Academic Journal of Sukuna – AJoS, A Peer-reviewed Interdisciplinary Journal
Volume 5 (Issue 1) 2025 July (2082 Ashad), Pp. 119 – 139, ISSN 2594-3138 (Print)
Research Management Cell (RMC – Sukuna), Sundarharaincha, Morang

Faculty Motivation and Research Productivity in Nepal's Community Campuses: A Quantitative Analysis

Doi: https://doi.org/10.3126/ajos.v5i1.81832

Matrika Thapa*, Trilochan Sitaula,
Mohan Kumar Karki and Surendra Babu Shrestha
Faculties of Sukuna Multiple Campus, Sundarharaincha, Morang
*Email: matrikathapa203@gmail.com

Abstract

The level of faculty motivation regarding the publication of research is very important towards expansion of academic knowledge, institutional and professional growth. The study deals with the intrinsic and extrinsic issues that affect the research productivity of the faculty members in the community campuses, and the assistance and challenges of the faculty members in community campus settings. Among the data collected, the quantitative method was used to collect data among faculty members using structured questionnaires. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation), along with inferential statistics (ANOVA, independent t- tests and multiple regression analysis) were used in the examination of the data. The results indicate that intrinsic factors, or those factors related to intellectual satisfaction and personal interest are significant drivers of the productivity of research, whereas the extrinsic factors, or those circumstances associated with career promotion and financial rewards also influence the productivity of research. Nevertheless, it was also determined that institutional support was very poor with the most notable problems being high teaching loads, restrained research resources, and time restraints. There was also evidence regarding gender-based and age gap in research output. In the study, both the issues and the suggested solutions point to the

necessity of institutional changes, such as improved levels of funding research, higher levels of mentorship, and workload reduction, to provide a more favorable research environment. These lessons carry useful implications to policymakers, teachers, and administrators at the community campuses who want to enhance academic faculty interested in the publication of research works.

Keywords: Motivation, faculty, research, challenges, productivity, and institutional support

Introduction

Faculty motivation to perform research and publish scholarly products is the most critical focus of academic progress, knowledge distribution, and institutional status. Publication of research work is not simply an academic pursuit; it is part and parcel of national development program because research, when published, creates evidence-based responses and spawns critical questioning (Sivertsen & Meijer, 2020). Research productivity in higher education plays a major role in determining the university ranking, grant competition and in the faculty appraisal system (Geuna,1999; Times Higher Education, 2021).

It is important therefore to understand what makes faculty conduct research. The Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) holds the notion that intrinsic motivations like intellectual interest, satisfaction as well as personal interest is crucial towards long-term scholarly practice. Those faculty members, who perceive research as mentally stimulating, have a greater chance to engage in sustainable academic performance (Amabile, 1993; Bland et al., 2005). There is also the effect of extrinsic motivators such as advancement in career, institutionally recognized, and economic gain and they happen to be significant in systems that have correlation between promotion and tenure with publication record (Fairweather, 2002; Hemmings & Kay, 2010).

The culture of research in Nepal is backward, and this is more prevalent in the case of community campuses, which are undermined by a lack of infrastructure support,

appropriate funding sources, and a conundrum of high teaching loads (Regmi, 2019; UGC Nepal, 2022). More so, unlike central universities which have a whole wing that focuses on research, community campuses cannot develop the enabling environment to carry research activities as a result of policies gap and lack of resources. The research study conducted by Subedi (2018) in the Journal of Education and Research emphasized some systemic problems of the lack of incentives and mentoring in Nepal universities, particularly those beyond the capital.

This situation is complicated even further by gender and demographic inequalities. It has been indicated that socio-cultural norms and institutional bias are disproportionally affecting female faculty in Nepal and lead to lower rates of research output by them than males (Shrestha & Singh, 2022; Xu, 2015). Likewise, those in mid-career are more likely to engage in research since they have promotion and professional growth pressures on them (Neve & Feldman, 2015; Chapagain, 2020).

Although there is increasing knowledge that faculty research is important, the context is not well understood in the distinct realities of the community campuses of Nepal. The current literature has narrowed to look at research intensive Universities leaving a critical gap of literature on local, teaching oriented Universities. Furthermore, the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivators about the interaction with institutional support and demographic variables on the faculty research productivity among such conditions is less investigated empirically (Phuyal, 2023; Ghimire et al., 2024).

