



RESEARCH CHARACTERISTICS, COMPETENCIES, MOTIVATION AND CHALLENGES OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS OF ILAGAN WEST DISTRICT IN CONDUCTING RESEARCH AS BASIS FOR A STRATEGIC CAPACITATION PLAN

Mirasol B. Paguirigan
Maria Elisa T. Alvaro

*Saint Ferdinand College-City of Ilagan Campus, City of Ilagan,
Isabela, Philippines*

ABSTRACT

This study, completed in 2026, investigated the research characteristics, competencies, motivations, and challenges of teachers and school administrators in conducting research as basis for a Strategic Capacitation Plan. The study utilized a descriptive-comparative research design involving 345 elementary and secondary teachers and 25 school administrators from Ilagan West District, Schools Division of the City of Ilagan, selected through total enumeration. Data were gathered through a researcher-made questionnaire and analyzed using frequency count and percentage, weighted mean, ANOVA, and Pearson correlation. Findings revealed that teachers were primarily interested in teaching and learning research, while school administrators focused more on governance research. Most teachers had not conducted, presented, or published research, whereas school administrators demonstrated greater research engagement. Both groups were competent in conceptual competencies and highly competent in research dissemination and utilization. However, they demonstrated only moderate competence in methodological, analytical, and technical areas. Results further showed significant differences in competencies and motivation when grouped according to research characteristics, but no significant difference in the overall competencies of teachers and school administrators. Both groups were intrinsically motivated to conduct research, although teachers exhibited higher extrinsic motivation. Moreover, a significant relationship existed between competencies and motivation. Common challenges included time constraints, workload, insufficient research skills, and limited institutional support. The study concludes that strengthening competencies, motivation, and institutional support mechanisms is essential in enhancing research engagement and productivity.

Hence, a Strategic Capacitation Plan was proposed to address the identified needs and strengthen research culture in schools.

Keywords: *Research, Competencies, Motivation, Challenges, Capacitation Plan*

INTRODUCTION

Research is widely recognized as one of the most indispensable pillars of modern society, serving as a foundation for shaping educational policies and programs to national development and community welfare. It plays a transformative role in advancing knowledge, fostering innovation, addressing social concerns, generating evidence-based solutions, and contributing to progress and enhancing human well-being.

Within the educational domain, research functions as the cornerstone for implementing effective teaching strategies and responding to learners' evolving needs. It validates knowledge and informs assessment practices, curriculum design, and pedagogical approaches. Educators are empowered to identify learning gaps, refine instructional methods, and cultivate environments that foster deeper understanding. As stewards of knowledge, teachers are encouraged to engage in research endeavors that nurture critical thinking, problem-solving, lifelong learning, and responsible citizenship.

Countries strive to achieve high-quality education by fostering innovation through research and enhancing teachers' research competencies. Professional learning communities, mentoring programs, and collaborative inquiry models strengthen teachers' research engagement and instructional decision-making, reflecting the recognition that teacher research competence is integral to improving student learning outcomes (Abina et al., 2023).

In the Philippine context, DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2016 institutionalized the Basic Education Research Agenda, directing school heads, supervisors, and teachers to pursue research aligned with Teaching and Learning, Child Protection, Human Resource Development, and Governance. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2010 provides research funding through the Basic Education Research Fund.

Despite these efforts, Philippine PISA results reveal critical gaps in reading comprehension and foundational learning skills (Yaneza et al., 2024). Mohammad et al. (2013) linked these challenges to misalignment with global benchmarks. Tindowen et al. (2019) emphasized action research as a vital mechanism for improving pedagogical practice. Locally, low research participation in Ilagan highlights the need to examine research characteristics, competencies, motivation, challenges, and support systems as basis for a Strategic Capacitation Plan.

