

Perceived Publication Pressure Among Faculty Members of MSU-Sulu

*Maryam A. Saradi¹, Amina A. Saradi¹, Aiza A. Saradi², Mohammad Jamal A. Saradi³,
Hamdoni K. Pangandaman⁴

¹College of Nursing, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Capitol Hills, Jolo, Sulu 7400, Philippines

²College of Arts and Sciences, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Capitol Hills, Jolo, Sulu 7400, Philippines

³College of Agriculture, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Capitol Hills, Jolo, Sulu 7400, Philippines

⁴College of Health Sciences, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Marawi, City 9700, Philippines

Abstract

The study aimed to determine the level of perceived publication pressure among MSU-Sulu faculty members. The study aimed to examine if the pressure to publish differed among academic ranks and disciplinary fields. The study utilized a quantitative descriptive-comparative research design. Revised Pressure Publication Questionnaire of Haven et al. (2019) was used to gather the data. The researchers employed descriptive statistical methods to obtain a comprehensive overview of the faculty members' profile and their perceived level of pressure related to publishing. The findings show most of the faculty members had an academic rank of instructor and from the college of nursing. In general, it can be observed that the faculty members exhibited a significant degree of perceived stress related to publication, while maintaining a moderate attitude towards the publication climate. Additionally, they reported minimal availability of resources to alleviate the stress associated with publication.

Keywords: Publication pressure, Faculty member, Publication stress, Publication attitude

1. Introduction

Within the domain of tertiary education, producing scholarly research writing and disseminating it through peer-reviewed journals has traditionally been held in high regard as a distinguished achievement and a common standard method of establishing a professional association (Fawzi and Al-Hattami, 2017). According to Zaumanis (2023), the publication of research papers in reputable peer-reviewed journals is a significant indicator of academic achievement among academicians. In Australia, universities are granted additional funding contingent upon their academic publication rates. Moreover, a strong publication record is a prerequisite for academic promotion. Nevertheless, it is a fact that merely a fraction of scholars is engaged in publishing endeavors. Several higher education institutions and international universities have implemented interventions to increase the number of publications to address this issue (Wa-Mbaleka, 2015).

The proliferation of higher education institutions has become increasingly prevalent throughout the Southeast Asian region. In 2014, the UNESCO Institute for Statistics reported that the Philippines ranked second concerning the most significant number of higher education institutions, trailing only Indonesia. As the report mentioned earlier, the Philippines secures the second position in Asia regarding the maximum count of public higher education institutions, with China occupying the topmost position. Likewise, the nation attains

*Corresponding author



the runner-up spot for private tertiary institutions, while Indonesia claims the top rank. Increased accessibility to higher education in the Philippines has resulted in a concomitant expectation for professors to engage in research and publication alongside their teaching responsibilities.

As per the Commission on Higher Education's (CHED) report in 2009, the fundamental duty of a faculty member in tertiary education is to generate and disseminate knowledge. In order to fulfill their academic responsibilities, faculty members must engage in scholarly dissemination of knowledge, as teaching alone may not be sufficient. Failure to do so may result in a perceived deficiency in their academic duties. The anticipation for faculty members in higher education to present and publish research has resulted in a significant amount of pressure, particularly in recent times (Wa-Mbaleka, 2015).

The presence of publication pressure may serve as a motivating factor for generating scientific work of superior quality. Excessive pressure to publish may have adverse consequences on the scientific community as a whole, as well as on individual scholars. The use of scare tactics, such as implementing the “publish or perish” mentality, has resulted in instability and uncertainty among faculty members within higher education institutions regarding the sustainability of their work (Wa-Mbaleka, 2015).

The creation and dissemination of knowledge through scientific conferences and journal articles is one of the main demands placed on faculty in higher education. At MSU-Sulu, numerous unpublished research outputs led the administration to mandate that faculty members publish their research exclusively in Scopus publications. As the focus has increased on presenting and disseminating research, this expectation has put much strain on faculty members. The analysis was carried out to ascertain the extent of perceived publication pressure among the faculty members of MSU-Sulu. Moreover, the study examined whether the imperative to disseminate scholarly work differed among academic levels and areas of expertise.

