American Journal of Applied Science and Technology

VOLUME Vol.06 Issue 08 2026
PAGE NO. 65-76
DOI-10.37547/ajast/Volume06Issue08-06

Predictive Modeling of Research Productivity in Higher Educational Institutes Using Regression and Deep Learning

Dr. Leka Tarosa

Department of AI and Information Systems Vanuatu Institute of Smart Technologies Port Vila, Vanuatu

Dr. Naomi Kalolo

Laboratory of Data Science and Intelligent Applications Pacific Digital Research Center Port Vila, Vanuatu

Received: 29 June 2026; **Accepted:** 15 July 2026; **Published:** 12 August 2026A

Abstract: Research productivity has become a fundamental indicator for evaluating the academic performance, institutional reputation, and global competitiveness of higher educational institutes. Universities increasingly rely on quantitative performance indicators to allocate research funding, assess faculty achievements, and formulate strategic development policies. However, research productivity is influenced by numerous interrelated institutional, professional, and individual factors, making accurate prediction a complex analytical challenge. Conventional statistical approaches have provided valuable insights into linear relationships among productivity determinants, yet they often fail to capture complex nonlinear interactions present in large educational datasets. Recent developments in machine learning, particularly deep learning, offer new opportunities for developing predictive models capable of identifying hidden relationships and improving forecasting accuracy.

This research and review article develops a predictive modeling framework integrating regression analysis with deep learning techniques to estimate research productivity in higher educational institutes. The study synthesizes previous investigations concerning faculty motivation, institutional performance, research evaluation indicators, scientometric analysis, organizational risk, and productivity assessment to establish a comprehensive analytical foundation. Regression analysis is employed to quantify statistically significant predictors, while deep learning models are proposed to capture multidimensional nonlinear relationships among institutional and academic variables. The proposed framework demonstrates how hybrid predictive approaches can improve institutional decision-making, faculty development strategies, and research policy formulation.

Keywords: Research Productivity, Higher Education, Regression Analysis, Deep Learning, Predictive Modeling, Educational Analytics, Artificial Intelligence, Faculty Performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

Research productivity represents one of the most significant indicators used to evaluate academic excellence within higher educational institutes. Universities are increasingly assessed based on publication output, citation impact, funded research projects, collaborative activities, innovation performance, and knowledge dissemination. Consequently, institutional administrators continuously seek reliable approaches to understand factors influencing faculty productivity and to forecast future research performance.

The evaluation of research productivity has evolved from simple publication counting toward multidimensional performance assessment models incorporating qualitative and quantitative indicators. Early educational research emphasized institutional policies, faculty motivation, workload allocation, and organizational support as primary determinants of academic productivity (Creswell, 1985). Contemporary higher education systems, however, generate large volumes of heterogeneous data, requiring more sophisticated analytical techniques capable of identifying complex relationships among influencing variables.

Regression analysis has traditionally served as the dominant statistical technique for investigating relationships between independent variables and research performance. Regression models provide interpretable estimates of variable importance while supporting hypothesis testing and policy formulation. Nevertheless, educational environments exhibit nonlinear interactions that frequently violate regression assumptions, limiting predictive performance.

Deep learning techniques have emerged as powerful alternatives capable of learning hierarchical feature representations from complex datasets. By integrating regression-based statistical interpretation with deep neural architectures, institutions can develop predictive systems that simultaneously preserve explainability and improve forecasting accuracy.

The assessment framework proposed by **Chang and Chiu (2008)** demonstrates that research productivity evaluation should incorporate multiple weighted indicators rather than relying on single performance measures. Their multidimensional assessment perspective provides an important theoretical basis for predictive modeling within higher education.

Problem Statement

Although extensive research has investigated factors affecting research productivity, existing studies frequently examine isolated variables without integrating institutional, motivational, organizational, and scientometric dimensions into a unified predictive framework. Traditional statistical models successfully identify significant relationships but often struggle when predictor interactions become nonlinear or highly correlated.

Higher educational institutes therefore face several challenges:

- Difficulty identifying future high-performing researchers.
- Limited ability to allocate research funding efficiently.
- Inadequate prediction of institutional research performance.
- Insufficient analytical support for strategic policy formulation.
- Poor understanding of multidimensional interactions among productivity factors.

These challenges motivate the development of predictive models capable of integrating conventional statistical analysis with modern artificial intelligence techniques.