Research Questions

This study examined the research characteristics, competencies, motivational factors, and challenges encountered by teachers and school administrators in the conduct

of scholarly inquiry. The findings served as the empirical foundation for the formulation of a Strategic Capacitation Plan, designed to strengthen research engagement, enhance methodological proficiency, and address institutional barriers to sustained research productivity.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the research characteristics of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 research theme;
 - 1.2 type of research conducted;
 - 1.3 number of completed research;
 - 1.4 research presentation done;
 - 1.5 research publication;
 - 1.6 type of authorship;
 - 1.7 research-related trainings and seminars attended; and
 - 1.8 number of hours of research-related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years
2. How competent are the respondents in conducting research in terms of:
 - 2.1 conceptual competencies
 - 2.2 methodological competencies
 - 2.3 data analysis and interpretation competencies
 - 2.4 technical competencies
 - 2.5 dissemination and utilization competencies
3. Is there a significant difference in the level of research competencies of the respondents when grouped according to their research characteristics?
4. Is there a significant difference in the level of research competencies of the teachers and school administrators?
5. What is the level of motivation of the respondents in conducting research in terms of:
 - 5.1. intrinsic motivation
 - 5.2 extrinsic motivation
6. Is there a significant difference in the level of motivation of the respondents when grouped according to their research characteristics?
7. Is there a significant difference in the level of motivation of teachers and school administrators?
8. Is there a significant relationship between the level of competencies of the respondents and their level of motivation in conducting research?
9. What are the challenges experienced by the respondents in conducting research in terms of:
 - 9.1 time constraints
 - 9.2 personal skills and knowledge
 - 9.3 work load
 - 9.4 institutional support
 - 9.5 access to resources
 - 9.6 administrative support and ethical requirements

10. Is there a significant difference in the challenges experienced by teachers and school administrators?

11. What strategic interventions can be designed to enhance the respondents' capability in conducting research based on the identified gaps?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive–comparative research design, which Creswell (2014) described as appropriate for describing existing conditions and examining differences among groups without manipulating variables. The design was suitable because the study aims to describe the research characteristics, competencies, motivations, and challenges of teachers and school administrators, while determining significant differences when respondents are grouped according to selected research characteristics. The descriptive component provides a systematic portrayal of respondents' research profiles and capabilities as they naturally occur. Meanwhile, the comparative component examines differences based on research trainings attended, years of research experience, completed studies, and participation in research-related activities. Since no intervention or experimental treatment is involved, the findings will serve as basis for a Strategic Capacitation Plan to strengthen research competencies and address research-related challenges.

Locale of the Study

The research was conducted within the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan, particularly in the Ilagan West District, which comprises eleven elementary schools and two secondary schools. As a field office of the Department of Education, the division oversees the delivery of basic education in the City of Ilagan, Isabela, and supervises public and private elementary and secondary institutions to ensure quality, inclusive, and culture-responsive education. Established on December 17, 2012 after Ilagan's cityhood under Republic Act No. 10169, the division officially began operations on January 11, 2013. From three school districts, the division expanded into six districts. At present, the division serves thousands of learners and is supported by 1,580 teachers, 110 school heads, and non-teaching personnel.

Selection and Description of Respondents

The participants to this study include 345 elementary and secondary teachers and 25 school administrators to include Principals, Assistant Principals and Head Teachers totaling to 370 respondents. They were selected through total enumeration, ensuring proportional representation across the 13 schools. The participants were chosen primarily due to their accessibility to the researcher, as the study was conducted within the same district where the researcher was teaching. Their familiarity with and involvement in both classroom instruction and research-related activities made them suitable participants for the research undertaking.

The table below presents the distribution of participants from each of the 13 schools in the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan, Ilagan West District who took part in this study.

School	Number of Teaching Staff	Number of School Administrator	Percentage
Alibagu Elementary School	21	1	5.95
Baligatan Elementary School	10	1	2.98
Bliss Elementary School	18	2	5.41
Camunatan Elementary School	7	1	2.16
Guinatan Elementary School	7	1	2.16
Ilagan West Central School	18	2	5.40
Lullutan Elementary School	7	1	2.16
Malalam Elementary School	7	1	2.16
Namnama Elementary School	7	1	2.16
Salindingan Elementary School	7	1	2.16
San Felipe Elementary School	7	1	2.16
Isabela National High School	218	11	61.90
Alibagu National High School	11	1	3.24
TOTAL	345	25	100

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to the conduct of the study, formal approval was secured from the Schools Division Superintendent of the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan and the Officer-in-Charge District Supervisor of Ilagan West District. Furthermore, the researcher coordinated with the school heads of each of the 13 schools to request permission to administer the research instrument. Coordination was likewise established with both elementary and secondary teachers who served as participants in the study.

