The Influence of Pay as a Motivator on the Research Productivity of Educators

Virginia D. Natividad-Franco
Bulacan State University

Maybelle N. Dela Cruz
Bulacan State University

Research is one of a university's primary functions. This study aimed to determine the influence of pay as a motivator on the research productivity of educators. It utilized a mixed-methods research design. The respondents are 150 faculty members randomly selected during the 1st semester of the SY 2022-2023. It used a validated survey instrument. The results show a 0.279 weakly positive correlation between the two variables. The computed t-value for this predictor exceeds the 95% confidence interval of (.492, 1.735) by a significant margin of p=0.001, hence the researchers reject the null hypothesis, which states that pay as a motivator significantly does not influence research productivity. For the qualitative phase, the emerging themes include the issues and problems regarding research productivity including lack of time due to work overload, lack of knowledge in research writing, tedious procedures in the research approval, and lack of work motivation/encouragement. Thus, the researchers crafted recommendations that could help enhance faculty members' research productivity.

Keywords: motivation, pay, research, research productivity, educators

INTRODUCTION

A university is a higher education institution that provides facilities for teaching-learning, research, extension service, and academic degrees (Iroaganachi & Izuagbe, 2018). University campuses aren't only places for students to get their degrees; they're also places where researchers may conduct a study, share their findings, and encourage new ideas to spread throughout society (Ibidapo-Obe, 2012). Research is one of its primary functions. Hence, the university endeavors to research knowledge generation and are responsive to the community's immediate needs. The systematic process of gathering and evaluating data to improve human comprehension of the phenomena being studied is called research (Basilio & Bueno, 2019). Likewise, Pamatpat & Subillaga (2016) quoted that the expansion of knowledge's frontiers is greatly aided by research. Hence everyone in academia is dynamically involved in this academic endeavor. Thus, higher education institutions in the Philippines have been reminded of their primary role in knowledge creation and dissemination. According to this concept, the duty and function of conducting research and associated academic inquiries across various fields should be addressed. Moreover, the foundational prerequisite for program accreditation and university rank leveling is research. However, information on the research productivity of educators at state universities and colleges in the Philippines was quite scant.

(Cocal et al., 2017). Research Productivity, as defined by Sridhar et al. (2010 as cited in Aljiha & Majdob, 2017), is the volume of published scholarly books and peer-reviewed academic journals.

In a state university like Bulacan State University, ten percent of the time spent by instructors is spent on research. In comparison, those with professor status spend fifty percent of their time on research and outreach initiatives. Although teaching is the primary responsibility of a faculty member, the value of research to the institution cannot be overstated. All universities worldwide do research and publish the results of their research (Cocal et al., 2017). Similarly, Quimbo and Sulado (2014) found several policy implications for universities, including the necessity of better research productivity and collaboration, a solid faculty development program, and a fair incentive structure for promoting and enhancing the research culture in universities. Research productivity is becoming increasingly important to higher education institutions and individual students since it has become a global trend. Developing countries, such as China, have recognized the importance of research and have made significant investments in the growth of academic research in their educational institutions (Tang & Chamberlain, 2003, cited in Mala & Canencia, 2021). However, state colleges and universities need to foster a stronger research culture due to the poor research productivity in these institutions. It assures that faculty members' principal duties, along with instruction and extended activities, including conducting research (Almonte-Acosta, 2007; Cocal et al., 2017).

As Uzonna (2013) stated, one of the most important roles of management is to support workers in making their job more fun and rewarding and link their motivation with the company's aims. Motivation is a complicated concept that encompasses many needs, drives, aspirations, wishes, and other influences that influence everyone's conduct (Alalade & Oguntodu, 2015). Governments worldwide aim to motivate employees, improve leadership abilities and boost the quality of public services by implementing performance pay programs (Wenzel et al., 2019). Enhancing the research productivity of each educator is one of the main objectives of the research management office of Bulacan State University. Encouraging educators to do research despite their tremendous workloads requires a driving force to achieve its goals. It is, therefore, necessary to determine the motivating factors, problems, and issues in research to impart research productivity in the university.

Furthermore, the following questions were addressed by this research:

1. How may the contingent and variable pay of the educators be described?
2. What is the current state of university educators' research productivity?
3. Do pay as a motivator significantly influence the research productivity of an educator?
4. What are educators' problems and issues regarding research productivity?

