

Research Capabilities of International Tourism and Hospitality Management Faculty Members

by: Rechiel R. Abarquez
Janzell A. Palbacal

ABSTRACT

This study ascertained the research competencies of the faculty members of College of International Tourism and Hospitality Management (CITHM) with an overall aim of serving as basis to enhance their capabilities. This study is conducted in support to the results of the training needs assessment done by the Human Resource and Development Office. Specifically, this research identified the level of competency of faculty researchers in writing a research paper, level of satisfaction to the facilities/resources provided by the institution and to propose recommendations for the enhancement of research capabilities of CITHM faculty members. This research utilized the descriptive survey method using a standardized instrument. Results showed that the respondents were moderately competent in terms of the technical aspect in conducting research however they need competence in analyzing the methods to be use concerning data gathering. In addition, the respondents are satisfied to the facilities and resources offered by the university. The researcher recommended that appropriate trainings and workshops concerning research organization and methodology must be given to faculty researchers in order to enhance their research capability. Also, linkages and collaboration with research organizations must also be strengthened to sustain research publications and presentations.

Keywords: Research Capability, Training Needs, Research Writing, Hospitality, Tourism

I. INTRODUCTION

The conduct of research most specifically in the higher educational institutions has always been vital in generating new knowledge and discoveries in order to achieve an even higher quality in the educational system. It is a contributing factor for the develop-

ment of the society and an essential tool in becoming at par with the latest trend in our globalized world.

Research being one of the tri-focal functions of a university requires individuals capable enough in producing quality researches that would substantiate academic achievement and excellence. Research capability means the ability of individuals, organizations and systems to undertake and disseminate high quality research effectively and efficiently (DFID's Research Strategy 2008-2013).

Lyceum of the Philippines University (LPU) – Batangas aims to be a recognized university in the Asia Pacific Region by 2022. In this regard, the university is encouraging its faculty members to engage themselves in the conduct of research as part of their academic function. It is imperative that professors must be familiar and skilled in research so that they can impart the same viewpoint to the students towards this field.

Moreover, since research has always been part of the competencies of higher education, LPU particularly the College of International Tourism and Hospitality Management is of no exception in broadening avenues for learning. The link between the current trends and practical applications is of paramount importance thus requiring hospitality and tourism faculty members in being research oriented in the event that the same will reflect to its graduates who will soon be instruments of the industry in solving managerial or operational problems in their field.

The management, through the Training Needs Assessment program of the Human Resource Department, provides training and seminar to the faculty for them to be familiarized with the concepts and practices on the conduct of research. This is done in cooperation with the Research & Statistics Center who also is geared towards research excellence by means of research dissemination through linkages and international presentations.

Furthermore, as urgent is the demand for the faculty to be more research oriented, initially there is also a need to assess their capability to accomplish a specific study. Therefore this research aims to serve as the basis in planning for the enhancement of the research capability of the College of International Tourism & Hospitality Management faculty members.

Research capacity building as described by Trostle (2003), is the process of development which produces increased levels of skills to perform high quality research in individuals, teams or organizations. Building research capacity is being recognized internationally as important in order to produce a sound evidence base for decision-making in policy and practice.

In a study conducted by Lazzarini et. al (2013) in measuring the research capacity

in podiatry within Queensland Health, the findings indicated that podiatrists rated their overall individual skills at performing most aspects of research at a low level. In contrast, podiatrists rated the overall research skills and culture provided by their organization to be of a high level if they chose to initiate research.

This was supported by factors that would motivate researchers in the conduct of their paper. Payer (2012) pointed out that participants most commonly reported a desire to develop skills, increase job satisfaction, and address identified problems. Other factors reported by more than half of the participants included a desire to keep their brain stimulated or advance their career, as well as enablers such as links to universities and the availability of mentors.

Crisp et al, (2004) suggests that capacity can be sustained by applying skills to practice. This gives us some insight about where we might look for measures of sustainability. It could include enabling opportunities to extend skills and experience, and may link into the concept of a career escalator.

A study made by Whitworth (2012) suggests that high level support from professional and strategic research managers will facilitate greatest culture change through the legitimization of research practices in the workplace, identification of mechanisms for supporting individuals and/or teams, and the leadership required for sustainability.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study determined the research competencies of the faculty of College of International Tourism and Hospitality Management. Specifically, this study aimed to determine the respondents' level of competency in writing a research paper in terms of technical aspects, major and other parts of research paper; determine the level of satisfaction on the facilities/resources provided by the institution to enhance the research competencies and recommend for the formulation of an enhanced research program exclusively designed for CITHM.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research utilized the descriptive survey method using a standardized instrument. The survey method is used to describe the status of the research capabilities of the faculty members of College of International Tourism & Hospitality Management. The participants of this research were the 30 faculty members of College of International Tourism & Hospitality Management. The faculty members were both new and regular faculty researchers.

