UNVEILING THE VEIL: EXPLORING FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO FACULTY'S DIMINISHED INTEREST IN ACADEMIC RESEARCH

Prof. Urvesh Chaudhery
Professor, Gitarattan International Business School

Dr. Sneha Chaudhry
Associate Professor, Gitarattan International Business School

ABSTRACT:
This research paper delves into the intricate web of factors influencing the waning enthusiasm among faculties for engaging in academic research. Through a comprehensive exploration of challenges such as heavy teaching commitments, administrative burdens, resource constraints, and inadequate incentives, this study aims to unveil the underlying reasons behind the diminished interest. By shedding light on these issues, it aspires to provide insights that can inform strategies for rekindling faculty engagement in meaningful and impactful academic research pursuits

Objectives of Study

1. Uncover and analyze obstacles impeding faculty interest in academic research.
2. Propose effective strategies to address identified challenges and rekindle faculty engagement in research pursuits.

Introduction

The realm of academic research stands as a cornerstone in the edifice of higher education, driving innovation, knowledge dissemination, and intellectual growth. However, a discernible concern has emerged within the academic landscape - a diminishing interest in research among faculty members. This phenomenon is a cause for introspection as it holds implications for institutional progress, student mentorship, and the broader academic community.

"Unveiling the Veil: Exploring Factors Contributing to Faculty's Diminished Interest in Academic Research" endeavors to delve into the intricate web of influences shaping this trend. As the pursuit of knowledge is integral to the academic profession, understanding the factors that hinder faculty engagement in research is pivotal for fostering a vibrant and dynamic scholarly environment.

In this exploration, we aim to identify and dissect the multifaceted aspects contributing to the waning enthusiasm for research activities among faculty members. By unveiling the veiled barriers, we aspire to pave the way for strategic interventions, policy adjustments, and institutional support systems that can reignite the passion for research within the academic community. This research endeavor is not merely an investigation but a proactive step toward revitalizing the research culture within our academic institutions. As we embark on this journey, we anticipate uncovering insights that will not only inform academic discourse but also serve as a catalyst for positive change, revitalizing the spirit of inquiry among faculty members and, by extension, enriching the academic experience for students and the entire educational community.

Background

In the realm of academia, the commitment to continuous research is integral for both individual faculty members and the institution as a whole. However, a noticeable trend has emerged, revealing a diminishing interest among faculty members in engaging actively in academic research. This decline raises critical questions regarding the factors that contribute to this phenomenon. "Unveiling the Veil: Exploring Factors Contributing to Faculty's Diminished Interest in Academic Research" seeks to delve into the root causes behind the waning enthusiasm for research activities among faculty members in contem porary educational settings. The background of this study revolves around understanding the historical context, evolving academic landscapes, and changing expectations placed upon faculty members. By uncovering the underlying factors, we aim to shed light on the dynamics that may impact the research culture within academic institutions. This research is not only timely but also imperative for addre ssing the challenges posed by this trend and devising strategies to rekindle the passion for academic research among faculty members.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its potential to inform institutional policies and practices that can revitalize the culture of academic research. A comprehensive exploration of the

factors contributing to the decreased interest in research among faculty members will offer valuable insights for administrators, policymakers, and educators alike. Understanding these factors will not only aid in fostering an environment conducive to research but also contribute to the overall advanceme nt of academic excellence. Moreover, the study's findings can serve as a catalyst for discussions within the academic community, encouraging dialogues that address the challenges faced by faculty members in balancing teaching, administrative responsibilities, and research commitments. By unrav eling the complexities associated with the diminishing interest in research, this study aspires to initiate positive changes that reinvigorate the passion for scholarly pursuits among faculty members, ultimately benefiting the entire academic community.