2. Materials and Methods

The current study used a descriptive-comparative research approach to acquire the necessary information on the perceived publishing pressure among faculty members at Mindanao State University-Sulu and the notable disparities between academic ranks and disciplinary disciplines. The primary objective of employing a descriptive study design is to systematically collect information to depict a phenomenon, situation, or group. To be more precise, it aids in addressing inquiries related to the research problem, such as those about what, when, where, and how, as opposed to the question of why (VOXCO, 2021). Comparative research examines two or more objects to gain further insights into one or all entities under scrutiny. This approach often integrates multiple disciplines into a singular investigation. The prevailing viewpoint regarding methodology in comparative research is that every distinct technique is unique to this field of study (Clasen, 2004). The study suggests that a quantitative approach, namely the descriptive-comparative research design, will be used in the current investigation.

2.1 Locale

The study was conducted at Mindanao State University-Sulu. To improve the educational environment of the province of Sulu through rehabilitation efforts, the government created the campus in 1974. The institution is located at Capitol Site, Jolo, Sulu. MSU-Sulu is one of the eight campuses of Mindanao State University. It offers graduate studies, eight colleges, one senior high school, and one laboratory high school.

2.2 Respondents and Sample

The data of the study were gathered from primary sources. The participants in the survey were faculty members from Mindanao State University-Sulu. The study participants consisted of 74 faculty members who were employed across various colleges within Mindanao State University-Sulu.

Cochran's formula was used in determining the sample size. There are 344 employees at MSU-Sulu. By using Cochran's, the researchers decided on 74 employees.

After the sample size was determined, stratified random sampling was employed to identify participants in the research study. Stratified sampling involves dividing data into sub-groups, or strata, based on shared characteristics such as age, sex, race, income, education, and ethnicity. A stratified random sampling approach is employed, selecting a sample randomly from each stratum. One advantage is that it ensures the representation of all necessary population groups. Stratum characteristics can be estimated and compared. It decreases systematic sampling variability. Limitations of stratified sampling include the need for precise information on stratum proportions and the high cost associated with preparing stratified lists (Acharya, 2013).

2.3 Instrument and Tool

The revised Publication Pressure Questionnaire (PPQr) developed by Haven et al. (2019) was used to measure publication pressure. The survey comprised three subscales and was assessed using a 5-point Likert scale. The three subscales evaluated are publication stress, attitude, and publication resources. Each subscale consists of six items. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the reliability coefficients for the constructs of publication stress, publication attitude, and publication resources, resulting in values of .804, .777, and .754, respectively. The computation of subscales involves deriving the mean score of all constituent items within the subscale. An elevated score across all subscales indicates that the researcher has a perception of experiencing stress related to publication, harbors a pessimistic outlook towards the publication climate, and perceives limited resources to mitigate the stress associated with publication.

2.4 Data Gathering

The researchers personally administered the questionnaires to the participants. The researchers provided instructions to the respondents on how to complete the survey questionnaire. The faculty members were given a survey questionnaire and instructed to complete it promptly. The researchers were present during the questionnaire administration to address any inquiries from respondents and personally collected the data. The respondents were thanked for their participation in the survey.

The collected questionnaire data underwent statistical analysis using SPSS version 21 to facilitate tabulation, processing, and scientific interpretation of results. The research data were coded numerically and entered into computer software following data collection. The data were statistically analyzed and subsequently interpreted.

2.5 Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage distribution were used to determine the academic rank and disciplinary fields among faculty members of MSU-Sulu. Mean and SD was used to determine the difference in the faculty position and disciplinary areas on the perceived publication pressure among faculty members of MSU-Sulu.

2.6 Ethical Consideration

The researchers established study objectives that comprised three primary components: a. Providing the respondents with a thorough comprehension of the study's purpose and significance; b. Ensuring that the questionnaire was clearly explained to the respondents to facilitate accurate data collection; c. Being receptive to any inquiries raised by the respondents after they consented to participate in the study.

This study must ensure the safety and confidentiality of participant information. The Respondent's background was kept confidential. Respondents were assured of strict confidentiality regarding their identities or names.

