

# GAP Lecturers Perceptions and Preferences in Scientific Research and Publication Activities

*by* Dhian Tyas Untari

---

**Submission date:** 22-Apr-2020 11:15AM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 1289482543

**File name:** IJASE\_Template\_2019-new.docx (66.88K)

**Word count:** 1479

**Character count:** 8159

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

## GAP Lecturers Perceptions and Preferences in Scientific Research and Publication Activities

Dhian Tyas Untari<sup>#</sup>, Rini Wijayaningsih<sup>1</sup>, Bintang Narpati<sup>1</sup>, Tyna Yunita<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya University, Indonesia

e-mail: tyas\_un@yahoo.co.id

<sup>#</sup>Corresponding Author

Whatsapp Number 08 1285492242

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 5 January 2019

Revised: 28 February 2019

Accepted: 7 March 2019

Copyright © 2019 Authors & Published by IIES Independent. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-SA License.



### ABSTRACT

This study aims to look at the GAP between lecturers' perceptions and preferences related to research activities and publications. Question material related to Perception and Preference aspects. Before the workshop, a questionnaire was given to assess the Perception aspect, then after the workshop, respondents were again given the same question to assess the Preference aspect. The data is in the form of cross sectional and is processed using descriptive statistics and GAP analysis models. Before conducting research and publication workshops, lecturers' interests and perceptions were still very minimal. But after the activities of the Lecturer began to be interested and interested in researching and publicizing. As a suggestion, this activity should be carried out continuously and continued with assistance so that the developed interest can be implemented in real activities.

**Keywords:** GAP analysis, Lecture, Tridarma, Indonesia

**How to Cite:** Surname, N. M. & Surname, N. M. (Year). Put the title of the paper here. *International Journal of Advances in Social and Economics*, Vol (No), Page X- Page Y. doi: <https://doi.org/10.33122/ijase.v1i1.0001>

### Introduction

As mandated in Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers, and Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 37 of 2009 concerning Lecturers, it is stated that lecturers are professional educators and scientists with the task of developing, disseminating knowledge, technology, and art, research and community service (Margaretha and Saragih; 2012).

The main task of the teaching staff is to carry out teaching and is obliged to apply knowledge and take a role in society with knowledge at large. Thus in addition to the implementation of the national education staff, teachers are required to take part in research and study activities and actively publish the results of ideas, both on an internal, national and international scale. This is related to the role of a teacher who also plays a role as a scientist who as much as possible should be able to play a role in the development of science.

The issue of research productivity is quite interesting. According to (Kademani, B., V. Kumar, A. Kumar, A. Sagar, L. Mohan, 2005), research productivity reflects the contribution of an institution or a researcher to research activities. Evaluation of research productivity provides in-depth knowledge of the dynamics of research activities (Amelia, M and Rahmaida, 2017).

Scientific publications are also an accurate measure to see the research achievements of a country (Inglesi-Lotz, R., 2013). The fact that the quality and quantity of lecturers' writing is inseparable from the lack of reviewer interest and writing ability (Wardani, 2012). This also happened to the Lecturers in Jakarta. Lack of interest in reading (Ingriyani F and N, 2017), ideas and understanding of how to write scientific works to how to publish scientific works, is one of the obstacles to the lack of productivity of lecturer writing (Margaretha M and Saragih S, 2012). On the other hand, the quality and quantity of research produced from a tertiary institution is one of the key benchmarks in achieving and achieving academic excellence. An assessment of this has also been set out in the standards and procedures for higher education accreditation. Universities that have a reputation as a research-based university (research university) are often indicated as colleges that have good quality (Wichian, 2009). This then inspired us to study more about the lecturers' perceptions and preferences regarding research activities and scientific publications.

### Method

The study was conducted in Jokjakarta, involving lecturers at the College of Tourism. Involving 30 respondents. The method used is to provide questionnaires before and after research and publication workshops. Question material related to Perception and Preference aspects. Before the workshop, a questionnaire was given to assess the Perception aspect, then after the workshop, respondents were again given the same question to assess the Preference aspect. The data is in the form of cross sectional

and is processed using descriptive statistics and GAP analysis models. The scoring system uses the Linkert scale; 1. strongly disagree, 2. disagree, 3. neutral, 4. Agree, 5. strongly disagree

**Results and Discussion**

Based on the results of the respondent's profile data recap, it can be seen in table 1,

Table 1. Profile of Responses

	Categories
Gender	Male = 12
	Female = 18
Age	24 – 30 = 9
	31 – 40 = 15
	41 – 50 = 6
Education	Bachelor = 1
	Master = 29
	Doctor = 0

Sources : Procced data, 2019

Based on the recapitulation data in table 1, it can be seen that the majority of Lecturers are in the productive age category (31-40 years old), and the majority of education is Masters education. In general it can be concluded that respondents should have a high enthusiasm for writing and researching.