Literature Review

Tuan (2022) analyzed data from 398 Vietnamese university lecturers and researchers at the Vietnam National University, Hanoi. It found that resources and policies promoting research activities were the most influential factors affecting lecturers' productivity. The study also found a close relationship between management factors and research productivity. Resources, such as human resources and research support, had the greatest impact. However, infrastructure and finance conditions for lecturers' research activities were limited. Support for research and the organization's research objectives positively influenced lecturers' productivity. Abramo et.al. (2017) examined the relationship between different types of collab oration and research productivity, revealing that both are influenced by personal and organizational variables. The research uses cross-lagged panel models to analyze the relationship between research productivity, collabo ration, and their determinants. The results show that collaboration at intramural and domestic levels has a positive effect on research productivity, while all forms of collaboration are positively affected by research product ivity. The study also highlights the importance of understanding the causal nexus between collaboration and research performance, as there is limited research on the different forms of collaborations and the impact of research performance on collaboration activation. The study employs a structural equation modeling approach to estimate cross-lagged panel models, allowing for the evaluation of the impact of different forms of propensity to collaborate on research productivity and vice versa. The study also considers the indirect influence of determinants on research collaboration and productiv ity through the mediation of other variables. The study's breadth and exhaustiveness make it a valuable contribution to the literature on this topic. Wills et. Al. (2013) This study investigates factors affecting research productivity of accounting academics in an international context of increased workloads and revenue-driven research. A meta-analysis of international studies from 1988 to 2008 identified three clusters: institutional characteristics, intrinsic motivation, and knowledge, skills, and other individual characte ristics. Hierarchical clusters at govern ment, institution, and individual levels were found to influence academic research output. White et.al. (2012) This paper investigates factors affecting research productivity among business faculty members. Data from 236 faculty members was analyzed using a web-based survey. Findings revealed that research "stars" have higher academic rank, better time management skills, high research value, more available time, institutional support, fewer course preparations, and work in departments with similar research priorities.

Theoretical Framework

Understanding the diminished interest in academic research requires a theoretical framework that illuminates the interplay of various factors shaping faculty behavior. The following theoretical perspectives provide a lens through which to analyze this complex phenomenon: Resource Dependency Theory: Examines how faculty members' reliance on institutional resources, such as funding and support, influences their engagement in research activities. Goal Setting Theory: Explores how faculty members' individ ual goals, influenced by institutional expectations and career aspirations, impact their prioritization of research. Institutional Theory: Investigates how institutional norms, values, and policies shape the behavior of faculty members regarding research engagement. Role Conflict Theory: Analyze the conflicts that arise from faculty members juggling multiple roles, such as teaching, administrative duties, and research, and how these conflicts impact their research interests. By employing these theoretical frame works, a compreh ensive understanding of the factors contributing to faculty's diminished interest in academic research can be achieved, paving the way for targeted interventions and policy adjustments.

Research Methodology

A. Research Design: The study employ ed a mixed-methods research design, combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches. This allows for a comprehensive exploration of the factors influencing faculty's diminished interest in academic research.

B. Data Collection Methods: Quantit ative data was collected through surveys distributed to faculty members, focus ing on their perceptions and attitudes towards research. Qualitative data will be gathered through in-depth interv iews to del vedeeper into individual experiences and insights.

C. Participant Selection: The particip ants were selected using purpo sive sampling, ensuring representation from various departme nts and academic ranks. This approach aims to capture diverse perspectives and experiences related to research engagement.

D. Data Analysis Techniques: Quantitative data was analyzed using statistical methods- Multiple regression analysis to identify significant factors affecting research interest.

E. Parameters/Variables to Study:
Independent Variables:
1. Heavy teaching commitments,
2. Administrative burdens,
3. Resource constraints,
4. Inadequate incentives
5. Limited access to relevant research resources and databases

Dependent Variable:
Reducing interest in Academic Research
F. Hypothesis:
H0: all β coefficients are equal to 0
H1: not all β coefficients are equal to 0
G. Regression Equation:
$Y = \beta 0 + \beta 1\ X1 + \beta 2\ X2 + \beta 3\ X3 + \beta 4\ X4 + \beta 5\ X5 +$
Where,
Y is the dependent variable (reducing interest in academic research)
X1, X2, X3, X4, X5 are the independent factors (namely, Heavy Teaching Commitments, Administrative Burdens, Resource Constraints, Inadequate Incentives, limited Access to Resources)
β0 is the intercept
β1, β2, β3, β4, and β5 are the coefficients for each independent variable
is the error term

Analysis and Findings

The study's dependent variable is the declining interest in academic research, whereas the independent variables are the following: Heavy teaching comm itments, Administrative burdens, Resource constraints, inadequate incentives, Limited access to research databases The questionnaire responses provided by the respondents were used to evaluate each of these variables. We obtained the regression equation after first presenting the data required for the investigation. The goal of calculating the coefficient of determination (R2) was to determine the percentage that the independent variables account for in explaining the overall variation. After that, we used the Student test with n-(k+1) degrees of freedom and the F test to determine which hypothesis may be accepted.