Hypothesis: *Pay as a motivator does not influence the research productivity of educators.*

PAY AS A MOTIVATOR

Azar and Shafighi (2013) contend that motives are what propel all living things, including people, to move. When someone experiences this motivation, their likelihood of keeping their word and approaching their activity with seriousness and passion increases. One of the factors influencing businesses' success is the presence of high levels of motivational factors. Increasing employee motivation results in better human resources and increased organizational performance. Because it can alter and increase employee performance, motivation is crucial and required in both government and non-government organizations (Aarabi et al., 2013). The bounds and types of an activity are established by motivational variables, which are the internal and external driving forces that prompt someone to engage in it. It is unclear if motivation has an impact on how well people perform at work. Research indicates a connection between motivation and effectiveness (Robescu & Iancu, 2016). According to Horváthová et al., (2012), creating an efficient, motivating, equitable, and transparent system of employee remuneration in a specific organization is one of the most difficult challenges that managers or personnel officers must successfully manage. Contingent pay refers to compensation that is determined by an individual's performance, contribution, skill, and abilities, as well as by the success of their team or company (Armstrong, 2009; Horváthová et al.,2012). It

also describes any type of monetary benefit that is tied to an employee's performance, abilities, competence, and contributions to the company and is given in cash as a bonus or added to the regular salary (Allison et al., 2020). Contingent pay can be added to basic income or given as a one-time cash bonus. Contingent payment comprises payments that are based on a person's performance, talent, competence, and skills, as well as the performance of the entire team or company. Njanja et al. (2013), stated that contingency payments are used by businesses to compensate staff for achieving and exceeding goals. The level of performance or the employee's position within the company determines the amount of the contingency payment. In addition, it may depend on each employee's level of expertise, professionalism, and skill (Armstrong, 2012). Likewise, the variable payment is the payment that takes into account each employee's performance, with the understanding that when performance goals are met and exceeded, compensation will likewise rise above the standard base income. Heneman (2020) asserts that a technique known as variable remuneration rewards employees for their accomplishments in the industry.

According to Robescu & Iancu (2016), team incentives have a considerably greater impact on performance than individual rewards. Moreso, Bussin & Van Rooy (2014) stated that higher education institutions will benefit from complete rewards that encourage organizational engagement by sustaining high satisfaction and enhancing performance. Similarly, Rack et al. (2011) found that the assertiveness of the group members influenced the effects of team-based rewards on performance. They likewise found that team-based rewards promote more cooperative and goal-oriented communication. Furthermore, equally distributed incentives resulted in an overall higher level of pay satisfaction than evenly distributed rewards. Every business wants to outperform its competitors, maintain a competitive advantage within the market, and increase its market value. Hence, motivated employees are more productive than demotivated ones because they can work harder to meet their goals. Employees should be encouraged to give their all to the company to achieve their desired goals (Setiawan et al., 2021). Though, employee motivation isn't just influenced by salary, contrary to Herzberg's assertion, according to research by Jalagat (2016). His findings showed that, rather than being linear, the link between job happiness, job performance, and motivation is circular. Although this is not always the case, there is a link between greater job satisfaction and increased productivity when these two qualities are related to group performance. It implies that workers shouldn't be kept apart but rather given chances and encouragement to collaborate on projects that benefit the company as a whole. Moreover, it satisfies their fundamental psychological need for competence, research is typically conducted by intrinsically driven individuals since it makes them feel inherently satisfied. The researcher's intrinsic motivation is not supported by productivity and incentive mechanisms. The researchers are at the center of the framework for developing research incentive programs. This method helps create a research atmosphere that fosters independence, creativity, adaptability, and innovation, which leads to a successful research output that depends on the ability to maintain researchers' intrinsic motivation (Masinde & Coetzee, 2021). Every organization, especially those in the government sector, faces significant difficulties in carrying out everyday activities in the modern, dynamic business environment. They rely on their most important resources, their personnel, and the managers' capacity to foster an environment that is stimulating for them. Employee motivation is essential since, according to research, it increases performance and productivity (Bakker & Albrecht, 2018).

RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY

The Philippines, a nation in the Third World, has a culture of research in a variety of fields (Mirasol & Inovejas: 2017; Mbaleka: 2015). The National Higher Education Research Agenda II (NHERA II) is the second stage of the Philippine education research strategy from 2009 to 2018. It seeks to increase the research capacity and output of higher education institutions (HEIs) to have a substantial impact on various fields of higher education research (Guido & Orleans, 2020). Universities are regarded as contemporary knowledge producers and engines for entrepreneurship. Academicians can obtain better tenure and pay packages by publishing their research. Teachers at universities have thought that research and instruction go hand in hand (Iqbal & Mahmood, 2011). Teaching and research are equally crucial for university professors, according to Cresswell (1986). Faculty members who have a track record of excellence or