Despite having increased focus on research publication in higher education globally, faculty members in community campuses in Nepal face unique problems that remain unexplored. While existing literature highlights intrinsic (e.g., intellectual satisfaction) and extrinsic (e.g., career advancement, financial incentives) motivators for research publication (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Subedi, 2018), most studies focus on

universities or research-intensive institutions, neglecting the specific context of Nepal's community campuses.

Nepal has an underdeveloped research culture in general and community campuses, in particular, since they are limited in infrastructure and funding and carry excessive teaching loads (Regmi, 2019; UGC Nepal, 2022). In contrast to central universities where there is a separate wing of research, in the community campuses finding the conducive environment to conduct the research work has been a challenge due to lack of a policy and funds. According to a research by Subedi (2018), in Journal of Education and Research the problems are found to be systematic in Nepal since there is no incentive and mentorship provided in academies especially out of the capital.

This situation is complicated by the gender and demographic differences. It is supported by evidence that female faculty in Nepal experience a disparity of pressure due to socio-cultural norms and institutional discriminations, which lead to a less research publication compared to the male faculty members (Shrestha & Singh, 2022; Xu, 2015). Likewise, you would also find mid-career faculty to be more research-active because of promotion-related and professional development pressure (Neve & Feldman, 2015; Chapagain, 2020).

Though the value of faculty research is increasingly being appreciated, the reality of community campuses in Nepal has not been routinely investigated before. The lack of literature is significant concerning local teaching-based higher educational institutions because the majority or current research is carried out on more research-intensive institutions. In addition, little empirical research has been conducted to explain the extent to which these factors combine to affect the research productivity of faculty using institutional support and demographic variables in these environments (Phuyal, 2023; Ghimire et al., 2024).

This paper therefore tries to bridge this gap by analysing the motivation, institutional barriers and demographic which influence faculty research activity at

community campuses in Nepal. In so doing, it shall endeavor to bring policy changes therefore encouraging research culture, and spurring new academic input by the grass roots-level institutions. The results may also be used to increase Nepal accreditation activities and augment evidence-based advancements of tertiary education.

In the case of Nepal, community campuses still appear to be dominated by intrinsic motivators. A research by Phuyal (2023) established that the motivation level was high among faculty whose interest in research was due to personal interest and interest in growth as compared to the faculty motivated by external factors. According to a study conducted by Ghimire et al. (2024) hope and self-efficacy, or psychological capital, were also found to be the main predictors of intrinsic research motivation in Nepali faculty.

Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, is the one that occurs through promised reward in the form of promotion or monetary award to the individual along with professional atelier as well. Fairweather (2002) found out that extrinsic rewarding acts as a performance incentive in academic performance whereby tenure and promotion is based on research output. Hemmings and Kay (2010) have established the fact that publication records tend to be applied as career advancement criteria. According to the findings of Lee and Bozeman (2005) the faculty is more likely to participate in research when they are given ample incentives and recognition at the institutions.

An extrinsic motivation is not fully developed in Nepal as it is a new institutional device. In the community campuses, Subedi (2018) observed that there are no standardized reward systems applicable in community campuses in regard to research productivity. It has however been suggested that, when used, such motivators can be effective. According to Gautam (2020), the links between financial incentives and promotional criteria and publication-based had modest consequences on faculty engagement when it comes to research. The authors were able to conclude that though

intrinsic factors proved dominant, extrinsic motivators of recognition and payment were supportive of them (Ghimire et al., 2024).

One other significant element that may cause faculty interested in research to be more or less motivated is institutional support. Research grants, training, mentorship and time with protection are some of the support mechanisms that create a good research culture. Brink et al. (2013) highlighted the usefulness of performance systems and well-organized HRM practices in assisting young-career researchers. They may be underdeveloped in developing countries such as Nepal. Regmi (2019) underlined that the problematic mentoring, weak infrastructure, as well as administrative support, lowers the productivity of faculty research. In line with that, UGC Nepal (2022) gave the findings of lack of funds, uncertain policies and lack of chances to collaborate in community campuses.