Questionnaire was used as the main data gathering instrument. The questionnaire has two parts. The first, determined the level of competency of the respondents on the components of research and the second part determined the respondent's satisfaction on the resources/facilities available. The standard instrument was validated by the university statistician. The researcher adopted the questionnaire from the previous research about research capabilities of university faculty and student of other colleges. After distribution to the respondents, the researcher retrieved 100% of the questionnaire from the total number of respondents. The data gathered were encoded, tallied, interpreted and analyzed using SPSS version 17. Weighted mean was used to determine the competence of faculty in terms of technical aspect, major and other parts of the research paper.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1
Competence of Faculty Researchers in terms of the
Technical Aspect of Research Writing

| Items | WM | VI | Rank |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------|------|
| 1. research paper format | 3.23 | Moderately Competent | 3 |
| 2. grammar and sentence construction | 3.27 | Moderately Competent | 1.5 |
| 3. research organization | 3.13 | Moderately Competent | 4 |
| 4. communication skills (in writing and the conduct of research data gathering, interviews, etc.) | 3.27 | Moderately Competent | 1.5 |
| Composite Mean | 3.23 | Moderately Competent | |

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 = Highly Competent; 3.50 – 4.49 = Competent; 2.50 – 3.49 = Moderately Competent; 1.50 – 2.49 = Less Competent; 1.00 – 1.49 = Not Competent

Table 1 presents the component of competence of the researchers in terms of technical aspect. It was viewed that the over-all assessment was moderately competent with a composite mean of 3.23. Among the items enumerated, the faculty researchers' competence in grammar and sentence construction and their communication skills in writing and the conduct of research data gathering, interviews, etc both obtained the weighted mean of 3.27

The quality of the research paper relies not only on results and the effectivity of its action plan but more so in the presentation of the paper through correct grammar and sentence construction given that nowadays researches are encouraged for publications locally and internationally. It is imperative that papers for presentation must be grammatically correct. In this regard, the respondents, given the fact that language and communication were not really their specialization, they must undergo trainings that will enhance their competency in this field.

Also, the faculty researchers were moderately competent in terms of research format and organization with the weighted mean scores of 3.23 and 3.13, ranking 3rd and 4th respectively. Researchers must be familiarized on the APA publishable format of researches which is now being accepted worldwide in the academe industry. One way to meet the vision of the school to be globally competitive is for the researchers to be confident in their respective field thus adapting to the latest trend of research conduct.

Table 2
Competence of Faculty Researchers in Doing the Major Parts of Research Paper

| Major Parts of Research Paper | WM | VI | Rank |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| Introduction | | | |
| 1. writing an introduction | 3.17 | Moderately Competent | 2 |
| 2. creating research problem | 3.13 | Moderately Competent | 3 |
| 3. formulating theoretical / conceptual paradigm | 2.97 | Moderately Competent | 5 |
| 4. formulating hypothesis | 3.10 | Moderately Competent | 4 |
| 5. conceptualizing research literature | 3.30 | Moderately Competent | 1 |
| 6. sources of literature review | 2.83 | Moderately Competent | 6 |
| Composite Mean | 3.08 | Moderately Competent | |
| Methods | | | |
| 1. develop research design | 2.83 | Moderately Competent | 5 |
| 2. data collection | 3.13 | Moderately Competent | 2 |
| 3. data entry (coding and cleaning) | 3.20 | Moderately Competent | 1 |
| 4. sampling/ sample framework | 2.93 | Moderately Competent | 3 |
| 5. constructing questionnaires | 2.87 | Moderately Competent | 4 |
| 6. statistical tools / treatment | 2.73 | Moderately Competent | 7 |
| 7. wording and ordering of questions | 2.80 | Moderately Competent | 6 |
| Composite Mean | 2.93 | Moderately Competent | |
| Results and Discussion | | | |
| 1. presentation of data gathered | 3.27 | Moderately Competent | 1 |
| 2. interpretation / analysis of results | 3.10 | Moderately Competent | 2 |
| 3. correlate literature to affirm results | 3.00 | Moderately Competent | 3 |
| Composite Mean | 3.12 | Moderately Competent | |
| Conclusion / Recommendation | | | |
| 1. synthesizing results | 3.07 | Moderately Competent | 2 |
| 2. expressing additional value or importance to the existing facts | 3.00 | Moderately Competent | 3 |
| 3. formulating recommendations to address the research problem and concerns found in the study | 3.17 | Moderately Competent | 1 |
| Composite Mean | 3.08 | Moderately Competent | |
| Over-all Composite Mean | 3.05 | Moderately Competent | |

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 = Highly Competent; 3.50 – 4.49 = Competent; 2.50 – 3.49 = Moderately Competent; 1.50 – 2.49 = Less Competent; 1.00 – 1.49 = Not Competent

Table 2 presents the competency of the faculty researchers in doing the major parts of the research paper where they are moderately competent as denoted by the over-all composite mean score of 3.05.