3. Results and Discussion

The data in Table 1 shows the academic rank and disciplinary field among faculty members of MSU-Sulu. The instructor scored the highest in the academic ranking, 44 or 59.5 %. It was followed by assistant professor (18, 24.3%), associate professor (11, 14.9%), and professor (1, 1.3%). This result suggests that the majority of respondents were instructors. While in the disciplinary field, the College of Nursing attained the highest frequency of 19 with a percentage of 25.7%, followed by the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and College of Education (COED) with 10 or 13.5%, Senior high School (SHS) with 7 or 9.4%, college of agriculture (COA), college of computer studies (CCS) and laboratory high school (LHS) with 6 or 8.1%, and college of business administration and accountancy (CBAA) and college of fisheries (COF) with 5 or 6.8%. Most of the respondents were from the College of Nursing (CON).

The findings above resemble Ramos' (2015) study, wherein most participants (43 or 51.8%) were identified as instructors. Assistant professors accounted for 21 (25.3%) respondents, while associate professors comprised 16 (19.3%) of the sample. The minor proportion of participants belonged to the professor category, with only 3 or 3.6% of the total respondents.

Table 1 Profile of the faculty members

Profile	Freq.	%
Academic Rank		
Instructor	44	59.5
Assistant Professor	18	24.3
Associate Professor	11	14.9
Professor	1	1.3
Disciplinary field		
Laboratory High School (LHS)	6	8.1
Senior High School (SHS)	7	9.4
College of Agriculture (COA)	6	8.1
College of Arts and Sciences (COA)	10	13.5
College of Business Administration and Accountancy (CBAA)	5	6.8
College of Computer Studies (CCS)	6	8.1
College of Education (COED)	10	13.5
College of Fisheries (COF)	5	6.8
College of Nursing (CON)	19	25.7

Data provided in Table 2 presents the perceived publication pressure among faculty members of MSU-Sulu. The mean score of the perceived publication pressure among faculty members of MSU-Sulu was 3.58. It can be inferred that the faculty members of MSU-Sulu experienced a significant degree of perceived pressure to publish. The tabulated outcomes reveal that the average scores for publication stress, publication attitude, and publication resources were correspondingly 3.49, 3.37, and 3.87. Hence, the faculty members have significant stress related to publication, hold a moderately optimistic outlook toward the publication environment, and have limited access to resources that can help mitigate the stress associated with publishing.

Table 2 Perceived publication pressure among faculty members of MSU-Sulu

Publication Pressure	Mean	SD	Description
Publication Stress	3.49	.62	Moderate
Publication Attitude	3.37	.76	Moderate
Publication Resources	3.87	.53	Little

Table 3 presents the perceived publication pressure among faculty members of MSU-Sulu according to academic rank and disciplinary field. As indicated in the tabular data, the instructors' position was associated with a moderate perception of publication pressure, a moderate attitude, and a relatively low perception of publication resources. Assistant professors had high publication pressure, a reasonable perspective, and few publication resources. Associate professors had very high perceived publication pressure and few resources for publication. The professor exhibited moderate perceived publication stress, maintained a positive outlook toward the publication climate, and had limited resources to mitigate the stress associated with publishing. The table further indicates perceived publication pressure among faculty members of MSU-Sulu according to the disciplinary field. Faculty members from Laboratory High School (LHS), Senior High School (SHS), College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), College of Business Administration and Accountancy (CBAA), College of Computer Studies (CCS), College of Education (COED), and College of Fisheries (COF) had a high level of perceived publication stress. In contrast, the College of Agriculture (COA) and the College of Nursing (CON) had moderate perceived publication pressure. COA, CBAA, CCS, COF, and CON had moderate attitudes, while LHS, SHS, CAS, and COED had negative attitudes toward publication climate. Across all disciplinary fields, there was a general perception that publication resources were insufficient in mitigating the stress associated with publishing.