The researcher personally met with some school heads and coordinated through online messaging to present the objectives, scope, and significance of the study, as well as to discuss the potential benefits that could be derived from its findings, particularly in enhancing the research capabilities of teachers and school administrators and supporting professional development initiatives. For school heads who could not be met in person due to distance and time constraints, the researcher sent formal messages explaining the purpose, scope, and benefits of the study.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The present study employed a set of statistical tools to facilitate the comprehensive analysis and interpretation of the data collected. These tools were carefully selected to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and validity of the findings, thereby enabling a rigorous examination of the research variables and the effective attainment of the study's objectives.

Frequency Count and Percentage. These statistical tools were employed to enumerate and describe the research characteristics of the respondents. Specifically, they were used

to analyze variables such as designation, research interests, type of research conducted, number of completed studies, research presentations, research publications, type of authorship, participation in research-related trainings, and the number of hours devoted to research seminars and trainings within the past three years.

Weighted Mean. This measure was utilized to assess the competencies, motivation, and challenges encountered by teachers and school administrators in conducting research. The findings derived from this analysis served as the empirical foundation for the formulation of a Strategic Capacitation Plan, designed to enhance the research capabilities and foster greater engagement among the respondents.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The Analysis of Variance was employed to ascertain whether significant differences exist in the respondents' level of research competencies when grouped according to their research characteristics. It was likewise utilized to examine differences in the competencies of teachers and school administrators, the level of motivation of respondents when classified by their research characteristics, the motivation levels of teachers and school administrators, and the challenges encountered by both groups in conducting research.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (Pearson r). The Pearson correlation coefficient was applied to determine the relationship between the respondents' level of research competencies and their level of motivation in undertaking research activities.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What are the research characteristics of the respondents in terms of:

1.1 Research Theme

Table 1.1
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents
According to Research Theme

	Teachers		School Administrators	
Research Theme	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Teaching and Learning	300	86.95	2	8.0
Inclusive Education	15	4.37	3	12.0
Child Protection	10	2.89	0	0.0
Disaster Risk Reduction Management	3	0.86	2	8.0
Human Resource Development	4	1.16	5	20.00
Gender and Development	8	2.32	2	8.0
Governance	5	1.45	11	44.0
TOTAL	345	100	25	100

Table 1.1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to research interests. Among teachers, Teaching and Learning obtained the highest interest with 300 respondents (86.95%), showing emphasis on classroom-based practices and instructional improvement, while Disaster Risk Reduction Management recorded the lowest with three respondents (0.86%). Among school administrators, Governance ranked highest with 11 respondents (44%), reflecting concern for leadership, organizational management, and policy implementation, while Child Protection received no responses. The findings show that teachers concentrate on pedagogical practices, whereas administrators focus on institutional governance, indicating a possible disconnect in collaborative action research. Guided by DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2017, the themes align with DepEd's stakeholder domains. Insorio (2024) and Hiebert et al. (2022) affirmed that teachers engage in research when relevant to teaching.

1.2 Type of Research Conducted

Table 1.2
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Type of Research Conducted

Type of Research Conducted	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Action Research	86	24.92	2	8.00
Basic Research	30	8.70	12	48.00
Both Action and Basic Research	25	7.25	3	12.00
None	204	59.13	8	32
TOTAL	345	100	25	100

Table 1.2 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to the type of research conducted by designation. Among teachers, 59.13 percent reported having conducted no research, indicating limited engagement in research activity, while the lowest proportion conducted both action and basic research at 7.25 percent. Among school administrators, Basic Research recorded the highest proportion at 48 percent, showing greater inclination toward fundamental or theoretical studies, while Action Research had the lowest, with only two respondents. The findings reveal that many teachers and nearly one-third of administrators have not undertaken formal research, limiting evidence-based classroom practice. Ulla et al. (2017) associated this with heavy workloads, while Jud et al. (2025) emphasized limited access to journals, tools, funding, training, mentoring, and low research self-efficacy.

1.3 Number of Completed Research

Table 1.3
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Number of Completed Research

Number of Completed Research	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
0	204	59.13	8	32.00
1-3	138	40.00	14	56.00
4-6	0	0.00	2	8.00
More than 6	3	0.87	1	4.00
TOTAL	345	100	25	100

Table 1.3 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to the number of completed research studies. Among teachers, the majority, or 59.13 percent, reported having no completed research, while 40 percent completed one to three researches. Among school administrators, the majority, or 56 percent, completed one to three researches, whereas only one administrator completed more than six researches. These findings indicate that teachers have low research productivity compared with administrators, highlighting the need to strengthen research engagement and institutional support. Jud et al. (2025) observed that teachers often conduct research only when required for promotion, IPCRF, or training. Phuong and Vo (2017), Vásquez et al. (2022), and Hancock (2002) likewise identified limited methodology knowledge, statistical skills, writing ability, financial support, time, resources, and training as barriers.

