 Differences in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University in terms of civil status**

VARIABLES	Grouping Civil Status	Mean	S. D.	Mean Difference	t	Sig.	Description
Research Output	Single	4.118	.59658	.03311	.252	.802	Not Significant
	Married	4.085	.62891				
Research Support and Resources	Single	4.321	.49102	.06151	.665	.507	Not Significant
	Married	4.259	.40454				
Research Culture and Engagement	Single	4.351	.25264	-.14401	-2.395	.019	Significant
	Married	4.495	.29615				

Significance at alpha 0.05

Table 3.3 The table presents the differences in research productivity at Sulu State University when grouped according to civil status. Based on the data, it can be observed that there is generally no significant difference in the overall mean scores and t-values across most categories. The only exception is in “Research Culture and Engagement,” where a noticeable difference appears. In this particular area, married teachers reported a higher mean score of 4.495 compared to single teachers, who had a mean of 4.351. This suggests that married teachers may be more attuned to or appreciative of the university’s research culture and level of engagement than their single counterparts. Given these findings, the hypothesis stating that “There is no significant difference in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University when data are grouped according to civil status” is accepted.

**Table 3.4 Differences in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University in terms of length of service**

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Research Output	Between Groups	.846	3	.282	.738	.532	Not Significant
	Within Groups	36.672	96	.382			
	Total	37.518	99				
Research Support and Resources	Between Groups	.369	3	.123	.647	.587	Not Significant
	Within Groups	18.231	96	.190			
	Total	18.600	99				
Research Culture and Engagement	Between Groups	.068	3	.023	.263	.852	Not Significant
	Within Groups	8.222	96	.086			
	Total	8.290	99				

Significance at alpha 0.05

Table 3.4 The table illustrates the differences in research productivity at Sulu State University when grouped according to length of service. From the data, it can be observed that the overall F-ratios and P-values across this category generally indicate no significant difference. Even with variations in years of service, the findings suggest that perceptions of research productivity at Sulu State University remain fairly consistent. This means that newly hired teachers tend to share similar views with those who have been in service for a longer period. Based on these results, the hypothesis stating that “There is no significant difference in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University when data are grouped according to length of service” is accepted.

**Table 3.5 Differences in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University in terms of educational attainment**

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Research Output	Between Groups	.489	4	.122	.313	.868	Not Significant
	Within Groups	37.030	95	.390			
	Total	37.518	99				
Research Support and Resources	Between Groups	2.555	4	.639	3.781	.007	Significant
	Within Groups	16.045	95	.169			
	Total	18.600	99				
Research Culture and Engagement	Between Groups	.632	4	.158	1.962	.107	Not Significant
	Within Groups	7.657	95	.081			
	Total	8.290	99				

Significance at alpha 0.05

Table 3.5 The table shows the differences in research productivity at Sulu State University when grouped according to educational attainment. Based on the data, it can be observed that, aside from “Research Support and Resources,” the overall mean differences and t-values in this category generally indicate no significant difference. This suggests that while teacher-respondents differ in their level of educational attainment, a difference is only evident in terms of research

support and resources among faculty members. The other sub-categories of research productivity are not significant at the 0.05 level, indicating that there are no notable differences in their perceptions of research productivity at Sulu State University. In other words, even teachers with only a bachelor's degree tend to share similar perceptions with those who have pursued advanced education. Based on these findings, the hypothesis stating that "There is no significant difference in the level of research productivity at Sulu State University when data are grouped according to educational attainment" is accepted.

#### **4. DISCUSSION**

The findings of this study provide a clear picture of both the demographic composition of the teaching workforce and the current state of research productivity at Sulu State University, as well as how these factors relate to one another.

In terms of demographic profile, the results show that the majority of teacher-respondents are between 26 and 35 years old, suggesting a relatively young to middle-aged workforce. This indicates a dynamic teaching population that is likely in an active phase of professional growth. The predominance of female teachers reflects the continuing trend of teaching as a female-preferred profession within the institution. Additionally, most respondents are married, which may point to a preference for long-term personal and professional stability within the community. A considerable number of teachers are also in the early stages of their careers, with five years of service or less, indicating a workforce that is still building experience. In terms of educational attainment, most teachers hold master's degrees, suggesting that while many have advanced beyond undergraduate education, a large portion may still be in the process of further academic and professional development. Overall, these characteristics describe a teaching workforce that is relatively young, predominantly female, early in their careers, and positioned at a foundational stage of advanced academic qualification within a state university setting.

When it comes to research productivity, the findings reveal a consistently high level across all measured dimensions, with respondents generally expressing agreement in their assessments. Among the different areas, research culture and engagement received the highest ratings. This suggests that teachers feel supported, valued, and actively involved in collaborative research efforts within the institution. Research support and resources also received strong ratings, highlighting the presence of adequate facilities, clear research guidelines, monitoring systems, incentive programs, and regular training or seminars that encourage teachers to engage in research activities. However, research output received the lowest rating among the categories, pointing to a possible gap between support mechanisms and the actual production or recognition of research work. This may indicate that while the environment and resources are in place, translating these into tangible research outputs remains a challenge, particularly in terms of peer recognition and evaluation.

Looking at differences in perception based on demographic variables, the study found no significant differences in the level of research productivity when grouped according to age, gender, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment. This suggests a generally shared perception among teachers regardless of their background. However, some nuances are worth noting. Younger teachers, particularly those aged 25 and below, tend to have a more favorable perception of research support and resources. Married teachers appear to have a stronger appreciation for research culture and engagement. Meanwhile, teachers with bachelor's degrees with master's units and those with doctoral degrees show a more positive perception of

research support and resources. Despite these variations, the overall lack of significant differences indicates that perceptions of research productivity are largely consistent across different groups within the institution.