Table 3 Perceived publication pressure among faculty members of MSU-Sulu according to academic rank and disciplinary field

Profile	Publication Stress M (SD)	Publication Attitude M (SD)	Publication Resources M (SD)
Academic Rank			
Instructor	3.42 (.58)	3.29 (.78)	3.91 (.51)
Assistant Professor	3.61 (.69)	3.71 (.63)	3.81 (.65)
Associate Professor	4.6 (.00)	3.67 (.00)	3.50 (.00)
Professor	3.33 (.00)	2.33 (.00)	3.67 (.00)
Disciplinary field			
Laboratory High School	3.91 (1.10)	3.83 (.88)	3.79 (.77)
Senior High School	3.55 (.35)	3.61 (.67)	4.00 (.17)
College of Agriculture	3.33 (.31)	2.90 (.76)	3.33 (.78)
College of Arts and Sciences	3.80 (.89)	3.76 (.80)	4.00 (.59)
College of Business Administration and Accountancy	3.61 (.92)	3.39 (.63)	4.06 (.35)
College of Computer Studies	3.62 (.25)	3.08 (.67)	3.87 (.44)
College of Education	3.62 (.26)	3.98 (.49)	3.90 (.37)
College of Fisheries	3.57 (.38)	3.47 (.68)	4.10 (.63)
College of Nursing	3.14 (.48)	2.94 (.64)	3.85 (.48)

4. Conclusion

The issue of publication pressure is a matter of concern for researchers across various disciplines, and it is a stressor that has a particularly negative impact on associate and assistant professors. Moreover, it is widely acknowledged that colleges need more resources, which could impede their progress toward becoming conscientious researchers. Researchers commonly perceive the number of available resources to be insufficient. However, faculty members would significantly benefit from heightened support from their colleagues.

The study results highlight the importance of fostering a favorable environment for scholarly publishing, wherein faculty members are motivated to prioritize the excellence and honesty of their publications and are provided with adequate backing to carry out ethical research.

Acknowledgement

All praises and thanks to Almighty Allah SWT, the most Beneficent, the Most Merciful, whose blessings and guidance gave the researchers strength, health, courage and inspiration to prosper in this endeavour.

The researchers wish to express their sincerest gratitude to the authors Professor Haven, de Goede, Tjindink, & Oort of Revised Pressure Publication Questionnaire for allowing them to use their questionnaire to gather the data of the research.

Funding Information

This research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agency.

Declaration of Conflict

The authors declare that they have not known competing financial or personal relationship that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

1. Clasen, J. (2004). *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy*, Edward Elgar Publishing.
2. Commission on Higher Education. (2009). *National higher education research agenda-2: NHERA 2: 2009-2018*. Manila, Philippines: CHED.
3. Fawzi, H., & Al-Hattami, A. (2017). Faculty production of research papers: Challenges and recommendations. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 7(2), 221-228.
4. Haven, T. L., Bouter, L. M., Smulders, Y. M., & Tjindink, J. K. (2019). Perceived publication pressure in Amsterdam: Survey of all disciplinary fields and academic ranks. *PloS One*, 14(6), e0217931. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0217931>
5. Haven, T. L., de Goede, M. E. E., Tjindink, J. K., & Oort, F. J. (2019). Personally perceived publication pressure: revising the Publication Pressure Questionnaire (PPQ) by using work stress models. *Research integrity and peer review*, 4(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0066-6>
6. Jannaral, A. N. (2022). Administrative Leadership of Deans in Mindanao State University-Sulu During Pandemic COVID-19. *International Journal of Engineering, Science and Management*, 5(10), 43-47
7. Ramos, A. C. (2015). Methods and teaching strategies used by teacher education faculty members in one state university in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(5), 36-44
8. Scherer, R. W., Ugarte-Gil, C., Schmucker, C., & Meerpohl, J. J. (2015). Authors report lack of time as main reason for unpublished research presented at biomedical conferences: a systematic review. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 68(7), 803-810.
9. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2014). Higher education in Asia: Expanding out, expanding up: The rise of graduate education and university research. Retrieved from <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/higher-education-asia-graduate-university-research-2014-en.pdf>
10. Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2015). Factors leading to limited faculty publications in Philippine higher education institutions. *International Forum*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 121-141
11. Zaumanis, M. (2023). The story of getting Peer Recognized. Available at <https://peerrecognized.com/martins-zaumanis/>; Accessed on 9 June 2023