integrity in their research are frequently looked up to by other academics and students as being at the forefront of their field and well-versed in the majority of its issues. These professors are seen as more effective teachers and frequently act as a model for more younger professors or other individuals creating their research agenda (Levine, 1997). It is their job to devote equal time to both activities because engaging in research immediately enhances the quality of their instruction. The advancement of general knowledge depends on research, which also helps academicians better understand themselves and their abilities. Research also helps academicians properly comprehend their field of study, which is essential for efficient teaching. The vast majority of discoveries are created through research in the higher education environment, according to Dill (1986 as cited in Bassey et al., 2007), who also asserted that, recently, the priority for research in universities seems to be focused on productivity. Research productivity includes writing books, and chapters, collecting and analyzing original data, and working on dissertations and class projects with graduate students. Grants for research, editorial work, getting patents and licensing, writing monographs, creating experimental designs, creating works of art or creativity, and taking part in public debates are among the class projects (as cited in Iqbal & Mahmood, 2011). The study by Henry et al. (2020) used a logistic regression model to assess academic staff research productivity and found that personal, environmental, management, and behavioral factors all impacted that productivity. There is currently no accepted metric to evaluate an institution's research productivity. However, scholarly publications are frequently used to gauge an institution's output and are acknowledged on a global scale as a means of advancing social and knowledge economies.

According to Daniel's (2020) research, there is a correlation between incentives and productivity. However, one of the most crucial ways to encourage employees is to involve them in activities that will improve organizational effectiveness in addition to financial incentives. An organization cannot run without its support. The report recommends setting up a unit to look at the issue of incentives that will boost output. When department directors of agriculture and extension education were asked to rate the significance of 13 elements in the evaluation of professors, Radhakrishna and Jackson (1993) found that publishing in refereed journals was ranked as the most significant component. Economic indicators, the regional focus of many social science research studies, funding, individual researcher traits, and the nation's epistemic culture of knowledge production have all been used to explain poor research productivity. However, it is hoped that the government's reforms, particularly those in higher education, would improve the environment for research and, as a result, increase research productivity soon (Vinluan, 2012).

METHODOLOGY

The study made use of mixed-methods research. In a single study, mixed-methods research combines qualitative and quantitative data (Halcomb and Hickman, 2015, as cited in Natividad-Franco & Dela Cruz, 2021). Mixed methods provide an integrated, comprehensive view of the topic under inquiry by utilizing the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative procedures while addressing their weaknesses. (Scammon *et al*., 2013, as cited in Natividad-Franco & Dela Cruz, 2021). According to Molla (2019), quantitative research studies concentrate on specific queries or hypotheses that hold throughout the study. Standardized statistical techniques are used to conduct the analysis. Furthermore, the qualitative approach collects in-depth data regarding a specific topic. This approach, unlike the quantitative approach, is predicated on the notion that one person may speak for the opinions of a group of people (Rahi, 2017). Qualitative data typically has open-ended questions rather than predetermined answers. Mixed-methods research is used to combine qualitative and quantitative data into a single study.

The 150 regular faculty members at Bulacan State University in the Philippines who were chosen at random during the first semester of the academic year 2021–2022 are the focus of the study. The Influence of Contingent Pay and Variable Pay on Employees' Performance in Public Tertiary Institutions study by Allison et al. (2020) served as the basis for the validated instrument that was used in this study. The tool has a Cronbach alpha of .91. A Cronbach's alpha value of 0.7 and above indicates the scale's internal consistency (Surucu & Maslakci, 2020). The responses to the question of whether pay serves as a motivator were *strongly agreed* (5), *agree* (4), *neutral* (3), *disagree* (2), and *strongly disagree* (1). The questionnaire

was sent via messenger, assessing the influence of pay as a motivator on the research productivity of educators. The researchers sent a letter to the respective administrators attached to the survey questionnaire asking permission to participate in the study voluntarily. The accomplished survey instruments were checked, classified, tallied, tabulated, analyzed, and processed based on the research design earlier stated. The data were tabulated using Microsoft excel. The following descriptive statistics were utilized: frequency, percentage, and mean. ANOVA and Simple Linear Regression were used to assess the influence of pay as a motivator on the research productivity of educators. On the other side, the thematic method was used to evaluate the qualitative data. First, interview transcripts were read, and key phrases were extracted and categorized to form the initial codes. Lastly, the final themes were presented.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Particular criteria must be met to be eligible for an additional payout. According to Shield (2007), contingent payment offers a way for a company to specify and set performance standards and expectations. The foundation of contingent compensation is the relationship between the financial reward offered and each employee's performance, contribution, competency, or talents, as well as those of a team or an entire business (Havathova et al., 2012).