The questionnaire was divided into several questions related to 9 things namely; limited ideas, limited time, the ability to write and compose sentences, the ability of methodologies, the ability to access journal information, the ability to use the Online Journal System (OJS), the determination to accept input from reviewers, the ability to improve journal manuscripts, the physical ability to pay publication charges. The recapitulation of the results of the respondents' assessment before and after the workshop is as shown in table 2 below,

Table 2. Average score by respondents

Questions	Perseccion	Preference
limited ideas	3,5	4,2
limited time	2,7	2,9
the ability to write and compose sentences	3,1	3,4
the ability of methodologies	2,9	3,1
the ability to access journal information	2,9	3,6
the ability to use the Online Journal System (OJS)	2,8	3,6
the determination to accept input from reviewers	2,6	2,9
the ability to improve journal manuscripts	2,9	3,4

the physical ability to pay publication charges	3,6	3,6
---	-----	-----

Sources : Processed data, 2019

In general, there is a significant difference between the perception that research is difficult and publication is expensive (before the workshop) with the preference of respondents to want to start writing and publishing their work. The next data processing is to use the GAP Analysis model, as can be seen in table 3.

Table 3. GAP analysis

Questions	Perseccion	Preference	GAP
limited ideas	3,5	4,2	0,7
limited time	2,7	2,9	0,2
the ability to write and compose sentences	3,1	3,4	0,3
the ability of methodologies	2,9	3,1	0,2
the ability to access journal information	2,9	3,6	0,7
the ability to use the Online Journal System (OJS)	2,8	3,6	0,8
the determination to accept input from reviewers	2,6	2,9	0,3
the ability to improve journal manuscripts	2,9	3,4	0,5
the physical ability to pay publication charges	3,6	3,7	0,1

Source : Processed data, 2019

Based on the results of the GAP Analysis, it can be concluded that the workshop activities are going well and can increase the interest and understanding of lecturers in terms of research and publication, this can be seen from the increase in scores given by respondents.

**Conclusion**

Lecturers are professions that require to carry out "Tridarma" or three main tasks; teach, research and then publicize it and carry out service community activities. Research and publication have been considered difficult because of the many limitations faced. Before conducting research and publication workshops, lecturers' interests and perceptions were still very minimal. But after the activities of the Lecturer began to be interested and interested in researching and publicizing. As a suggestion, this activity should be carried out continuously and

continued with assistance so that the developed interest can be implemented in real activities.

## References

- Amelia, M dan Rahmaida, R. (2017). . Produktivitas Ilmiah Peneliti Indonesia pada Penelitian Keanekaragaman Hayati Indonesia Berdasarkan Basis Data Scopus 1990-2015. *Jurnal Biologi Indonesia* 13(2), 241–251.
- Inggriyani F dan N. (2017). PENGARUH BERPIKIR KRITIS TERHADAP KEMAMPUAN MENULIS NARASI SISWA KELAS V DI SEKOLAH DASAR. *JPSD*. 3(2). *JPSD*. 3(2)., 105–116.
- Inglesi-Lotz, R., & A. P. (2013). The influence of scientific research output of academics on economic growth in South Africa: An autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) application. *Scientometrics*, 129 –139.
- Kademani, B., V. Kumar, A. Kumar, A. Sagar, L. Mohan, & G. S. (2005). Publication Productivity of the Bioorganic Division at Bhabha Atomic Research Centre: A Scientometric Study. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 135-146.
- Margaretha M dan Saragih S. (2012). FAKTOR-FAKTOR PENENTU PRODUKTIVITAS PENELITIAN DOSEN SEBAGAI IMPLEMENTASI INTEGRITAS PROFESI. *Zenit*. 1(3)., 195–208.
- Wardani, P. (2012). Hubungan Minat Menulis Resensi Dengan Kemampuan Menulis Resensi Siswa Kelas XI SMA Widya Gama Malang. Unpublished Manuscript Universitas Negri Malang.
- Wichian, N. S. S. W. and S. B. (2009). Factors Affecting Research Productivity of Faculty Members in Government Universities: Lisrel and Neural Network Analysis. *Kasetsart J. (Soc. Sci)*. 30, 67–78.





# GAP Lecturers Perceptions and Preferences in Scientific Research and Publication Activities

---

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

---

**20%**

SIMILARITY INDEX

**20%**

INTERNET SOURCES

**0%**

PUBLICATIONS

**0%**

STUDENT PAPERS

---

## PRIMARY SOURCES

---

**1**

**www.scilit.net**

Internet Source

**20%**

---

Exclude quotes      On

Exclude matches      < 200 words

Exclude bibliography      On