Research Relevance

Universities worldwide are undergoing digital transformation, leading to unprecedented availability of institutional data regarding publications, collaborations, grants, citations, teaching responsibilities, faculty demographics, and organizational support systems. Such datasets create opportunities for predictive analytics capable of improving institutional planning.

Predictive modeling supports evidence-based management by enabling administrators to:

- anticipate research performance,
- optimize faculty development initiatives,
- improve research investment strategies,
- identify productivity barriers,
- strengthen institutional competitiveness.

The integration of regression and deep learning therefore represents an important advancement in educational data analytics.

Objectives

The primary objectives of this study are:

- To identify major factors influencing research productivity in higher educational institutes.
- To examine theoretical foundations supporting productivity prediction.
- To analyze regression-based approaches for productivity estimation.
- To develop a deep learning-assisted predictive framework.
- To compare statistical and artificial intelligence approaches for educational analytics.
- To discuss practical implications for institutional decision-making.

Scope and Significance

The study focuses on predictive modeling of faculty research productivity within higher educational institutes. Rather than emphasizing a specific country or institution, the paper synthesizes theoretical findings from previous studies to construct a generalized analytical framework applicable across diverse educational environments.

The significance of the study lies in demonstrating how artificial intelligence can complement traditional statistical methods rather than replace them. Such hybrid analytical approaches provide greater prediction accuracy while maintaining interpretability essential for educational policy implementation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research productivity has been investigated from multiple theoretical perspectives including organizational behavior, institutional management, faculty motivation, scientometrics, educational policy, and statistical evaluation. Collectively, these studies reveal that research productivity is a multidimensional phenomenon influenced by institutional characteristics, individual competencies, resource availability, performance evaluation systems, and organizational culture.

One of the earliest comprehensive investigations was conducted by **Creswell (1985)**, who argued that research productivity cannot be explained solely by individual academic ability. Instead, institutional climate, administrative leadership, research infrastructure, and professional expectations collectively shape faculty performance. Creswell emphasized that successful research universities establish organizational environments encouraging continuous scholarly engagement rather than relying exclusively on performance evaluation mechanisms.

Building upon institutional perspectives, **Chen, Gupta, and Hoshower (2006)** examined motivational determinants influencing business faculty research activities through expectancy theory. Their findings suggested that faculty members demonstrate higher research engagement when they perceive meaningful relationships between research effort, institutional recognition, professional rewards, and career advancement. This theoretical perspective highlights motivation as an indirect predictor that should be incorporated into predictive analytical models.

Research evaluation methodologies have also received considerable attention. **Chang and Chiu (2008)** proposed weighted index approaches for assessing university professors' research performance. Instead of relying exclusively on publication counts, they demonstrated that multiple performance indicators contribute differently to overall productivity assessment. Their multidimensional evaluation framework supports the development of predictive models using weighted academic variables rather than simplistic output measures (**Chang & Chiu, 2008**).

International comparative evidence further illustrates that institutional context significantly influences productivity outcomes. **Ahmed and Diah (2019)** analyzed research productivity patterns within Saudi Arabia and Iran, concluding that national research policies, funding mechanisms, institutional priorities, and academic culture collectively shape publication performance. Their comparative analysis indicates that predictive models should incorporate contextual institutional variables rather than assuming universal productivity patterns.

Institutional effectiveness has also been examined from policy perspectives. **Alcaine (2016)** investigated factors associated with institutional performance among research-intensive universities. The study emphasized strategic governance, research investment, faculty recruitment policies, organizational leadership, and administrative support as major contributors to institutional research excellence. These findings suggest that organizational characteristics serve as essential predictive variables when modeling research productivity.

From a risk management perspective, **Toma, Alexa, and Şarpe (2014)** highlighted organizational risks affecting higher educational institutions. Financial uncertainty, administrative instability, ineffective governance, and policy inconsistency may indirectly reduce research productivity by limiting institutional capacity for sustained scholarly activities. Consequently, predictive systems should account for institutional risk factors alongside academic performance indicators.

Scientometric analysis provides another valuable perspective. **Wagner et al. (2016)** examined factors affecting scientific impact through literature review evaluation. Their findings demonstrated that collaboration networks, publication quality, research visibility, and methodological rigor substantially influence scientific impact beyond publication quantity alone. These observations indicate that productivity prediction should extend beyond publication counts toward broader research influence indicators.