TABLE 1
CONTINGENT PAY AS A MOTIVATOR

Indicators	**Mean**	**Descriptive Rating**
The performances of teams are rewarded based on the skill set of the members of the teams/groups.	4.08	Agree
The team reward in place in my organization is flexible because better performance attracts better rewards	4.15	Agree
The abilities of the team members in my firm are essential because the bonus they receive considers it.	4.08	Agree
There is a bonus attached to a team that performs well in my organization.	3.90	Agree
The overall contribution of a team to the organization is taken note of while rewarding.	4.05	Agree
Weighted Mean	**4.06**	**Agree**

Strongly Agree 4.-21 – 5.00, Agree 3.41 – 4.20, Neutral 2.61-3.40, Disagree 1.81-2.60, Strongly Disagree 1.00-1.81

As can be gleaned from table 1, *the institution has flexible team awards, according to the faculty, because higher performance is rewarded* (4.15), and the minor indicator got a mean of 3.90 *which states that a successful team in the organization comes with a bonus.* Furthermore, contingent pay as a motivator got a weighted mean of 4.06. According to Robescu & Iancu (2016), team incentives have a considerably greater impact on performance than individual rewards. Bussin & Van Rooy (2014) stated that higher education institutions will benefit from complete rewards that encourage organizational engagement by sustaining high satisfaction and enhancing performance. Similarly, Rack et al. (2011) found that the assertiveness of the group members influenced the effects of team-based rewards on performance. They likewise found that team-based rewards promote more cooperative and goal-oriented communication. Furthermore, equally distributed incentives resulted in an overall higher level of pay satisfaction than evenly distributed rewards.

Table 2 presents the variable payment as a motivator. The variable payment is the payment that takes into account each individual's performance, with the understanding that if performance goals are fulfilled and exceeded, salaries will likewise rise above the minimum wage. Variable pay is offered as a bonus,

commission, or incentive to employees who achieve their objectives. Furthermore, cash payments made to individuals in the form of bonuses or performance pay based on their performance or that of your team or business are known as variable pay. (Armstrong & Murlis, 2007, as cited in Allison).

TABLE 2
VARIABLE PAY AS A MOTIVATOR

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating
People in my organization do not receive the same pay as it varies based on performance	3.72	Agree
My organization's reward is flexible in that it depends on individual skill-set.	3.88	Agree
The better people's performance in my workplace, the greater the reward they are likely to receive	3.90	Agree
The performance of employees is not considered rewarding in my organization.	3.19	Agree
Everybody is paid according to what they are supposed to receive, irrespective of their performance.	3.62	Agree
Weighted Mean	**3.67**	**Agree**

Strongly Agree 4.-21 – 5.00, Agree 3.41 – 4.20, Neutral 2.61-3.40, Disagree 1.81-2.60, Strongly Disagree 1.00-1.81

Regarding the variable pay, *these educators agreed that the bigger the incentive people are likely to receive at work, the better their performance is at work* (3.90), and the *least believed that a firm rewards employee performance* (3.19). This was rated as agree with a weighted mean of 3.67. Every business wants to outperform its competitors, maintain a competitive advantage within the market, and increase its market value. Hence, motivated employees are more productive than demotivated ones because they can work harder to meet their goals. Employees should be encouraged to give their all to the company to achieve their desired goals (Setiawan et al., 2021).

In creating a ranking and rating system for the Higher Education sector, research productivity is a crucial component (Henry et al., 2020). Writing books and chapters, collecting and analyzing original data, working with graduate students on dissertations and class projects, securing research grants, handling editorial responsibilities, securing patents and licenses, writing monographs, developing experimental designs, creating works of art or creativity, and engaging in public discourse are all examples of research productivity (Cresswell, 1986 as cited in Iqbal, 2011).