1.4 Research Presentation Done

Table 1.4
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Research Presentation

Research Presentation	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
LAC Session	77	22.31	15	60.00
Conference	24	6.96	2	8.00
Seminar/Training	24	6.96	0	0.00
Faculty meeting	16	4.64	0	0.00
None	204	59.13	8	32.00
TOTAL	345	100	25	100

Table 1.4 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to research presentation. Among teachers, the majority, or 59.13 percent, have not yet disseminated their research outputs, while only 16 respondents, or 4.64 percent, presented during Faculty Meetings. Among school administrators, 15 respondents, or 60 percent, presented their research outputs during LAC Sessions, while 32 percent have not presented. These findings suggest that research dissemination remains limited

among teachers, whereas administrators show greater involvement through professional platforms. This highlights the need to encourage teachers to share outputs and strengthen evidence-based practice and collaborative knowledge-building. Saro et al. (2023) noted low research presentation among Philippine teachers, while Cortes et al. (2024) emphasized that international conference participation remains constrained by financial limitations and limited exposure.

1.5 Research Publication

Table 1.5
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Research Publication

Research Publication	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
International journal	18	5.22	2	8.00
Conference Paper/Proceedings	3	0.87	2	8.00
Review Articles	0	0.00	0	0.00
Case reports	0	0.00	2	8.00
Book and Book Chapters	3	0.87	0	0.00
Conceptual/Theoretical Papers	0	0.00	1	4.00
Local and Refereed Journals	7	2.03	2	8.00
None	314	91.01	16	64.00
TOTAL	345	100	25	100

Table 1.5 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to research publications. Among teachers, 314 respondents, or 91.01 percent, have not published any research; 18 have internationally published researches; three have published in books; and seven have published in local and refereed journals. Among school administrators, 64 percent have not published their research, while only two have published work in review articles, book and book chapters, and local refereed journals. These findings suggest that research publication remains generally low among both teachers and administrators, emphasizing the need for strengthened institutional support and capacity-building initiatives. Ecija (2024) reported that fewer than 30 percent of Filipino teachers have published in refereed journals, while Morron (2018) identified publication as one of the least attained research outputs among educators.

1.6 Research Authorship

Table 1.6
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Research Authorship

	Teachers		School Administrators	
Research Authorship	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Sole Author	125	36.23	12	48.00
Co-author	6	1.74	1	4.00
Both sole author and co-author	10	2.90	4	16.00
None	204	59.13	8	32.00
TOTAL	345	100	25	100

Table 1.6 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to research authorship. Among teachers, the largest proportion, or 59.13 percent, have not engaged in any form of research authorship, while only 1.74 percent reported co-authorship. Among school administrators, 13 respondents, or 52 percent, have sole authorship, while only one has co-authorship. These findings show that research authorship remains limited, especially among teachers, and that administrators demonstrate greater involvement, mainly through sole authorship. The low level of co-authorship across both groups indicates a weak culture of collaboration in research activities. Durante (2022) emphasized that co-authorship with university researchers enables higher-quality scholarly outputs, while Feldman et al. (2018) highlighted the value of a critical friend in fostering shared inquiry and reflective practice.

1.7 Research-related Trainings

Table 1.7
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Research-related Trainings

	Teachers		School Administrators	
Research-related Trainings	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
School -Based Seminar	159	46.09	4	16.00
Division Level	42	12.17	11	44.00
Regional Level	10	2.90	4	16.00
National Level	6	1.74	0	0.00
International Level	2	0.58	0	0.00
None	126	36.52	6	24.00
TOTAL	345	100	25	100

Table 1.7 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to participation in research-related trainings. Among teachers, 159 respondents, or 46.09 percent, attended School-Based Seminars in Action Research,

indicating that most training participation occurred at the school level, while the lowest attendance was at the International Level, with only two respondents, or 0.58 percent. Among school administrators, 11 respondents, or 44 percent, attended Division-Level training on Basic Research, while none attended National or International research trainings. Overall, the findings show that respondents are mainly exposed to school- and division-level trainings, with limited access to advanced opportunities. This highlights the need to expand programs. Tirol et al. (2022) emphasized that participatory action research enhances teacher competencies, while Manansala (2008) stated that research skills develop through sustained training.