Although originating from civil engineering, the artificial neural network approach developed by **Golnaraghi et al. (2019)** demonstrates the capacity of deep learning algorithms to model complex nonlinear relationships between multiple predictors and productivity outcomes. Their successful application of neural networks for labor productivity prediction provides methodological inspiration for educational analytics, where similarly complex multidimensional interactions exist.

Finally, **Yang (2017)** investigated determinants affecting Taiwanese university professors' research output, identifying institutional support, workload distribution, research collaboration, academic experience, and professional commitment as important productivity predictors. The study reinforces the notion that research productivity emerges through interactions among institutional and individual characteristics rather than isolated variables.

Comparative Analysis and Research Gap

Across the reviewed studies, several common determinants consistently emerge: institutional support, faculty motivation, governance quality, evaluation mechanisms, collaboration, and workload. However, most prior research employs either conventional statistical techniques or conceptual analyses, with limited integration of advanced deep learning approaches. Moreover, weighted evaluation systems such as those proposed by **Chang and Chiu (2008)** are rarely combined with nonlinear predictive models despite their potential to enhance forecasting performance. This gap motivates the development of a hybrid framework that integrates regression analysis for interpretability with deep learning for capturing complex relationships, thereby advancing predictive analytics in higher education.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a **research and review methodology** to develop a predictive framework for estimating research productivity in higher educational institutes. The methodology combines evidence synthesized from the selected literature with a conceptual analytical model integrating regression analysis and deep learning techniques. Rather than collecting primary institutional data, the study proposes a generalized predictive architecture that can be adapted by universities using their own research performance datasets.

The methodological foundation is based on the assumption that research productivity is a multidimensional outcome influenced by institutional, organizational, motivational, and individual variables. Consequently, predictive performance can be improved by combining interpretable statistical methods with data-driven artificial intelligence models.

The proposed methodology consists of six sequential phases:

1. Identification of research productivity determinants.
2. Data preprocessing and feature engineering.
3. Regression-based statistical modeling.
4. Deep learning model development.
5. Comparative prediction analysis.
6. Institutional interpretation and decision support.

This hybrid workflow enables universities to generate accurate predictions while preserving the interpretability required for policy implementation.

3.2 Theoretical Foundation

The proposed predictive framework is supported by three complementary theoretical perspectives.

The first perspective is institutional performance theory, which argues that organizational characteristics such as governance quality, research funding, infrastructure, and academic policies directly influence faculty productivity (Alcaine, 2016). Institutions with stronger research ecosystems generally produce higher scholarly output.

The second perspective derives from expectancy theory, suggesting that faculty members increase research engagement when they expect meaningful professional rewards from research activities (Chen et al., 2006). Motivation therefore acts as an indirect predictor of productivity.

The third perspective is multidimensional performance evaluation. According to **Chang and Chiu (2008)**, research productivity should not be measured through publication counts alone. Instead, multiple weighted indicators collectively represent research performance. This principle forms the basis for selecting predictive variables within the proposed framework and reinforces the need for weighted feature importance during model development.

3.3 Predictor Variables

Based on the reviewed literature, the predictive model incorporates variables representing institutional, professional, and individual characteristics.

Table 1. Proposed Variables for Predicting Research Productivity

Category	**Representative Variables**
Faculty Characteristics	Academic experience, qualification, academic rank
Institutional Support	Research funding, laboratory facilities, administrative support
Motivation	Promotion opportunities, incentives, recognition
Collaboration	National collaborations, international collaborations
Workload	Teaching hours, administrative responsibilities
Research Activities	Publications, conference papers, grants
Performance Indicators	Citation count, h-index, journal quality
Institutional Environment	Governance quality, research policies, strategic planning

These variables collectively represent the multidimensional nature of academic productivity and align with findings across the reviewed studies.

3.4 Data Preparation

Effective predictive modeling requires systematic preprocessing before algorithm implementation.

The first stage involves data cleaning, including removal of duplicate records, correction of inconsistent entries, and treatment of missing observations.

The second stage performs normalization because predictor variables often exist on different numerical scales. Feature scaling improves regression stability and facilitates neural network convergence.

Categorical variables, including academic department and faculty rank, are transformed into numerical representations through suitable encoding techniques.

Feature engineering further improves predictive capability by constructing derived variables such as publication rate, collaboration intensity, citation efficiency, and research funding per faculty member.

Finally, the dataset is divided into training, validation, and testing subsets to enable unbiased model evaluation.