TABLE 3
RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY OF EDUCATORS

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating
How often do you publish the following research (textbooks)?	2.14	Rare
How often do you publish the following research (chapter in textbooks)?	2.00	Rare
How often do you publish the following research (co-author in textbooks)?	2.30	Rare
How often do you publish the following research (Patent and Certified invention)?	1.78	Rare
How often do you publish the following research (monograph)?	1.82	Rare
How often do you publish the following research (occasional papers)?	2.01	Rare

How often do you publish the following research (articles in learned journals)?	2.30	Rare
How often do you publish the following research (scientific peer-reviewed bulletin)?	2.03	Rare
How often do you publish the following research (conference papers)?	2.32	Rare
How often do you publish the following research (working papers)?	2.39	Rare
Weighted Mean	**2.11**	**Rare**

Always 4.-21 – 5.00, Frequently 3.41 – 4.20, Often 2.61-3.40, Rare 1.81-2.60, None 1.00-1.81

The faculty members' research productivity is depicted in the table as relatively low because they produce infrequently across the board. *The faculty members rarely published working papers with a mean of* 2.39, *likewise in publishing research in patent and certified invention* (1.78). The weighted mean of their research productivity is 2.11, interpreted as rare, which indicates that academic members are not producing much research. It is likewise due to their dual obligations of teaching and service, all faculty members in higher education struggle with finding enough time for research (Toews & Yazedjian, 2007). According to Bland et al. (2006), dedicating enough time to research is linked to higher research production. Conversely, a lack of time during the academic year is the biggest hindrance to research output, followed by a heavy teaching load.

TABLE 4
LIMITATIONS TO RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY AS PERCEIVED BY EDUCATORS

Indicators	**Mean**	**Descriptive Rating**
I find it challenging to locate the most appropriate information resource in my university library catalog	3.24	Often
Too many information resources are presented on the internet	3.28	Often
Lack of knowledge of search techniques to retrieve information s to retrieve information resources	2.96	Often
Financial constraints	3.56	Frequently
Too much time necessary to locate and retrieve the needed information	3.45	Frequently
Searching for relevant materials is expensive	3.41	Frequently
I retrieve records with high recall and low precision	3.16	Often
Weighted Mean	**3.30**	**Often**

Always 4.-21 – 5.00, Frequently 3.41 – 4.20, Often 2.61-3.40, Rare 1.81-2.60, None 1.00-1.81

Faculty members discussed how budgetary constraints are frequently the cause of their research productivity limitations (3.56). They recover records with great recall and low precision, which is the flimsiest defense (3.16). The weighted mean for the indicated restrictions was 3.30, and they were frequently perceived as such. Oringo & Muia (2016) cited that research productivity is also impacted by academic members' low morale, which is brought on by their subpar compensation as a result of funding constraints. Low morale among academic members in the subsector is frequently attributed to factors like the higher education system's downsizing efforts, which include retrenchments and other staff reductions Hence, universities should create rules and procedures that encourage the hiring of highly qualified and motivated individuals. There is evidence from numerous studies indicating there is a connection between research productivity and pay. While lowering the likelihood that active academics would leave for other institutions, higher wages may attract productive faculty.

Pay as a Motivator of Educators' Research Productivity

This research's main objective was to determine if there is a possible influence of pay as a motivator toward research productivity. In doing this, certain variables must be prepared to fit the assumptions of the regression test.

Scoring Mechanism

First, it is understood that the researchers used a descriptive method of measuring the preliminary variables. Thus, a scoring mechanism was done to convert the descriptive ratings to numerical (interval) ratings. Second, the predictor variable, pay as a motivator, was computed using the summation of the two existing variables, contingent pay and variable pay, and getting the average of the two summations, that is,

Computation of the Pay as a Motivator Variable

$$PM = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{5} a_i + \sum_{i=1}^{5} b_i\right) \quad (1)$$

whereas *PM* stands for pay as a motivator.

On the other hand, the 17 items under research productivity were assigned equal weights for it to become an interval variable ranging up to 100, which is the highest possible productivity score. To compute for the score, the assigned weight[1] is multiplied to the summation of the ratings in the items, that is,

Computation of the Research Productivity Score

$$RP = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{17} a_i * AW\right) \quad (2)$$

whereas *RP* stands for research productivity and *AW* stands for assigned weight.

Validation of Assumptions

After the computations needed to convert the descriptive ratings to numerical (interval) ratings, the researchers validated the assumptions of the simple linear regression test. One of the important assumptions was the independence of observations, which was computed using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test. Before this assumption, the linearity, homoscedasticity, and normality assumptions were already validated. Results show a significant F-value of 12.541 under $F(1,148)$ degrees of freedom with a p-value of 0.001. Since the probability of the variables not being independent is less than 1%, the researchers proceeded to the next test.

ANOVA [a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
1.	Regression	2123.410	1	2123.410	12.541	.001[b]
	Residual	25059.018	148	169.318		
	Total	27182.427	149			

a. Dependent Variable: Research Productivity
b. Predictors: (Constant), Pay as a Motivator (Average)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.279[a]	.078	.072	13.01221	.078	12.541	1	148	.001

a. Predictors: (Constant), Pay as a Motivator (Average)

Simple Linear Regression

The regression test results reveal a weak positive correlation of 0.279 between the two variables. Moreover, the linear model's money as a motivator variable barely explains 7.8% of the total variance, according to the R-square, suggesting that it may not be a strong linear predictor of research output. This value can be further lowered to 7.2%.