Research productivity is also a demographic element that is dependent on individual age, gender, and academic experience. Researchers have established that early-career scientists publish more due to increased pressure to establish as an academic (Fox & Mohapatra 2007). The study conducted by Xu (2015) identified that gender differences in publication output were consistent over time, and unequal institutional resources and family-care responsibilities were observed to be predisposing factors in female academics. Shrestha and Singh (2022) found that the development of several barriers is specific to women in community campuses in Nepal namely institutional bias and low accessibility of research functions. Gharti (2023) complained, however, that gender is not necessarily a major determinant, because his respondents pointed to no significant performance disparities between the sexes in the higher education institutions in Kathmandu. Rather, age diversity has been discovered to influence teaching performance positively and consequently research participation.

Faculty motivation has been the subject of numerous studies conducted in different contexts but the community campuses in Nepal have not been well researched.

Studies have been focused in research-intensive institutions but little is known about motivation in teaching-intensive and resource-scarce institutions. Moreover, the synergy of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and their effect on institutional settings are also not fully understood so far locally (Phuyal, 2023). This paper seeks to fill these gaps by looking at motivating factors, institutional forces, and population factors that determine faculty research activity among Nepal community campus campuses.

This study focuses on providing the context-specific information about the intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that influence faculty members in Nepalese community campuses. Similarly, the finding can help to formulate the policy at the institutional and national levels. This study also addresses the critical role of demographic variables in pursuing the faculty's motivation towards publication. Furthermore, encouraging faculty research publication through this study can have positive effect on institutional reputation and quality accreditation of community campuses. Lastly, this study will contribute to local knowledge production, enabling community campuses to address Nepal’s developmental challenges more effectively through evidence-based research.

The main aim of this study is to assess faculty motivation levels towards research publication in community campuses, including key motivating factors and barriers along with to examine the impact of the institutional support system and motivational factors on research publication in community campuses. Based on the objectives, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: There is a significant difference in research productivity between male and female faculty members.

H2: There is a significant difference in motivation for research publication across different age groups of faculties.

H3: Intrinsic motivation significantly predicts faculty research productivity.

H4: Extrinsic motivation significantly predicts faculty research productivity.

H5: Institutional support significantly predicts faculty research productivity.

Methods and Materials

The research study used a descriptive and analytical research design under the quantitative research design to survey the motivation of faculty to publish a research in community campuses of Nepal. The method used was appropriate to establish the major motivational motives, obstacles, and contexts of demographic aspects that determine the productivity of a research, as well as statistical assessment of trends and correlations.

The sampled population included full time faculty working in the different campuses of a community within the Koshi Province in Nepal. The sample was comprised of 150 participants, and the stratified random sampling technique was adopted to make sure that it is demographically balanced in terms of discipline, gender, academic ranking and location.

The Closed-ended, on a 5-point Likert (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) scale questionnaire was used to gather the information with demographic inquiries (age, gender, scholastic level, experience)

The questionnaire was spread through an online format and physically according to the accessibility at various campuses and choice of faculty. The informed consent was obtained by all respondents, and the confidentiality is strictly observed during the process.

In order to guarantee instrument reliability, pilot test was done and Cronbach alpha was determined. The calculation yielded a reliability coefficient of items in the form of the motivation scale = 0.85, which is deemed as good.

This study used Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the data that was collected. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation), along with inferential statistics (ANOVA, independent t- tests and multiple regression analysis) were used in the examination of the data.

The author of the research observed the professional ethics closely. The researcher took into consideration voluntary participation, informed consent, and anonymity of respondents. This study was conducted entirely for academic purposes.

This study was conducted only in community campuses affiliated with Tribhuvan University. This research focused entirely on full-time faculty members only, excluding part time, visiting and contract-based faculty members. This study was limited to study the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors and selected demographic variables on research productivity. This research did not explore the institutional policy of the concerned campuses in depth. It also did not consider the impact or quality of research publication of community campuses. The findings were based on the responses from only 150 faculty members.

