

Review of: "Understanding Research Tendencies of Academic Staffs"

Evelyn Chiyevo Garwe¹

¹ Mohammed VI Polytechnic University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for allowing me to provide feedback on the manuscript "Understanding Research Tendencies of Academic Staffs". Here are the suggested improvements to strengthen the manuscript:

Theoretical Framework and Conceptual Framework:

- Enhance the theoretical grounding by explicitly linking the constructs of Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and Organizational Support Theory (OST) to the factors examined in the study, such as individual attributes and institutional support.
- Provide a more robust theoretical foundation to guide the research and analysis.

Methodology:

- Provide more detailed information on the survey questions, the sample selection process, and the data analysis plan to enhance the rigor and replicability of the study.
- Discuss the potential reasons for the low participation rate of around 10% and its implications for the findings.
- Consider expanding the study to include a larger and more diverse sample from different states and demographic groups to improve the generalizability of the results.

Results and Analysis:

- Explore differences in research tendencies between demographic groups or test correlations between variables to reveal more substantial relationships.
- Explore more into the lack of a clear correlation between experience and publications, examining potential explanations for this observation.
- Investigate the mismatch between the priority given to research, motivation, and actual time allocated for research, and explore the reasons behind this inconsistency and its implications for research productivity.

Discussion and Conclusion:

- Link the theoretical framework to findings and discuss. For example: Linking SDT and OST to the Study's Factors

Motivation: The study emphasizes the role of self-motivation in research participation, aligning with SDT's focus on autonomous motivation. The finding that mismatches between perceived priority and actual motivation can hinder

research output underscores the importance of intrinsic motivation, a key tenet of SDT. The article by Zhou, Law, & Lee (2022), which explores the research motivation scale among academics, could provide further insights into the interplay between intrinsic motivation and research productivity.

Institutional Support: The study identifies institutional support as a crucial factor, echoing OST's emphasis on perceived organizational support (POS). The study's findings suggest that a supportive research culture, adequate resources, and recognition of research efforts can enhance participation. See the article by Muhammad et al. (2023), which investigates the impact of institutional factors on research productivity, for additional evidence of the link between POS and research engagement.

Workload and Time Management: The study highlights the challenges posed by heavy workloads and time constraints, which can thwart autonomous motivation as per SDT. The study's observation that effective time management and work-life balance can facilitate research participation aligns with SDT's emphasis on competence and autonomy. The article by Houston, Meyer, & Paewai (2007), which examines the relationship between workload and job satisfaction among academic staff, could shed light on the impact of workload on research motivation and engagement.

Muhammad et al. 2023. Investigating the effects of individual and institutional factors on the research productivity of university academics: A comprehensive analysis

Houston et al. (2007) Academic Staff Workloads and Job Satisfaction: Expectations and values in academe, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* volume=28;17 – 30/ <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:54061996>.

Zhou et al. 2022 "What motivates me?" Motivation to conduct research of academics in teaching-oriented universities in China, *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, Volume 31, 100392, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2022.100392>.
(<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1473837622000247>)

- Expand the discussion of limitations, acknowledging the small sample size, the limited scope of the study, and potential biases to enhance the credibility of the research.
- Incorporate a cross-institutional comparison within India to provide richer insights into the factors influencing research productivity.
- Include a comparison with findings from other developing countries to contribute to a broader understanding of the growth and impact of higher education.
- Explore further the role of organizational and institutional factors in shaping research tendencies, in addition to the individual factors explored in the study.
- Provide specific recommendations for institutions and policymakers based on the findings to increase the impact and practical application of the research.