Following that, it says in the model that for every unit increase in pay, research productivity is likely to increase by 1.114 units. Furthermore, since the computed t-value for this predictor exceeds the 95% confidence interval of (.492, 1.735) by a significant margin of p=0.001the researchers come to the conclusion that pays as a motivator has a considerable influence on research productivity, thus, rejecting the null hypothesis. However, there is an added note that the current model for research productivity is weak and needs further study to identify additional predictors that would strengthen its predictive power.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	30.473	6.164		4.943	.000	18.292	42.655
	Pay as a Motivator (Average)	1.114	.314	.279	3.541	.001	.492	1.735

a. Dependent Variable: Research Productivity

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES REGARDING RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY

Lack of Motivation

Herzberg (1959, as cited in Bakthavatchaalam, 2019) defined motivation as a function of both skill and opportunity in his highly regarded writings, remarking that a person feels motivated when given a chance to exhibit his ability. As stated by these educators, they lack the motivation to do research for some of them do not appreciate the current system for research incentives. They said the research writing job is quite hard, yet the compensation is not sufficient. Likewise, fellow teachers said, to follow the dictum of Adam Smith. "there is no such thing as free lunch," meaning in every economic activity engagement or involvement one should receive appropriate compensation. In addition, harmonious superior-subordinate relationships also are being encouraged to work.

Lack of Scientific Knowledge in Writing Research

Being literate requires the ability to write, and school success, job, and career advancement all depend on writing ability (Williams & Beam, 2019). Although writing is not a general skill, it is a pattern of behaviors that, when used in conjunction with various knowledge domains and learning situations, can have positive effects on knowing and thinking (Klein & Boscolo, 2016). Similarly, to be literate in writing research requires the ability to write. A researcher must learn the basics of academic writing scientifically. According to these educators, you cannot teach, what you do not know, and yet you cannot write if you don't know about writing a research paper.

Lack of Time Due to Work Overload

As mentioned by Ombati et al. (2019), one of the occupations where the workforce struggles with a severe workload is teaching. Overworked lecturers have negative impacts on both the employer and the employee. Likewise, the duties of a basic lecturer include giving lectures, seminars, and assessing students' coursework, scheduling and marking exams, doing personal research projects, writing up research and preparing it for publication, supervising students' research activities, and continuously developing and implementing new ways of teaching to reflect changes in research professional-development initiatives;

showcasing a company at trade shows and seminars. Faculty members stated that they cannot research because they lack the time for it due to heavy workloads, such as teaching and administrative work.

Tedious Process of the Research Approval

Some educators cited the tedious process of research approval. It took them a long before they can proceed with their research proposals which often cause them not to continue for their enthusiasm is lessen. The long process of approving a proposal made their chosen topics obsolete, thus making the research no longer new.

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS TO ENHANCE RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY

Work Environment

According to educators in universities, it would be easy for them to produce more research outputs if they will have a better work environment. Similarly, Massoudi & Hamdi (2017) stated that the amount of an employee's motivation, subsequent performance, and productivity may be solely influenced by the work environment. The degree of inventiveness and teamwork that employee exhibits, their level of absenteeism, and eventually how long they stay in their position are all influenced by how well they get along with the company

Removal/Reduction of Tax Rate for the Research Incentives

The faculty members in the university are urging for the removal/reduction of the tax rate from the research incentives. They stated that the incentives they got from their research output become too little after being taxed, hence, they become demotivated to do more research. Similar to a report from Briggs (2007) which indicates that financial incentives may have a limited impact in some cases. Likewise, Morisset and Pirnia (2000) concluded that tax exemptions, while occasionally influencing investors, are typically very minor influences.

Gifts/Rewards for Best Performance

For some educators in the university, it is likewise good if their performance is recognized and be given gifts and rewards as a form of recognition. Similarly, Thompson (2021) claims that giving gifts to employees as motivational tools helps employees achieve self-actualization and satisfies their need for self-esteem. Self-esteem is a term used to describe how one feels about themselves and their value as people. It also includes feelings of self-respect and self-acceptance. When given gifts, employees feel their contributions and performance are acknowledged as well as that the organization is achieving its goals, both of which help to satisfy their desire for self-esteem.