1.8 Number of hours of Research-related Trainings for the Past 3 years

Table 1.8
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Number of hours of Research-related Trainings for the Past 3 years

Number of hours of Research-related Trainings	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
None	114	33.04	5	20.00
4-12 hours	134	38.84	15	60.00
13-20 hours	32	9.28	3	12.00
21-28 hours	25	7.25	0	0.00
29-36 hours	11	3.19	0	0.00
More than 36 hours	29	8.41	2	8.00
TOTAL	345	100	25	100

Table 1.8 discloses the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to the number of hours of research-related trainings attended by designation. Most teacher-respondents attended 4–12 hours of training, showing relatively limited-duration exposure to research capacity-building activities, while only 11 respondents, or 3.19 percent, completed 29–36 hours of training. Similarly, among school administrators, 15 respondents, or 60 percent, had 4–12 hours of training. The findings reveal that both teachers and school administrators predominantly engaged in short-duration research trainings, with minimal exposure to extended and intensive programs. Such limited training remains insufficient to cultivate advanced research competencies. Lagrio and Fabonan (2022) likewise reported that the lack of training and seminars on research methodology is a significant challenge among school heads and teachers.

2. How competent are the respondents in conducting research in terms of:

2.1 Conceptual Competencies

Table 2.1
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to their Level of Conceptual Competencies in Conducting Research

A. CONCEPTUAL COMPETENCIES				
	Teachers		School Administrators	
Statements	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I understand how to formulate research questions.	2.55	Competent	2.64	Competent
2. I can identify relevant scholarly sources of research	2.50	Competent	2.56	Competent
3. I create a clear and appropriate research title.	2.52	Competent	2.48	Moderately Competent
4. I can state simple research objectives and research questions.	2.57	Competent	2.56	Competent
5. I can clearly identify a research problem in my teaching context.	2.58	Competent	2.56	Competent
6. I am able to identify research assumptions or hypotheses and explain the importance of the study.	2.47	Moderately Competent	2.48	Moderately Competent
7. I understand the characteristics of a good research problem.	2.55	Competent	2.56	Competent
8. I can link research objectives to educational issues.	2.50	Moderately Competent	2.48	Moderately Competent
9. I can distinguish between research objectives and research questions.	2.59	Competent	2.60	Competent
10. I present and explain research data clearly and understandably.	2.43	Moderately Competent	2.40	Moderately Competent
11. I know the meaning and purpose of educational research	2.65	Competent	2.56	Competent
12. I am able to distinguish basic, action and applied research.	2.55	Competent	2.56	Competent
13. I understand the difference between quantitative and qualitative research.	2.63	Competent	2.60	Competent
14. I am familiar with mixed-methods research design.	2.40	Moderately Competent	2.16	Moderately Competent
15. I understand the role of theory in research.	2.48	Moderately Competent	2.32	Moderately Competent
Average	2.53	Competent	2.50	Competent

The table presents the level of conceptual competencies of respondents in conducting action and basic research. Conceptual competencies refer to knowledge and understanding of research concepts, purposes, rationales, and principles. Among teachers, the highest mean was on knowing the meaning and purpose of educational research, with 2.65, interpreted as Competent, while the lowest was familiarity with mixed-methods research design, with 2.40, interpreted as Moderately Competent. Among school administrators, the highest mean was understanding the difference between quantitative and qualitative research, with 2.60, while the lowest was also familiarity with mixed-methods research design, with 2.16. The grand means of teachers (2.53) and administrators (2.50) were both Competent. Oestar and Marzo (2022) and Tirol et al. (2022) support the need for sustained capacity-building in advanced methodologies.