Result and Discussion

The demographic characteristics of faculty is highlighted in table 1

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Faculty

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	80	53.3
	Female	70	46.7
Age Group	25-34 years	40	26.7
	35-44 years	60	40.0
	45-54 years	40	26.7
	55 and above	10	6.7
Marital Status	Married	100	66.7
	Unmarried	50	33.3
Teaching Experience	0-5 years	30	20.0
	6-10 years	50	33.3
	11-20 years	40	26.7
	21 years and above	30	20.0

Source: Field Survey, 2024

The demographic profile of the faculty in terms of their gender was comparative among themselves: 53.3 percent of the faculty are males with 46.7 percent of the faculty being female. In terms of age, the highest was among 35 - 44 years category (40.0%, n = 60) followed by 25- 34 years and 45- 54 years with 26.7 percent (n = 40). A very small percentage of the faculty (6.7% n = 10) fell in the age category of above 55 years and above; therefore, the faculty was largely mid-career. This market force raises a condition whereby, this group of institutions will be at the mercy of a relatively young and dynamic whose possible long-term services and innovations, form the population of this academic. In the analysis of the marital status, 66.7 percent (n = 100) of the respondents were married people, in other words, 33.3 percent (n = 50) were not married. The implication of this distribution is that the majority of the faculty would be carrying out a mix of work and family life and this would influence their teaching load, administrative responsibilities but also on their overall job satisfaction. Analysis of the teaching experience shows that 33.3 percent (n = 50) of the faculty had the teaching experience range of 6 to 10 years followed by 5.0 to 20 years (26.7%, n = 40) of teaching experience and 0 to 5 years (20.0%, n = 30) and 21 and more years (20.0, n = 30).

Motivation Levels (Intrinsic and Extrinsic)

The motivation level of faculty is highlighted in table 2.

Table 2

Motivation Levels of Faculty

Motivational Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Intrinsic Motivation (Intellectual satisfaction)	4.2	0.68
Intrinsic Motivation (Personal interest)	4.5	0.59
Extrinsic Motivation (Career advancement)	4.0	0.72
Extrinsic Motivation (Financial incentives)	3.8	0.81
Institutional Support	3.2	0.95

Table 2 shows that that mean scores (M = 4.5, SD = 0.59 and M = 4.2, SD = 0.68) whose highest mean scores belong to the intrinsic aspects of motivation that were the personal interest and the intellectual satisfaction. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that members of the faculty can be motivated primarily on the interest of the individual to become involved in publication and the satisfaction that it brings to their intellectual curiosity. The standard deviations are low that indicate the direction towards uniform responses and the intrinsic motivation of the participants is strong. Under extrinsic motivation, the career development as well as financial incentives averagely scored 4.0 (SD = 0.72) and 3.8 (SD = 0.81) respectively. These results imply that there is a part that the external rewards play but it is not as effective as the intrinsic rewards. The variances in expectations or by-institution compensatory standards could be the reasons behind the greater standard deviation in the feedback of the financial incentives. The lowest score (M = 3.2, SD = 0.95) was recorded with institutional support with regard to the desire of the respondents to be helped by the institutions. The high standard deviation also means that there is no consistency with regard to how support systems are felt hence there should be more participation of the administration as well as greater clarification of the policy.

Challenges Faced

The following table presents the challenges faculty members face in research publication.

Table 3

Challenges Faced by Faculty

Challenges	Mean	Standard Deviation
Heavy Teaching Load	4.4	0.55
Limited Research Resources	4.1	0.70
Lack of Institutional Support	3.5	0.85
Time Constraints	4.2	0.67
Lack of Collaborative Opportunities	3.7	0.80

Table 3 highlights the challenges encountered by faculties. The highest mean (M = 4.4 SD=0.55) was reported in the area of too much teaching load. The implication is that, the teaching loads are heavy and hence the research has less time and energy in most Community Campuses with teaching emphases. The low standard deviation means that there was much agreement with regard to the respondents, which is a pointer that it is a general bottleneck. The time limit is also seen as the major barrier and the average (SD = 0.67) is high (4.2) that confirms that the workload determines the focus of the faculty members on research. The two problems are inter-connected in the direction of structural in the academic set-up that have over focused on the instructional roles to the depreciation of academic productions. The third one was limited research resources (M = 4.1, SD = 0.70) they were moderate to high scores of agreement that due to low research resources, the access to databases, research funds, and funds the research productivity falters. This limitation may be unsuitable to faculties in state-owned or low-resource based institutions. There were no opportunities of collaboration which ranked average 3.7 (SD = 0.80) elaborating that this should not be considered a major issue as per when it comes to publishing but it remains a critical barrier in that there is no form of academia networking or cooperation.