CONCLUSION

Research has grown in significance within higher education during the last few decades. Since, pay as a motivator significantly influence the research productivity of educators, a framework for creating research incentive programs are centered on the researchers. Despite having difficulties with their research, the faculty members' skills and enthusiasm to create academic papers and support the institution can be enhanced with the correct kind of motivation.

ENDNOTE

1. Assigned weight (AW) is $AW \approx 1.176471$

REFERENCES

Aarabi, M.S., Subramaniam, I.D., & A.B. Akeel, A.B. (2013). Relationship between Motivational Factors and Job Performance of Employees in Malaysian Service Industry. *Canadian Center of Science and Education, Asian Social Science*, *9*(9), 301–308

Alalade, S.Y., & Oguntodu, J.A. (2015). Motivation and Employees Performance in the Nigerian Banking Industry. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce, and Management*, *3*(4).

Alhija, F.M.N.A., & Majdob, A. (2017). Predictors of teacher educators' research productivity. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, *42*(11), 34–51.

Allison, P., Okoli, I., Nuel, E., & Nuel-Okoli, C.M. (2020). Influence of Contingent Pay and Variable Pay on Employees Performance of Public Tertiary Institutions. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research (Social and Management Sciences)*, *6*(12), 91–108.

Almonte-Acosta, S.A. (2007). *Developing research culture in Philippine higher education institutions: Perspectives of university faculty Rose Marie Salazar-Clemeña*. Ph.D. Dean, College of Education De La Salle University–Manila.

Armstrong, M. (2009). *Odměňování pracovníků* (pp. 126–132). Praha: Grada Publishing.

Azar, M., & Shafighi, A.A. (2013). The effect of work motivation on employees' job performance (Case study: Employees of Isfahan Islamic Revolution Housing Foundation). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *3*(9), 432.

Bakker, A., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Mind the mindset! The Interaction of proactive personality, transformational leadership and growth mindset for engagement at work. *Career Development International*, pp. 48–66. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2016-0194

Basilio, M.B., & Bueno, D.C. (2019). Research Skills and Attitudes of Master Teachers in a Division Towards Capability Training. In *19th CEBU Philippine International Conference on Economics, Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*.

Bassey, U., Akuegwu, B., Udida, L., & Udey, F.U. (2007). Academic staff research productivity: A study of universities in South-South Zone of Nigeria. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *2*(5), 103–108.

Bland, C.J., Center, B.A., Finstad, D.A., Risbey, K.R., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(1), 89–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2006.11778920

Bussin, M., & Van Rooy, D.J. (2014). Total rewards strategy for a multi-generational workforce in a financial institution. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *12*(1), 11.

Cocal, C.J., Cocal, E.J., & Celino, B. (2017). Factors limiting research productivity of faculty members of a state university: The Pangasinan state university Alaminos city campus case. *Asia Pacific Journal of Academic Research in Social Sciences*, *2*(43–48).

Creswell. (1986). *Measuring faculty research performance*. Jossey-Bass Inc, San Francisco.

Dill, D.D. (1986). Research as a scholarly activity: Context and culture. In J.W. Cresswell (Ed.), *New Directions For Institutional Research.*

Guido, R.M.D., & Orleans, A.V. (2020). Philippine research productivity in education research: A comparative performance in Southeast Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *8*(4), 76–90.

Halcomb, E.J., & Hickman, L. (2015). *Mixed Methods Research*.

Heneman, R.L. (2002). *Strategic Reward Management: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Henry, C., Ghani, N.A.M., Hamid, U.M.A., & Bakar, A.N. (2020). Factors Contributing towards Research Productivity in Higher Education. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *9*(1), 203–211.