Multiple Regression Analysis

This analysis aims to determine the degree to which the following independent variables—heavy teaching commitments, administrative burdens, resource constraints, inadequate incentives, limited access to research databases contribute to this declined interest in academic research. Additionally, it identifies appropriate next steps based on the findings obtained using the statistical package for social sciences, or SPSS.

Table 1 Regression coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1444.434	3680.374		0.392	0.715
Heavy teaching commitments	0.982	0.49	1.012	19.904	0.000
Administrative burdens	39.806	10.049	0.143	3.961	0.017
Resource constraints	-2.032	0.480	-0.122	-4.232	0.013
inadequate incentives	5.991	23.805	0.030	0.252	0.814
Limited access to relevant research resources and databases	-0.910	0.931	-0.099	-0.977	0.384

Based on the nonstandard coefficients we obtain the regression equation:
$Y = 1444.434 + 0.982\ X1 + 39.806\ X2 - 2.032\ X3 + 5.991\ X4 - 0.910\ X5$
Where
X1 = Heavy Teaching Commitments, X2 = Administrative Burdens, X3 = Resource Constraints, X4 = Inadequate Incentives, X5 = Limited Access to Resources)

Table 2 Estimation of standard deviation - Model Summar

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
1	0.999[a]	0.998	0.996	2168.98
a. Predictors: (Constant) Heavy Teaching Commitments, Administrative Burdens, Resource Constraints, Inadequate Incentives, Limited Access to Resources				

Table 2 shows that the independent variable accounts for 99.80% of the total variance, as indicated by the coefficient of determination R2. Starting with the following outcomes, an analysis of variance for multiple regressions will be conducted:

Table 3. Variation analysis · ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.087E10	5	2.174E9	462.098	0.000[a]
	Residual	18817814.997	4	4704453.749		
	Total	1.089E10	9			
a. Predictors: (Constant) Heavy Teaching Commitments, Administrative Burdens, Resource Constraints, Inadequate Incentives, Limited Access to Resources b. Dependent Variable: Reducing interest in academic research						

We use the F test, which necessitates an analysis of the variance shown in the preceding ANOVA table, to test the null hypothesis. It is possible to determine that the value of the estimated F for the variance produced by the regression is 462.098 using the data in the preceding table (Table 3). With 5 degrees of freedom in the numerator and 4 in the denominator, the critical value of F at the significance level of 0.05 is 6.256. It is necessary to accept the alternative hypothesis based on a comparison of the F values, indicating that not all regression coefficients are equal to zero. This indicates that the multiple regression model has a considerable impact on the dependent variables. Knowing which regression coefficients are likely to be zero and which are not is the problem that now arises. Therefore, it is mandated in order to accomplish an individual assessment of the regression coefficients. The Student test, or t with n-(k+1) degrees of freedom, is the test that is utilized. The computed t values for each of the five variables are obtained from the SPSS findings (Table 1). These are: -0.252 for insufficient investments, -0.977 for limited access to research databases, -3.961 for administrative burdens, -4.232 for resource constraints and 19.904 for a high teaching commitment. The computed t values will be compared with the critical value of t at a significance level of 0.05 in the case of a two-tailed test, with 10 (5+1), or with 4 degrees of freedom, in order to determine the decision rule for the null hypothesis. The outcomes are as follows: In the case of heavy teaching commitment, the computed t (19.904) is greater than the critical t (2.776). The test's indicated level of significance of 0.004 is less than the 0.05 level of significance that was selected. Consequently, the rejection of the null hypothesis leads to the acceptance of the difference between β1 and zero. Upon examining the administrative burdens, we find that the critical t (2.776) is less than the calculated t (3.961). The rejection of the null hypothesis results in the acceptance of the difference between β2 and zero. It is evident from looking at the resource constraints that the computed t (-4.232) is less than the crucial t (- 2.776). Consequently, the null hypothesis is once more rejected, and it is acknowledged that β3 differs from zero. We can see that the computed t (-0.252) is greater than the crucial t (-2.776) when we consider the insufficient investments. This indicates that β4 is equal to zero and the null hypothesis is accepted. The computed t-value (-0.977) is more than the threshold t-value (-2.776) in limited access to research databases. This indicates that β5 is equal to zero and the null hypothesis is accepted. As a result, it is believed that the imited access to research databases and the resource constraints are not significant predictors of the dependent variable, diminishing interest in academic research. In this instance, these variables will no longer be included in the regression model. The outcomes will be as follows if we determine the parameters for the new regression model:

