# LECTURERS' WORKLOAD AND RESEARCH PARTICIPATION IN MARA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SARAWAK BRANCH SAMARAHAN CAMPUS



BUREAU OF RESEARCH AND CONSULTANCY MARA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY 40450 SHAH ALAM, SELANGOR MALAYSIA

> PREPARED BY: CONSTANCE CHIN CINDY WEE SONG YIAN KHONG HENG YEN

> > JANUARY 2003

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Contents

Title Page	ii
Letter of Submission	iii
Research Group	iv
Acknowledgement	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	ix
List of Charts	xi
Abstract	xii

# Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Background of the Study	2
1.2	Statement of the Problem	3
1.3	Research Objectives	4
1.4	Research Questions	5
1.5	Significance of the Study	5
1.6	Scope of the Study	6
1.7	Operational Definitions	6
1.8	Limitations of Study	7

# Chapter 2: Review of Literature

2.0	Introduction	9
2.1	Faculty Workload and its Measurement	9
2.2	Teaching Load	11
2.3	Measurement of Research Productivity	11
2.4	Relationship Between Research and Teaching	12
2.5	Attitudes Towards Teaching and Research	13
2.6	Factors Affecting Research Productivity	15

### ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the workload of the lecturers and their research participation. It also attempts to investigate the existence of any relationship between research participation and lecturers' workload as well as between research participation and the demographic characteristics of the respondents. In addition, the researchers hope to determine the factors that could hinder or promote research participation.

This study was carried out in the form of a survey involving 113 lecturers of MARA University of Technology Sarawak Branch Samarahan Campus (UiTMCSKS). In addition eight UiTMCSKS lecturers who were actively involved in research were interviewed in order to gain an insight on how they managed their time so as to accommodate both teaching and research activities.

The findings showed that the respondents had a total workload of between 43 to 46 hours/week. Up to 47.4 % of the respondents were involved in research activities (conducting of research, presentation of findings and/or publication) for the two semesters surveyed. There was no significant relationship between the research participation and the respondents' workload. There were significant relationship only between research participation and the demographic characteristics of age and teaching experience. The most commonly cited reasons for involvement in research were intrinsic in nature (personal interest in research and self-development). The main factors hindering research activities was time constraints due to personal or work-related commitments and lack of research skills.

### CHAPTER 1

#### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.0 Introduction

Teaching and research, have the common goal of furthering knowledge, research emphasizes the creation of new knowledge and / or affirmation of existing knowledge (Weber and Russ 1997). Both teaching and research are therefore particular means of achieving the end goal of learning. Hasley (as cited in Selden and Selden, 1998) claimed that an active research interest is essential if a person is to be a good university teacher and Jencks and Reisman (as cited in Selden and Selden,. 1998)) added that when the teacher stops doing research he or she "begins to repeat himself and eventually loses touch with both young and the world around". Kingsman (as cited in Hattie and Marsh, 1996) also proclaimed "it is the duty of every teacher to engage in the form of research which benefits teaching". Besides, research prevents lecturer from teaching irrelevant materials. University lecturers are being faced with an increase in workload. They have varied roles to play, as a teacher, researcher, administrator and other roles, which are related to activities of the university. However, having seen the pertinent issue of research in the universities, lecturers are therefore expected to spend increasing time in activities associated with publication and research in most universities. In view of this, research participation has been emphasized by MARA University of Technology (UiTM)

#### **CHAPTER 2**

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.0 Introduction

Teaching and research are the two roles of a faculty member. Ironically while the faculty member was hired primarily to teach, promotion and salary advancement were based on their research and scholarship (Fairweather, 1993; Gough, Bundrock and Winter, 1998; Taylor, Volkwein and Carbone, 1994). However, teaching and research are both time intensive activities. The debate is whether faculty members can be equally involved in both activities without compromising on the time spent in either activity.

#### 2.1 Faculty Workload and Its Measurement

The three most common responsibilities of a faculty member are in the areas of teaching, research and service (Arreola, 1979). A more comprehensive definition of a faculty member's role was given by Miller (as cited in Arreola, 1979). His definition of the roles of a faculty member are those of (a) advising students and graduate research supervision (b) teaching (c) faculty members' services as in serving in committees (d) public service to the community (e) administrative duties (f) publications and (g) research.

Reflecting the roles of the faculty member, faculty workload studies usually ask the faculty member to estimate the time spent in teaching, research, service and administrative duties (Singel Jr., Lillypad & Singell Sr., 1996; Yuker, 1984 and Jordan, 1994 both cited in Colbeck, 1998). Likewise Sharma, Thasnapark and