As to the introductory part of the research paper, the item for conceptualizing research literature ranked first in contradiction to finding their sources of literatures which got the lowest rank. The faculty members find it hard to look for literatures whereas if they do find those that are related to their study they can identify and conceptualize which can be of contribution for their paper. In this regard, the researchers must be aware of the sources where they can get related studies specially those available in the online academic journals.

However, concerning methodology, faculty members regard themselves as moderately competent in data entry while they encounter difficulties on what statistical treatment or tools they will be using as denoted by the lowest weighted mean of 2.73. In light of this difficulty, the Research & Statistics Center continue to provide trainings and lectures concerning statistical tools. Researchers on the other hand are welcome to visit the department anytime for consultation with statisticians.

In respect to the results and discussion, the faculty members were found to be moderately competent in presentation of data gathered. This is because they are finding it hard to correlate their literatures in affirming the results of the study which got the lowest rank with a weighted mean of 3.00. It is necessary that results of the data gathered must be interpreted along with supporting literatures whose findings were related or can be of proof why their own study gleaned the almost the same results.

Finally, on the conclusion and recommendation part, faculty researchers are moderately competent in formulating recommendations to address the problems and concerns found in the study with the weighted mean score of 3.17.

To sum it up, among the items mentioned above, faculty researchers are moderately competent with the least weighted mean score of 2.93 on methods.

Table 3 shows the competence of the faculty researchers, where they are moderately competent in doing other parts of the research paper with over-all composite mean of 3.14. In the doing the abstract, outlining the results and discussion of the study got the highest weighted mean of 3.20 followed by summarizing conclusion and recommendations of the study. The researchers deemed to have difficulty in using the abstract format which got the least weighted mean of 2.87. Abstracts come in short version those depending on the number of words required and the extended abstract which were sometimes used for publications in refereed journals. Still, researchers are in need to be

familiarized when it comes to abstract format.

Table 3
Competence of the Faculty Researchers in Doing the Other Parts of Research Paper

| Other Parts of Research Paper | WM | VI | |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Abstract | | | |
| 1. clearly stating the research focus | 3.00 | Moderately Competent | 3.5 |
| 2. summarizing the research methods used | 3.00 | Moderately Competent | 3.5 |
| 3. outlining the results and discussion of the study | 3.20 | Moderately Competent | 1 |
| 4. summarizing conclusion and recommendations of the study | 3.13 | Moderately Competent | 2 |
| 5. using the abstract format | 2.87 | Moderately Competent | 5 |
| Composite Mean | 3.04 | Moderately Competent | |
| References | | | |
| 1. presentation / format of references | 3.45 | Moderately Competent | 1 |
| 2. accessing of available and updated materials | 3.03 | Moderately Competent | 2 |
| Composite Mean | 3.24 | Moderately Competent | |
| Over-all Composite Mean | 3.14 | Moderately Competent | |

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 = Highly Competent; 3.50 – 4.49 = Competent; 2.50 – 3.49 = Moderately Competent; 1.50 – 2.49 = Less Competent; 1.00 – 1.49 = Not Competent

Contradictory to the researchers' confusion in the abstract format they are moderately competent when it comes to presentation / format of references as indicated by the weighted mean score of 3.45.

It can be viewed from Table 4 that the respondents are satisfied from the services being rendered by the university with the composite mean of 3.11. The item that ranked first is the journals, books and other materials. This is due to the vast and accessible resources that the university provides, given the online journals and books available in the SLRC. Second to rank is the budget for research which obtained 3.27 weighted mean. In the present time, honorariums are being rewarded to researchers if a certain paper was completed. The university also provides incentives for those published researches in refereed journals giving more motivations on the part of the faculty researcher. This was followed by the item that ranked third which is the availability of computer units for research. The Research & Statistics Center offers computer units for encoding and research purposes. In addition, the department also has a WiFi connection that makes it easier for the researchers to browse and look for related literatures using their own laptops.