3.5 Regression-Based Predictive Model

Regression analysis provides the statistical foundation of the proposed framework.

Multiple regression estimates the influence of independent variables on research productivity while quantifying statistical significance and predictor importance.

The regression model may be represented conceptually as:

Research Productivity=f(X1,X2,X3,...,Xn)

where:

- X_1 = Institutional support
- X_2 = Faculty motivation
- X_3 = Collaboration
- X_4 = Research funding
- X_5 = Teaching workload
- X_6 = Academic experience
- X_7 = Performance indicators

Regression coefficients identify variables contributing most significantly to productivity prediction.

The major strengths of regression include:

- High interpretability
- Statistical significance testing
- Variable importance estimation
- Policy-oriented decision support

However, regression assumes linear relationships among predictors and may not fully capture complex interactions occurring within educational environments.

3.6 Deep Learning Model

To overcome the limitations of traditional regression, this study incorporates a deep learning model capable of learning nonlinear relationships among predictor variables.

The proposed architecture consists of:

- Input Layer
- Multiple Hidden Layers
- Nonlinear Activation Functions
- Output Layer predicting research productivity

The neural network automatically learns interactions among institutional, motivational, and research variables without requiring manually specified mathematical relationships.

Unlike regression, deep learning can discover hidden feature interactions that significantly influence prediction accuracy.

Inspired by the neural network application presented by Golnaraghi et al. (2019), the proposed model adapts multilayer learning principles to educational analytics rather than engineering productivity prediction.

Figure 1. Proposed Hybrid Regression–Deep Learning Framework

Institutional Data

▼

Data Cleaning & Preprocessing

▼

Feature Engineering

▼

Regression Analysis | Deep Learning Neural Network | Feature Importance Analysis

▼

Prediction Fusion

▼

Research Productivity Score

▼

Institutional Decision Support

3.7 Hybrid Prediction Strategy

Rather than selecting a single predictive algorithm, this study proposes a hybrid prediction strategy integrating regression outputs with deep learning predictions.

Regression contributes:

- Statistical explanation
- Variable significance
- Policy interpretation

Deep learning contributes:

- Nonlinear relationship modeling
- Automatic feature extraction
- Higher prediction capability

Combining both approaches reduces weaknesses associated with individual methods while improving robustness.

This integrated analytical strategy is particularly valuable in higher education because administrators require both prediction accuracy and transparent explanations for policy decisions.

3.8 Model Evaluation

Prediction performance should be evaluated using multiple complementary metrics.

Table 2. Performance Evaluation Metrics

Metric	Purpose
Mean Absolute Error (MAE)	Measures average prediction error
Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)	Penalizes larger prediction errors
Coefficient of Determination (R^2)	Explains variance captured by the model
Prediction Accuracy	Measures overall forecasting performance
Computational Efficiency	Evaluates processing time

Regression performance is primarily assessed using R^2 and statistical significance, whereas deep learning performance emphasizes predictive accuracy and error minimization.

3.9 Practical Implementation in Higher Educational Institutes

The proposed framework can be incorporated into university research management systems to support strategic planning.

Potential institutional applications include:

- Early identification of highly productive researchers.
- Personalized faculty development programs.
- Strategic allocation of research funding.
- Evaluation of institutional research policies.
- Prediction of departmental research performance.
- Monitoring long-term institutional productivity trends.

By integrating predictive analytics into institutional decision-making, universities can transition from reactive management toward evidence-based strategic planning.

Furthermore, the weighted assessment principles proposed by **Chang and Chiu (2008)** can be embedded within the feature engineering stage, ensuring that research productivity is evaluated through multiple balanced indicators rather than simplistic publication counts. This integration enhances both prediction quality and institutional fairness.

3.10 Methodological Strengths and Limitations

The proposed methodology offers several advantages.

First, it integrates explainable statistical modeling with advanced artificial intelligence, enabling both interpretation and high predictive capability.

Second, it accommodates multidimensional educational datasets that include institutional, organizational, and faculty-level characteristics.

Third, the framework is scalable across universities with different research environments and performance indicators.

Nevertheless, certain limitations remain. The proposed framework is conceptual and depends on the availability of high-quality institutional datasets for empirical implementation. Differences in national research policies, funding structures, and evaluation criteria may also affect model generalizability. Additionally, deep learning models generally require larger datasets than conventional regression techniques to achieve optimal performance.

Despite these limitations, the hybrid methodology provides a robust foundation for future empirical studies investigating predictive analytics in higher education.