Gender Differences in Research Productivity

The researcher conducted an independent samples t-test to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in research productivity between male and female faculty members.

Table 4

Independent Sample t-Test

Group	Mean Research Output	Standard Deviation	t-Value	p-Value
Male	3.5	0.95	2.11	0.036*
Female	3.0	0.89		

*Significant at $p < 0.05$.

These findings prove that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean values of the research output of the two groups, t =2.11, p =.036, which indicates that gender is a significant aspect of research output. The mean research output among the male faculty was higher (M = 3.5, SD = 0.95) than that of the female faculty (M = 3.0, SD = 0.89). Therefore, because the p-value is smaller than the pre-determined alpha value of .05, the difference is a statistically significant result. This observation means that men faculty workers on average generate higher research outputs than women faculty workers in the target institution.

Effect of Age on Motivation for Research Productivity

An ANOVA test was conducted to examine whether age groups differ significantly in their levels of motivation for research publication.

Table 5

ANOVA Matrix

Age Group	Mean Motivation Level	Standard Deviation
25-34 years	4.0	0.78
35-44 years	4.3	0.65
45-54 years	3.8	0.85
55 and above	3.6	0.92

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Value	p-Value
Between Groups	4.32	3	1.44	2.93	0.034*
Within Groups	98.27	146	0.67		

*Significant at $p < 0.05$.

The analysis established that there was a statistically significant difference in research motivation per age, F(3, 146) = 2.93, p = .034, which shows that age forms an avenue leading to diversifications on motivation of research. The mean motivation level is high among the age bracket 35 44 (M = 4.3, SD = 0.65) where the level of motivation in the age group 25 34 (M = 4.0, SD = 0.78) is also high. Conversely, the motivation was less with faculty aged 45-54 (M =3.8, SD = 0.85) and above 55 years (M =3.6, SD

= 0.92). These findings indicate that the mid-career faculty members are more enthusiastic with regard to the involvement in research publication which is perhaps because of the pressure of career advancement and institutional promotion at that age.

Predictors of Research Productivity

A regression analysis was conducted to explore how intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and institutional support predict research productivity.

Table 6

Regression Results

Predictor Variable	B	Standard Error	Beta	t-Value	p-Value
Intrinsic Motivation	0.42	0.11	0.45	3.82	0.001**
Extrinsic Motivation	0.28	0.10	0.30	2.80	0.007**
Institutional Support	0.15	0.08	0.18	1.87	0.067

$R^2 = 0.52$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.50$

The total regression model was significant with 52 percent of the variance in research productivity ($R^2 = 0.52$, Adjusted R 2 = 0.50), which means that there was a good fit of the model. The most significant and strong predictor was intrinsic motivation (B = 0.42, SE= 0.11, 045, t = 3.82, p =.001). This implies that intellectually stimulated faculty members who take a personal interest in research are more probable to demonstrate a greater research output. The great and positive beta value confirms the imperativeness of self-motivated curiosity and intellectual satisfaction in enhancing academic productivity. Another major predictor of research productivity was in extrinsic motivation (B = 0.28, SE = 0.10, B = 0.30, t = 2.80, p = .007), which shows that research performance on faculty is influenced positively by external factors including opportunities to advance careers and monetary reward. This is because this discovery implies the worth of institutional systems of recognition and reward in the encouragement of scholarly personnel to research. Institutional support on the other

hand had a positive relationship with research productivity but not significant (R^2 = 0.03, B = 0.15, SE = 0.08, 0.18, t = 1.87, p = 0,067). that the value of the coefficient does not differ significantly on the traditional p <.05 level, although there seems to be a trend to increase an influence towards a positive one. It could be an indicator of irregular or inadequate support systems in institutions.

The sample showed a fairly balanced gender distribution, with slightly more male (53.3%) than female (46.7%) participants. This relatively equitable composition suggests that the institution has made progress in promoting inclusivity in hiring and retaining faculty. In terms of age, the majority of respondents fell within the 35–44 years range (40%), indicating a workforce that is not only young but also likely to be at a stage where career advancement and research activity are prioritized. These results resonate with earlier findings by Neve and Feldman (2015), who noted that mid-career academics often engage more actively in research due to pressures related to promotion and job security.