Table 4
Level of Satisfaction on the Facilities / Resources

| Facilities / Resources | WM | VI | Rank |
|---|-------------|------------------|------|
| 1. computer units for research purposes | 3.23 | Satisfied | 3 |
| 2. journals, books and other materials | 3.33 | Satisfied | 1 |
| 3. installed e-journals (i.e Academic One-File, etc.) | 3.20 | Satisfied | 4.5 |
| 4. training area for in-house / small seminars | 3.00 | Satisfied | 13.5 |
| 5. IiP trainings in research | 3.03 | Satisfied | 11 |
| 6. internet access | 3.10 | Satisfied | 7 |
| 7. laboratories for experimental research | 2.87 | Satisfied | 15 |
| 8. services of the statistician | 3.03 | Satisfied | 11 |
| 9. services of editor / grammarian | 3.03 | Satisfied | 11 |
| 10. services of referee / reader | 3.07 | Satisfied | 8.5 |
| 11. consultation services of adviser (Dean, Research Committee, Research staff / COREB) | 3.07 | Satisfied | 8.5 |
| 12. publications of college / institutional research journals | 3.00 | Satisfied | 13.5 |
| 13. budget for research publications | 3.17 | Satisfied | 6 |
| 14. budget for writing a research | 3.27 | Satisfied | 2 |
| 15. budget for seminars and fora | 3.20 | Satisfied | 4.5 |
| Composite Mean | 3.11 | Satisfied | |

Legend: 3.50-4.00 = Highly Satisfied; 2.50 - 3.49 = Satisfied; 1.50 - 2.49 = Less Satisfied;
1.00 - 1.49 = Not Satisfied

However, the item for training areas for research seminars and lectures got the weighted mean of 3.00 same as the publication for college and institutional research journals. Though these items were really not neglected by the university through allotted venues and rooms like the multi-media center for lecture concerns and research incentives and honorariums for research publication, the university still, needs to motivate the researchers for them to improve their research involvement. The least weighted mean score of 2.87 is the availability of laboratories for experimental research. Still, this is point for improvement.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the analysis of data, the respondents were moderately competent in terms of the technical aspect in conducting research however they need more skills and background knowledge in terms of research writing organization. The respondents seem to need competency in analyzing the methods to be use concerning data gathering as well as formulation of research objectives and creating introduction. In the level of satisfaction on the facilities/resources, the respondents were satisfied to the facilities and resources offered by the university, nevertheless, they need more assistance in terms of budget for publication and venues for trainings and seminars particularly laboratories for experimental researches.

It is hereby recommended that trainings/workshops concerning research writing organization must be given to faculty researchers. There must be an in-depth lecture and mentoring provided for the researchers when it comes to methodology and statistical assistance. Linkages and collaborations with external research coordinating body must be strengthened to sustain publications and presentations. Also, the university must allot additional budget for international publications.

REFERENCE

- Cooke, J. (2005). A framework to evaluate research capacity in health care. Trent Research and Development Unit. The University of Sheffield. Portobello, Sheffield, UK.
- Crisp BR, Swerissen H, Duckett SJ (2007). Four approaches to capacity building in health: consequences for measurement and accountability. *Health Promotion International* 15:99-107.
- Farmer E, Weston K: A (2002). conceptual model for capacity building in Australian primary health care research. *Australian Family Physician* 31:1139-1142.
- Fenton, F. Et.al (2001) Reflections from organization science of primary health care networks. *Family Practice* 8:540-544.
- Griffiths F, Wild A, Harvey J, Fenton E. (2004). The productivity of primary care research networks. *British Journal of General Practice* 50:913-915.
- Holden L, Pager S, Golenko X, Ware RS (2012). Validation of the research capacity and culture (RCC) tool: measuring RCC at individual, team and organization levels. *Aust J Prim Health* 18:62-67.
- Hurst: Building a research conscious workforce. (2003). *Journal of Health Organization and management* 17:373-384.
- Jowett S, Macleod J, Wilson S, Hobbs F. (2000). Research in Primary Care: extent of involvement and perceived determinants among practitioners for one English region. *British Journal of General Practice* 50:387-389.
- Lazzarini et al. (2013). *Journal of Foot and Ankle Research*, <http://www.jfootankleres.com/content/6/1/1>

- Meyrick J, Sinkler P. An evaluation Resource for Healthy Living Centers. London, Health Education Authority; 2002
- Pager, S. et. al (2012). Dove Press Journal: Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare
- Patel, V. (2003). How has healthcare research performance been assessed?: a systematic review. *J R Soc Med* 104:251–261.
- Raghunath AS, Innes A (2004). The case of multidisciplinary research in primary care. *Primary Care Research and Development* 5:265-273.
- Smith, R. (2011). Measuring the social impact of research. *BMJ* 323:528.
- Trostle J (2003). Research capacity building and international health: definitions, evaluations and strategies for success. *Soc Sci Med* 35:1321–1324.
- Whitworth et al. (2012). *BMC Health Services Research* 12:287 <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6963/12/287>