4. RESULTS

The proposed hybrid framework demonstrates that research productivity in higher educational institutes is best understood as the outcome of interactions among institutional support, faculty characteristics, motivational factors, research collaboration, workload, and organizational policies rather than any single determinant. Regression analysis provides an interpretable statistical assessment of the contribution of each predictor, whereas the deep learning component captures nonlinear dependencies that conventional models may overlook. Consequently, the integrated model offers greater analytical capability than using either approach independently.

The literature consistently indicates that institutional support—including research funding, infrastructure, administrative facilitation, and strategic governance—is a primary determinant of research productivity. Studies examining institutional performance emphasize that universities with effective research policies and supportive organizational environments generally exhibit stronger publication output and scientific impact (Alcaine, 2016; Ahmed & Diah, 2019). These findings suggest that institutional variables should receive considerable weight within predictive models.

Faculty motivation also emerges as a significant predictor. Motivation is strengthened when researchers perceive that scholarly achievement leads to professional recognition, promotion, and career advancement. The expectancy theory perspective explains that research effort increases when expected rewards are aligned with institutional evaluation systems (Chen et al., 2006). Consequently, motivation-related variables contribute substantially to predictive accuracy.

The multidimensional evaluation framework proposed by **Chang and Chiu (2008)** further supports the finding that research productivity should not be represented solely by publication counts. Instead, weighted indicators—including publication quality, research impact, collaboration, and academic contribution—provide a more comprehensive representation of faculty performance. Incorporating these weighted measures into feature engineering improves the capability of both regression and deep learning models to estimate research productivity accurately.

Research collaboration is another influential factor. Collaborative activities enhance knowledge exchange, interdisciplinary innovation, publication opportunities, and citation impact. The reviewed literature suggests that institutions encouraging collaborative research networks are more likely to experience sustained improvements in scientific productivity (Wagner et al., 2016; Yang, 2017).

From a methodological perspective, regression analysis effectively identifies statistically significant variables and quantifies their individual contributions. However, educational datasets frequently contain complex interactions among institutional, motivational, and organizational factors. Deep learning models overcome this limitation by automatically learning nonlinear relationships, making them particularly suitable for predicting research productivity in dynamic academic environments. The proposed hybrid framework therefore achieves an appropriate balance between interpretability and predictive capability.

Overall, the synthesized evidence indicates that integrating statistical analysis with artificial intelligence produces a more reliable decision-support mechanism for higher educational institutes than relying on traditional evaluation approaches alone.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings reinforce the view that research productivity is a multidimensional phenomenon requiring analytical models capable of integrating organizational, institutional, and individual characteristics. Traditional statistical techniques remain valuable because they provide transparent explanations regarding the significance of individual predictors. However, increasing data complexity within higher educational institutes necessitates computational methods capable of identifying hidden relationships that conventional regression cannot adequately model.

The proposed hybrid framework addresses this challenge by combining regression analysis with deep learning. Regression contributes statistical interpretability, allowing university administrators to identify which institutional policies or faculty characteristics most strongly influence research performance. Such interpretability is essential because higher education policies require evidence-based justification rather than purely algorithmic predictions.

Conversely, deep learning enhances predictive performance by modeling nonlinear interactions among variables. Academic productivity rarely develops through independent influences; instead, institutional funding, collaboration opportunities, research infrastructure, motivation, and workload interact simultaneously. Deep neural architectures are capable of learning these multidimensional relationships without requiring predefined assumptions regarding variable interactions.

The literature also emphasizes the importance of balanced evaluation systems. The weighted assessment methodology proposed by **Chang and Chiu (2008)** demonstrates that faculty performance should be evaluated through multiple complementary indicators rather than simplistic publication counts. Incorporating weighted research indicators into predictive analytics increases both fairness and predictive validity. This principle represents one of the principal theoretical contributions supporting the proposed hybrid model.

Comparison with previous studies reveals strong conceptual consistency. Creswell (1985) emphasized organizational climate and institutional support, while Chen et al. (2006) highlighted motivational determinants. Ahmed and Diah (2019) demonstrated the influence of national research environments, whereas Yang (2017) emphasized collaboration and workload management. Collectively, these studies suggest that no single predictor sufficiently explains research productivity. Instead, predictive models should integrate diverse variables representing institutional, professional, and individual dimensions.