Additionally, most faculty reported being married or in long-term relationships, suggesting they have successfully navigated the balance between professional responsibilities and personal life. As Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) highlight, maintaining this balance contributes to overall job satisfaction and work performance. Institutions may therefore benefit from implementing flexible policies that support both family and career commitments.

Researchers singled out intrinsic motivations as the most potent drives to their research activity. They described themselves as being very intellectually satisfied (M = 4.2) and personally interested (M = 4.5), which were even higher than the external incentives of career growth (M = 4.0) and financial compensation (M = 3.8). These perceptions concur with the Self-Determination Theory by Deci and Ryan (2000), who

conclude that real curiosity and self-direction is the main ingredients to motivation over time and excellent performance.

The institutional support was, however, not so high (M = 3.2, SD = 0.95), which may indicate possible inadequacy of available resources or discrepancy between support experience across the departments. According to Bland et al., (2005), dichotomy within the support system or lack of proper articulation (or communication) of the support system can be detrimental to the academic motivation and output. As such, it is crucial to enhance institutional support, particularly by establishing of better communication and availability of personnel.

Some of the key factors that prevented research were achieved by the faculty. The heaviest teaching loads (M = 4.4) and time constraints (M = 4.2) were identified as the biggest obstacles, which differs with Rox (2014), who noticed the same trends in the environments where teaching has high precedence over research. Also, having adequate research infrastructure was considered a limiting factor (M = 4.1) which served to strengthen the organization with more access to financing and databases as well as technical assistance in the resource-constrained environment (Brew & Boud, 1995).

Although the opportunities to collaborate and support of institutions had lower averages, the large standard deviations reveal that faculty have different experiences. This implies that, although certain departments will host effective cooperative working conditions, others can be below par. Institutional leaders are advised to work on consistent methods of improving collaboration and guaranteeing fair assistance to each of the units.

Gender differences in the productivity of research resulted in the presence of a large gap as was seen in statistical analysis. Male faculty had expressed more output (M = 3.5) than that of female faculty (M = 3.0). According to Xu (2015), these disparities are typical in the world and usually are the results of systematic differences in resource

accumulation and support by institutional paradigms. These results demand specific interventions like encounters and mentorship programs, the provision of grants and the development of leadership to enhance equity and deal with possibilities of gender-based prejudices in the academic framework.

There was a high variation in the level of motivation among the various age groups. The most motivated group of faculties were mid-career (35 44 years) followed by the early-career (25 34 years). Faculty between 45 and over became de-motivated, which could be a result of change of priorities or burnout (Levinson et al., 2006). The trends reveal that the support mechanism needs to be designed according to the stage of the career in order to keep motivation and productivity through the career of an academic in an institution.

A multiple regression showed that intrinsic motivation was the best predictor of research output (0.45, P= .001) than extrinsic motivation (0.30, P =.007). These results confirm the perception of Amabile (1993) that creativity and research excellence is mainly as a result of internal motivation, which is curiosity and self-interest. Although the trend of institutional support was on the positive side, it was not significant (p = .067), implying that either its application is different in different instances, or that it is not quite effective in its present form.

In order to enhance faculty motivation and performance in research, institutions ought to center on building a culture that grants credence to intellectual interest and personal development, but on the other hand, must enhance support mechanisms in administration and infrastructure. Such investments in the way of mentorship, training and research facilities may serve as long-term investments and retention of the institutions in terms of scholarly production and reputation.

Conclusion

To sum up the paper, the presented study has helped shed light on the multidimensional aspect of faculty motivation to conduct research publication at the Nepali community campuses. The evidence shows that internal forces, including intellectual gratification and personal interest, are of eminent importance in keeping the research interesting, and extrinsic forces, including career development and money, also play a significant role. However, the study highlights the fact that institutional support is not at par and faculties are often held back due to excessive workload in teaching and inadequate research facilities and time. More so, the analysis shows that there is a continuing discrepancy between research productivity based on gender and age groups, and this indicates that academic institutions should be more inclusive and equal.