2.2 Methodological Competencies

Table 2.2
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to their Level of Methodological Competencies in Conducting Research

B. METHODOLOGICAL COMPETENCIES				
	Teachers		School Administrators	
Statements	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I can find related literature using reliable and credible web sources.	2.60	Competent	2.52	Competent
2. I am able to try out the innovation, intervention, or strategy on a small scale before full implementation.	2.54	Competent	2.44	Moderately Competent
3. I can collect data systematically and ethically.	2.63	Competent	2.60	Competent
4. I am able to choose appropriate data collection tools.	2.52	Competent	2.44	Moderately Competent
5. I can design/adapt adopt data collection instrument.	2.49	Moderately Competent	2.28	Moderately Competent
6. I can develop simple research instruments that are appropriate for the study.	2.45	Moderately Competent	2.36	Moderately Competent
7. I check and improve the research instruments to make sure they are clear and usable.	2.41	Moderately Competent	2.32	Moderately Competent
8. I follow basic ethical guidelines while conducting the research.	2.64	Competent	2.56	Competent
9. I use more than one method to collect data when appropriate.	2.48	Moderately Competent	2.56	Competent
10. I properly administer and collect research instruments while observing ethical practices.	2.54	Competent	2.48	Moderately Competent
11. I can differentiate between experimental, descriptive and correlational designs.	2.49	Moderately Competent	2.16	Moderately Competent
12. I understand population, sample and sampling techniques.	2.59	Competent	2.52	Competent
13. I can select an appropriate research design based on the research problem.	2.53	Competent	2.16	Moderately Competent
14. I can align research questions with research design.	2.51	Competent	2.32	Moderately Competent
15. I can understand the strengths and limitations of different research designs.	2.52	Competent	2.32	Moderately Competent
Average	2.53	Competent	2.40	Moderately Competent

Table 2.2 presents the methodological competencies of respondents in conducting action research, covering research design, sampling methods, and data collection techniques. Among teachers, the highest mean was on following ethical guidelines, with 2.64, interpreted as Competent, while the lowest was checking and improving research instruments for clarity and usability, with 2.41, interpreted as Moderately Competent. Among school administrators, the highest mean was collecting data systematically and ethically, with 2.60, while the lowest means were on differentiating experimental,

descriptive, and correlational designs and selecting appropriate research designs, both with 2.16. Teachers obtained a grand mean of 2.53, interpreted as Competent, while administrators obtained 2.40, interpreted as Moderately Competent. Creswell (2014) and Briggs et al. (2012) support strengthening research design, instrument development, and methodological application.

2.3 Data Analysis and Interpretation Competencies

Table 2.3
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to their Level of Data Analysis and Interpretation Competencies in Conducting Research

C. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION COMPETENCIES				
Statements	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I can choose a statistical tool or qualitative data analysis method suitable for the study.	2.39	Moderately Competent	2.08	Moderately Competent
2. I am able to use basic computer software to help analyze research data.	2.42	Moderately Competent	2.44	Moderately Competent
3. I can understand and explain the results produced by computer software.	2.38	Moderately Competent	2.28	Moderately Competent
4. I present data clearly using simple tables, graphs, or written explanations.	2.51	Competent	2.16	Moderately Competent
5. I can analyze data to answer the research questions with the help of related literature.	2.49	Moderately Competent	2.32	Moderately Competent
6. I compare my research findings with earlier studies to see similarities and differences.	2.50	Competent	2.36	Moderately Competent
7. I use a theoretical framework to help explain the research results	2.42	Moderately Competent	2.24	Moderately Competent
8. I identify possible implications and simple practical uses of the study.	2.49	Moderately Competent	2.32	Moderately Competent
9. I can make conclusions based on the data that were presented and analyzed.	2.56	Competent	2.40	Moderately Competent
10. I give recommendations based on the conclusions of the study.	2.54	Competent	2.44	Moderately Competent
11. I can select an appropriate data analysis procedure.	2.44	Moderately Competent	2.08	Moderately Competent
12. I understand basic statistical procedures.	2.47	Moderately Competent	2.08	Moderately Competent
13. I can analyze quantitative data using code or thematic analysis.	2.36	Moderately Competent	2.08	Moderately Competent
14. I can use basic data analysis software.	2.35	Moderately Competent	2.20	Moderately Competent
15. I can interpret analysis results accurately.	2.37	Moderately Competent	2.04	Moderately Competent
Average	2.45	Moderately Competent	2.23	Moderately Competent

Table 2.3 presents the data analysis and interpretation competencies of respondents in conducting action research. Among teachers, the highest mean was on making conclusions based on presented and analyzed data, with 2.56, interpreted as Competent, while the lowest was using basic data analysis software, with 2.35, interpreted as Moderately Competent. Among school administrators, the highest means were using basic computer software to analyze research data and giving recommendations based on conclusions, both with 2.44, while the lowest was interpreting analysis results accurately, with 2.04. The grand means of teachers (2.45) and administrators (2.23) were both Moderately Competent. Bito-onon (2022), De Asis et al. (2023), and Bryman (2016) support the need for capacity-building in statistical analysis, data interpretation, and research software use.