Table 4. Estimation of standard error deviation Model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
1	0.998[a]	0.997	0.996	2451.85
a. Predictors: (Constant) Heavy Teaching Commitments, Administrative Burdens, Inadequate Incentives				

The coefficient of determination R^2 is 99.70%

Dependent Variable:
Reducing interest in Academic Research
F. Hypothesis:
H0: all β coefficients are equal to 0
H1: not all β coefficients are equal to 0
G. Regression Equation:
Y = β0 + β1 X1 + β2 X2 + β3 X3 + β4 X4 + β5 X5 +
Where,
Y is the dependent variable (reducing interest in academic research)
X1, X2, X3, X4, X5 are the independent factors (namely, Heavy Teaching Commitments, Administrative Burdens, Resource Constraints, Inadequate Incentives, limited Access to Resources)
β0 is the intercept
β1, β2, β3, β4, and β5 are the coefficients for each independent variable
is the error term

The coefficient of determination R2 is 99.70%

Table 5. Regression coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-1373.99	2303.6		-0.596	0.57
Heavy teaching commitments	0.923	0.025	0.951	37.08	0.00
Administrative burdens	47.90	9.05	0.172	5.29	0.00
Inadequate incentives	-1.87	0.515	0.112	-3.62	0.01

The new regression equation results from the above presented:

Y = -1373.986 + 0.923 X1 + 47.902 X2 1.866 X3

where: X1 = Heavy teaching commitments, X2 = Administrative burdens,

X3 = Inadequate incentives

Table 6. Analysis of variance · ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.087E10	3	3.617e9	601.750	0.000[a]
	Residual	36069295.328	6	6011549.221		
	Total	1.089E10	9			

a. Predictors: (Constant) Heavy Teaching Commitments, Administrative Burdens, Inadequate Incentives
b. Dependent Variable: Reducing interest in academic research

As can be observed from Table 6, the computed F value for the variance produced by the regression is 601.750. With three degrees of freedom in the numerator and six in the denominator, the critical value of F at the significance level of 0.05 is 4.754. It is evident from comparing the F values that accepting the alternative hypothesis is required. This indicates that the multiple regression model has a considerable impact on the dependent variables. Once more, we must determine which regression coefficients are likely to be zero and which are not. We were able to obtain a unique assessment of the regression coefficients as a result.

Conclusion

The five independent factors in the first regression model did not significantly predict faculty members' declining interest in academic research. This led to the creation of the updated regression model. matching the computed t-values to the t-critical value at a significance level of 0.05 for a two-tailed test with 10 (3+1), or six degrees of freedom. This amount is 2,446 ±. These are the outcomes that were obtained: Calculated t (37.082) is more than critical t (2.446) in the case of heavy teaching responsibilities. The test's 0.004 level of significance indicates a lower level of significance than the 0.05 level that was used. As a result, it becomes evident that β1 differs from zero and the null hypothesis is rejected. The administrative burden (5.291) exceeds the critical t-value (2.446). Consequently, the null hypothesis is disproved and it accepted that β2 deviates from zero. Examining the inadequate incentives, we find that the critical t (-20446) is more than the computed t (-3.622). Once more, there is a rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the difference between β3 and zero. Based on the information provided above, we can infer the following: Three of the influencing factors—the administrative burden, the heavy teaching commitments, and inadequate incentives are strong predictors of the dependent variable, which is the faculty members' declining interest in academic research.

References

Wills, D., Ridley, G., & Mitev, H. (2013). Research productivity of accounting academics in changing and challenging times. Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change, 9(1), 4-25.

White, C. S., James, K., Burke, L. A., & Allen, R. S. (2012). What makes a "research star"? Factors influencing the research productivity of business faculty. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 61(6), 584-602.

Abramo, G., D'Angelo, A. C., & Murgia, G. (2017). The relationship among research productivity, research collaboration, and their determinants. Journal of Informetrics, 11(4), 1016-1030.

Nguyen,T., Truon, H., Luon, L., Lu,V., Hoang, N., Luu,D. (2022). Management factors influencing lecturers' research productivity in Vietnam National University, Hanoi, Vietnam: A structural equation modeling analysis,Heliyon, 8(9). Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10510.