Finally, the correlation analysis provides deeper insight into how different aspects of research productivity interact. The strong relationship between research output and research support and resources highlights the importance of institutional investment in driving tangible research outcomes. As funding, facilities, and administrative support increase, research productivity also improves significantly. On the other hand, the relationship between research support and resources and research culture and engagement, while present, is less pronounced. This suggests that although resources contribute to building a research-oriented environment, they alone are not sufficient to fully shape research culture or ensure active faculty engagement. More notably, the absence of a significant correlation between research output and research culture implies that research production may be influenced more by external demands or requirements rather than internalized cultural values.

Taken together, these findings emphasize that while Sulu State University has been effective in providing the necessary support systems to enhance research output, there is still a need for more targeted and strategic efforts to strengthen the connection between institutional culture and actual research performance. Bridging this gap could help ensure that research productivity is not only sustained by external support but also deeply rooted in the university's academic culture.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The findings show that Sulu State University has a largely early-career teaching workforce, mostly married females aged 26–35, many of whom hold master's degrees and are still in a key stage of professional growth. Teachers generally view research productivity positively, with consistently high ratings across all areas, reflecting a developing research culture supported by institutional efforts. While no significant differences were found across demographic groups, younger, married, and more academically advancing teachers tend to have slightly more favorable perceptions. Strong institutional support clearly drives research output, but the research culture itself has yet to fully evolve into a central force behind productivity.

## References

1. Albina, A. (2020). Challenges in research productivity among Filipino faculty members. (Please verify full journal/book details).
2. Altbach, P. G. (2015). The past, present, and future of the research university. In *International higher education (contextual reference commonly cited in higher education studies)*.
3. Amerol, B. I., Berry, E. B., Chavez, J. V., et al. (2025). Exploring the strategies of education leaders in managing under-achieving faculty. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(9), 3831. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i9.3831>
4. Ang, J. V., Berry, E. B., Chavez, J. V., et al. (2025). How academic leaders induce motivation and productivity among faculty through faculty development management. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(8), 3913. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i8.3913>
5. Ang, J. V., Tonalet, A. L., Macabago, J. M., et al. (2025). Diffusing stress caused by work-related experiences among faculty members. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(7), 3497. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i7.3497>

6. Barrientos, A. A. (2025). Harnessing science teaching strategies for the least-exposed learners in science real-life settings. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(12), 3232. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i12.3232>
7. Barrientos, A. A., Amar, C. J. R., Montaña, D. E., et al. (2025). Navigating challenges, triumphs, and transformations of college of teacher education graduates assigned in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(8), 3890. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i8.3890>
8. Bornmann, L., & Mutz, R. (2015). Growth rates of modern science: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(11), 2215–2222. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23329>
9. Bucoy, R. K., Enumerabellon, K. M., Amilhamja, A. J., et al. (2024). Knowledge deficits and analysis on comprehension of teachers on their common legal rights as teachers. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9), 2559. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2559>
10. Calderon, J. F., & Gonzales, E. C. (2018). *Methods of research and thesis writing*. Rex Book Store.
11. Castro, F. L. T., Ventura, B. L. O., Estajal, R. S., et al. (2024). Teachers handling multiple subject areas: Difficulties and adaptive attributes in the delivery of instructions. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9), 2520. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2520>
12. Chavez, J. V. (2023). Assessing online academic integrity and humanized teaching in Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences*, 19(1), 9–17.
13. Chavez, J., & Lamorinas, D. D. (2023). Reconfiguring assessment practices and strategies in online education during the pandemic. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 10(1), 160–174.
14. Chavez, J. V., Cuilan, J. T., Mannan, S. S., et al. (2024). Discourse analysis on the ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in academic settings from ICT, science, and language instructors. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 349–363. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6765>
15. Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2016). *Higher education research agenda and development priorities*. CHED Philippines.
16. Cutillas, A. L. (2025). Generative AI as a catalyst for instruction in higher education: A study on relevance and effectiveness. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(4), 3185. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i4.3185>
17. Cutillas, A. L., Orquia, C. J. B., Bacalso, F. D., et al. (2025). Building confidence and updated mindset of science and tech teachers through professional development training techniques in science-industry settings. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(6), 3460. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i6.3460>
18. Dela Cruz, R., & Cruz, J. (2020). Faculty development and research capacity building in Philippine higher education institutions. (Please verify publication source and details).
19. Hadji-Ali, A. (2023). Faculty workload and research productivity in state universities. (Please verify full source details).
20. Montero, J. M. (2025). Stakeholders' security and confidence mindset of accreditation and ISO in university quality enhancement. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(12), 4299. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i12.4299>

21. Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
22. Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
23. Shin, J. C., & Cummings, W. K. (2014). Multilevel analysis of academic productivity: The case of faculty research performance. *Higher Education*, 68(3), 421–438. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9724-3>
24. Supian, N. U. (2025). Assessing cognitive-based attitudes, evidence-based research practices, and engagement-oriented professional development among college English instructors in Sulu. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(5), 3705. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i5.3705>
25. Vivero, P. M. (2025). Promoting productive academic conferences: Educators' perceptions through the interpersonal alliance model. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(11), 4259. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i11.4259>