2.4 Technical Competencies

Table 2.4
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to their Level of Technical Competencies in Conducting Research

D. TECHNICAL COMPETENCIES				
Statements	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I can write a research paper following a basic and acceptable format for publication.	3.30	Highly Competent	3.28	Highly Competent
2. I can show basic skills in academic writing using clear and formal language.	2.56	Competent	2.56	Competent
3. I am familiar with the standard format of a research paper required by DepEd.	2.48	Moderately Competent	1.88	Not Competent
4. I can paraphrase or summarize information from reliable sources.	2.54	Competent	2.68	Competent
5. I properly cite sources using the APA citation style.	2.44	Moderately Competent	2.48	Moderately Competent
6. I integrate citations and references accurately.	2.49	Moderately Competent	2.44	Moderately Competent
7. I can write the introduction and methodology sections of a research paper with proper guidance.	2.56	Competent	2.52	Competent
8. I write the results and discussion sections in a clear and organized way.	2.50	Competent	2.48	Moderately Competent
9. I am able to write conclusions and recommendations based on the study's findings.	2.52	Competent	2.52	Competent
10. I correctly write the abstract and choose appropriate keywords for the study.	2.48	Moderately Competent	2.32	Moderately Competent
11. I complete the research terminal report with all the required parts.	2.42	Moderately Competent	2.36	Moderately Competent

12. I can use data processing tools for academic writing.	2.37	Moderately Competent	2.48	Moderately Competent
13. I know how to use online survey tools.	2.45	Moderately Competent	2.36	Moderately Competent
14. I can handle accurate coding and labelling of data.	2.38	Moderately Competent	2.24	Moderately Competent
15. I know how to maintain confidentiality if digital data.	2.61	Competent	2.36	Moderately Competent
16. I can manage reference using software.	2.42	Moderately Competent	2.20	Moderately Competent
Average	2.53	Competent	2.45	Moderately Competent

Table 2.4 illustrates the technical competencies of respondents in conducting action and basic research, referring to the ability to use research tools, technology, and software. Among teachers, the highest mean was on writing a research paper following a basic and acceptable format for publication, with 3.30, interpreted as Highly Competent, while the lowest was using data processing tools for academic writing, with 2.37, interpreted as Moderately Competent. Among school administrators, the highest mean was on writing a research paper for publication, with 2.68, while the lowest was familiarity with the standard DepEd research paper format, with 1.88, interpreted as Not Competent. Teachers obtained a grand mean of 2.53, while administrators obtained 2.45. Tindowen et al. (2019) support the need for targeted technical training.

2.5. Research Dissemination and Utilization Competencies

Table 2.5
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents in Terms of Research Dissemination and Utilization Competencies in Conducting Research

E. RESEARCH DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION COMPETENCIES				
Statements	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I can share research outputs and findings during conferences, meetings, seminars, or trainings.	3.28	Highly Competent	3.24	Highly Competent
2. I can submit a research paper to a peer-reviewed journal with proper guidance	3.26	Highly Competent	3.20	Highly Competent
3. I develop simple research-based materials for teaching or training, such as worksheets, brochures, or learning tools.	3.24	Competent	3.04	Competent
4. I use research findings to help improve my teaching practices and learners' performance.	3.42	Highly Competent	3.36	Highly Competent
5. I apply research results in planning school policies, programs, or projects.	3.34	Highly Competent	3.36	Highly Competent
6. I use research outputs to support faculty or staff development activities.	3.31	Highly Competent	3.36	Highly Competent

7. I apply research findings to help address school or classroom problems.	3.41	Highly Competent	3.52	Highly Competent
8. I use research results to improve curriculum content, teaching strategies, and assessment practices.	3.42	Highly Competent	3.52	Highly Competent
9. I help promote continuous improvement in the school by using research findings.	3.40	Highly Competent	3.56	Highly Competent
10. I can prepare research reports digitally.	3.33	Highly Competent	3.32	Highly Competent
11. I can identify suitable dissemination channels.	3.27	Highly Competent	3.08	Competent
12. I can write research articles for publication.	3.19	Competent	2.80	Competent
13. I can confidently present findings orally and visually.	3.30	Highly Competent	3.20	Highly Competent
14. I use digital platforms to share my research output.	3.27	Highly Competent	3.04	Competent
Average	3.32	Highly Competent	3.26	Highly Competent