Despite its strengths, the proposed framework has several limitations. First, it is conceptual and requires empirical validation using institutional datasets from different universities. Second, deep learning models generally require substantial amounts of high-quality data for effective training. Third, differences in research evaluation policies among countries may influence model performance and limit direct generalization. Future empirical investigations should therefore examine cross-national datasets to evaluate the adaptability of the proposed framework across diverse higher education systems.

From a practical perspective, the hybrid model offers substantial benefits for university management. Predictive analytics can support strategic resource allocation, identify researchers requiring institutional support, improve faculty development initiatives, and strengthen evidence-based research planning. Consequently, integrating regression and deep learning into institutional research management systems has the potential to enhance both academic productivity and organizational effectiveness.

6. CONCLUSION

Research productivity has become one of the most important indicators of institutional excellence in higher educational institutes. The complexity of academic environments requires analytical methods capable of examining diverse institutional, organizational, and individual determinants simultaneously. This study developed a conceptual hybrid predictive framework integrating regression analysis with deep learning techniques to improve the estimation of faculty research productivity.

The literature demonstrates that institutional support, faculty motivation, collaboration, governance quality, workload, and multidimensional performance evaluation collectively influence research outcomes. Regression analysis provides interpretable statistical evidence regarding the significance of these variables, whereas deep learning captures nonlinear relationships that conventional statistical models cannot adequately represent. Their integration therefore offers improved predictive capability while maintaining transparency for institutional decision-making.

The study contributes to educational analytics by proposing a scalable framework capable of supporting strategic planning, research funding allocation, faculty evaluation, and institutional policy development. By incorporating weighted performance indicators consistent with the evaluation principles proposed by **Chang and Chiu (2008)**, the framework also promotes more comprehensive and equitable assessment of academic performance.

Future research should validate the proposed framework using real-world institutional datasets and compare multiple machine learning architectures to further improve predictive accuracy, interpretability, and generalizability across diverse higher education systems.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, Y. A. M., & Diah, N. M. (2019). An analysis of research productivity in Saudi Arabia and Iran. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education, 4*, 197–208.
2. Alcaine, J. G. (2016). *Factors affecting institutional performance at high and very high research universities: Policy implications*. PhD Thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University.
3. Chang, C. Y., & Chiu, C. Y. (2008). A study on index weights for assessing university professors' research performance. *Journal of National Taipei University of Technology, 41*(1), 89–106.
4. Chen, Y., Gupta, A., & Hoshower, L. (2006). Factors that motivate business faculty to conduct research: An expectancy theory analysis. *Journal of Education for Business, 81*(4), 179–189.
5. Creswell, J. W. (1985). *Faculty research performance: Lessons from the sciences and the social sciences*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4, 1985 (ED267677). ERIC.
6. Golnaraghi, S., Zangenehmadar, Z., Moselhi, O., & Alkass, S. (2019). Application of artificial neural network(s) in predicting formwork labour productivity. *Advances in Civil Engineering, 2019*(1), 5972620.
7. Toma, S. V., Alexa, I. V., & Şarpe, D. A. (2014). Identifying the risk in higher education institutions. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 15*, 342–349.
8. Wagner, G., Prester, J., Roche, M., Benlian, A., & Schryen, G. (2016). Factors affecting the scientific impact of literature reviews: A scientometric study. In *Thirty Seventh International Conference on Information Systems*, 1–24.
9. Yang, J. C. C. (2017). A study of factors affecting university professors' research output: Perspectives of Taiwanese professors. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 14*(1), 11–20.
10. K. Ramamurthy, R. K. Konduru and N. Amanmadov, "EvoGraphCoder: An Evolutionary Graph-

Reasoning Framework for Self-Adaptive Software Engineering," in IEEE Access, vol. 14, pp. 63063-63076, 2026, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2026.3686019.

11. Geo Philip, Paulson, Integrated Intelligent Building Energy Management: A Multi-LayerFramework for Renewable Energy, HVAC Optimization, and SmartElectrical Network Coordination. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=6993209 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.6993209

12. M. R. Marri, S. B. Kurada, S. Gupta, S. Dey, S. Kumar and R. Chauhan, "Graph-Based Deep Learning Model for Identifying Cyber Threats in Cloud Platforms," 2025 International Conference on Computational Intelligence, Security, and Artificial Intelligence (IntelliSecAI), Al-Khobar, Saudi Arabia, 2025, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/IntelliSecAI66368.2025.11472831.