These results have profound implications on the policy maker and the leader of any institutions of higher education and the campus administrators. In order to develop a healthy research culture, the priority should be given to those reforms that would improve the amounts of research budget funds, introduce organized mentorship programs, and introduce some changes in the workload dynamics. Removal of the alleged barriers especially the gender inequality and career stage will play key role in enhancing better involvement of faculties as well as increasing the level of research productivity. Institutional support systems: Enhancing institutional support systems will not only make all community campuses gain academic grounds, but will also bringing them towards the larger goal of national development and quality of education in that country. Converting these insights into usable strategies allows the stakeholders to establish an enabling environment that allows long-term scholarly contributions and enhancing research capacity of community campuses in Nepal.

References

Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational synergy: Personal interest, goals, and creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*(3), 628–641. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.3.628

Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. G. (2005). A theoretical, practical, predictive model of faculty and department research productivity. *Academic Medicine, 80*(3), 225–237. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200503000-00007

Brew, A., & Boud, D. (1995). The place of research in staff development. *Higher Education, 29*(3), 285–303. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384737

Chapagain, B. R. (2020). *Job satisfaction among academicians in Nepal: The influence of institutional sector and demographic factors*. Quantitative Economics and Management Studies, 2(2), 94–104.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Fairweather, J. S. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 26–48.

Fox, M. F., & Mohapatra, S. (2007). Social-organizational characteristics of work and publication productivity among academic scientists in doctoral-granting departments. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(5), 542–571.

Gautam, D. K. (2020). Faculty research productivity in Nepalese universities. *Molung Educational Frontier, 10*(1), 72–89. https://doi.org/10.3126/mef.v10i1.33246

Geuna, A. (1999). *The economics of knowledge production: Funding and the structure of university research*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Gharti, A. (2023). Examining age diversity, gender diversity and teaching performance in higher education in the Kathmandu Valley. *Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 6*(3), 129-144.

Ghimire, B., Karki, D., Dahal, R. K., & Joshi, S. P. (2024). *The impact of psychological capital on faculty motivation in higher education institutions of Nepal: A cross-sectional study*. Journal of Business and Management, 8(2), 36–49.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(1), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4277352

Hemmings, B., & Kay, R. (2010). Research self-efficacy, publication output, and early career development. *International Journal of Educational Management, 24*(7), 562–573.

Lee, S., & Bozeman, B. (2005). The impact of research collaboration on scientific productivity. *Social Studies of Science, 35*(5), 673–702.

Levinson, W., Kaufman, K., Clark, V., & Tolle, S. W. (2006). You've got to get up every morning and decide to be happy: Stories of resilience from physicians nearing retirement. *Academic Medicine, 81*(5), 433–441. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200605000-00011

Neve, H., & Feldman, K. A. (2015). Relationships of college faculty's motives for teaching, research, and service with their perceived abilities, experiences, and values. *Teaching in Higher Education, 20*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.987750

Phuyal, P. (2023). *Motivation and professional development of faculty respondents in community colleges: A case study in Eastern Nepal*. *Journal of Management, 6*(1), 116–133.

Regmi, K. D. (2019). Why don't Nepalese academics publish? *Higher Education Policy, 32*(3), 511–529.

Rox, T., (2014). Dimensions of academic teaching cultures: Exploring patterns through thematic analysis. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(4), 653–667. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.721361

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 54–67.

Shrestha, S., & Singh, A. (2022). Gender and Research Productivity in Nepalese Academia: A Case of Community Campuses. *South Asian Educational Review*, *5*(1), 45-60

Sivertsen, G., & Meijer, I. (2020). Normal versus extraordinary societal impact: How to understand, evaluate, and improve research activities in their relations to society? *Research Evaluation, 29*(2), 136–148. https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvaa016

Subedi, B. P. (2018). Challenges of research and innovation in Nepal. *Journal of Education and Research, 8*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3126/jer.v8i1.25336

Times Higher Education (2021). *World University Rankings 2021 methodology*. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/world-university-rankings-2021-methodology

UGC Nepal. (2022). *Annual report 2021/22*. University Grants Commission Nepal. https://www.ugcnepal.edu.np/publication

Brink, V. M., Fruytier, B., & Thunnissen, M. (2013). Talent management in academia: Performance systems and HRM policies. *Human Resource Management Journal, 23*(2), 180–195. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2006.00030.x

Xu, L. (2015). Women and research productivity in higher education: A comparative perspective. *Higher Education Policy, 28*(2), 189–206. https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.2014.26