Horváthová, P., Davidová, M., & Bendová, M. (2012). Contingent pay and experience with its use by organizations of the Czech Republic operating in the field of environmental protection. *International Journal of Economics and Management Engineering*, *6*(4), 522–526.
Iqbal, M.Z., & Mahmood, A. (2011). Factors related to low research productivity at higher education level. *Asian Social Science*, *7*(2), 188.
Iroaganachi, M.A., & Izuagbe, R. (2018). A comparative analysis of the impact of electronic information resources use towards research productivity of academic staff in Nigerian Universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, pp. 1–18.
Jalagat, R. (2016). Job performance, job satisfaction, and motivation: A critical review of their relationship. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*, *5*(6), 36–42.
Klein, P.D., & Boscolo, P. (2016). Trends in research on writing as a learning activity. *Journal of Writing Research*, *7*(3), 311–350.
Latham, G. (2012). *Work Motivation - History, Theory, Research, and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.
Levine, J.S. (1997). Research and the practitioner. *Proceeding of the Annual Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing and Community Education, East Lansing, MI, 16,* 127–132 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 412 370).
Mala, C.M., & Canencia, O.P. (2021). Influence of ethnicity and geographical location on research productivity in Mindanao State University System, Philippines. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *9*(1), 20–30.
Masinde, M., & Coetzee, J. (2021). Modelling research productivity of university researchers using research incentives to crowd-in motivation. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*.
Massoudi, A.H., & Hamdi, S.S.A. (2017). The Consequence of work environment on Employees Productivity. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, *19*(1), 35–42.
Mbaleka, S.W. (2015). Focusing Research Publication on Global Issues: Evidence from the Philippines. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *5*(5), 248–261. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v5-i5/1634
Mirasol, J.M., & Inovejas, C.J. (2017). Building a Culture of Research in a Higher Education Institution. *Journal of Higher Education Research Disciplines*, *1*(12), 72–82.
Molla, Y., Berhanu, E., & Demissie, D. (2019). Conflict Management and Its Impact on Teachers' Performance of Secondary Schools of Wolaita and Dawro Zones, South Ethiopia. *Organization*, *10*(13).
Natividad-Franco, V., & Dela Cruz, M.N. (2022). A*ssessing the Efficacy of Online Learning Among Hospitality and Tourism Management Students in Bulacan State University-Hagonoy Campus*.
Ombati, M.E., Karume, S., & Thiga, M. (2019). *Effectiveness of Quantitative Factors Used in the Evaluation of Lecturer's Teaching Workload*.
Oringo, J.O., & Muia, A.M. (2016). Constraints on research productivity in Kenyan universities: case study of University of Nairobi, Kenya. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Multidisciplinary Research*, *3*(8), 1785–1794.
Pamatmat, F.V., & Subillaga, L.G. (2016). Research attitudes of teaching personnel in one Philippine state university: Basis for development and sustainability towards excellence. *Research Journal of Language, Literature and Humanities*, *3*(3), 12–17.
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.
Rack, O., Ellwart, T., Hertel, G., & Konradt, U. (2011). Team-based rewards in computer-mediated groups. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/22e98dza
Rahi, S. (2017). Research design and methods: A systematic review of research paradigms, sampling issues, and instruments development. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*, *6*(2), 1–5.

Robescu, O., & Iancu, A.G. (2016). The effects of motivation on employees performance in organizations. *Valahian Journal of Economic Studies*, *7*(2), 49–56.

Scammon, D.L., Tomoaia-Cotisel, A., Day, R.L., Day, J., Kim, J., Waitzman, N.J., . . . Magill, M.K. (2013). Connecting the Dots and Merging Meaning: Using Mixed Methods to Study Primary Care Delivery Transformation. *Health Services Research, 48*, 2181–2207.

Setiawan, R., Cavaliere, L.P.L., Chowdhury, A.R., Koti, K., Mittal, P., Subramaniam, T.S., . . . & Singh, S. (2021). *The impact of motivation on employees productivity in the retail sector: The mediating effect of compensation benefits*. [Doctoral dissertation, Petra Christian University].

Sürücü, L., & MASLAKÇI, A. (2020). Validity and reliability in quantitative research. *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal*, *8*(3), 2694–2726.

Tang, T.L., & Chamberlain, M. (2003). Effects of Rank, Tenure, Length of Service, and Institution on Faculty Attitudes Toward Research and Teaching: The Case of Regional State Universities. *Journal of Education for Business*, *79*(2), 103–110.

Thompson, M. (2021). *Financial vs Non-Financial Gifts and Workers' Performance: An Experimental Analysis of Reciprocity in the Workplace*. [Master's thesis, Faculty of Commerce]. Retrieved from: https://tinyurl.com/3fdbaek9

Toews, M.L., & Yazedjian, A. (2007). College adjustment among freshmen: Predictors for white and Hispanic males and females. *College Student Journal*, *41*(4), 891–900.

Uzonna, U.R. (2013). Impact of Motivation on Employees Performance: A Case Study of CreditWest Bank Cyprus. *Journal of Economics and International Finance*, *5*(5), 199–211.

Vinluan, L.R. (2012). Research productivity in education and psychology in the Philippines and comparison with ASEAN countries. *Scientometrics*, *91*(1), 277–294.

Wenzel, A.K., Krause, T.A., & Vogel, D. (2019). Making performance pay work: The impact of transparency, participation, and fairness on controlling perception and intrinsic motivation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 39*(2), 232–255.

Williams, C., & Beam, S. (2019). Technology and writing: Review of research. *Computers & Education*, *128*, 227–242.