Table 2.5 presents the research dissemination and utilization competencies of respondents in conducting action research. Among teachers, the highest means were recorded in “I use research findings to help improve my teaching practices and learners’ performance” and “I use research results to improve curriculum content, teaching strategies, and assessment practices,” both with 3.42, interpreted as Highly Competent. The lowest mean was “I can write research articles for publication,” with 3.19. Among school administrators, the highest mean was “I help promote continuous improvement in the school by using research findings,” with 3.56, while the lowest was “I can write research articles for publication,” with 2.80. Both groups obtained Highly Competent grand means, teachers at 3.32 and administrators at 3.26. Abrenica and Cascolan (2022) and Edralin (2017) affirm the value of action research, leadership, collaboration, and innovation.

Table 2.6
Summary of the Respondents’ Level of Competencies in Conducting Research

Competencies	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
Conceptual competencies	2.53	Competent	2.50	Competent
Methodological competencies	2.53	Competent	2.40	Moderately Competent
Data analysis and interpretation	2.45	Moderately Competent	2.23	Moderately Competent
Technical	2.53	Competent	2.45	Moderately Competent
Research dissemination and utilization	3.32	Highly Competent	3.26	Highly Competent
Average	2.67	Competent	2.56	Competen

Table 2.6 shows that both teachers and school administrators rated themselves highest in dissemination, with mean scores of 3.32 and 3.26, respectively, reflecting confidence in presenting and utilizing research within school contexts even without formal publication. Conversely, data analysis received the lowest ratings, with mean scores of 2.45 for teachers and 2.23 for administrators, indicating limited confidence in the technical aspects of research design and analysis. The findings suggest that while respondents are competent in initiating and disseminating research, they remain only moderately proficient in technical execution. Baguhin et al. (2025) similarly identified insufficient research training, particularly in data analysis, as a key factor in low scholarly productivity. Thus, sustained hands-on mentoring and capacity-building in methodology and data analysis are needed. Santos (2024) further emphasized that community engagement strengthens educators' competencies in action research.

3. Is there a significant difference in the level of research competencies of the respondents when grouped according to their research characteristics?

Table 3
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Level of Research Competencies of Teachers and School Administrators in terms of Conceptual, Methodological, Data Analysis and Interpretation, Technical, Dissemination and Utilization Competencies When Grouped According Their Research Characteristics

Competencies	Research Characteristics	Teachers		School Administrators	
		p value	Remarks	p value	Remarks
<i>Conceptual Competencies</i>	Research Theme	0.010	Significant	0.002	Significant
	Type of Research conducted	0.275	Not Significant	0.350	Not Significant
	Number of completed research	0.003	Significant	0.489	Not Significant
	Research Presentation Done	0.001	Significant	0.004	Significant
	Research Publication	0.694	Not Significant	0.828	Not Significant
	Type of Authorship	0.414	Not Significant	0.719	Not Significant
	Research-related trainings and seminars attended	0.037	Significant	0.864	Not Significant
	Number of hours of research related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years	0.013	Significant	0.361	Not Significant
<i>Methodological Competencies</i>	Research Theme	0.016	Significant	0.008	Significant
	Type of Research conducted	0.235	Not Significant	0.245	Not Significant
	Number of completed research	< 0.001	Significant	0.457	Not Significant
	Research Presentation Done	0.003	Significant	0.038	Significant
	Research Publication	0.703	Not Significant	0.757	Not Significant

	Type of Authorship	0.560	Not Significant	0.385	Not Significant
	Research-related trainings and seminars attended	0.027	Significant	0.592	Not Significant
	Number of hours of research related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years	0.016	Significant	0.265	Not Significant
<i>Data Analysis and Interpretation Competencies</i>	Research Theme	0.002	Significant	0.109	Not Significant
	Type of Research conducted	0.038	Significant	0.184	Not Significant
	Number of completed research	< 0.001	Significant	0.460	Not Significant
	Research Presentation Done	< 0.001	Significant	0.345	Not Significant
	Research Publication	0.943	Not Significant	0.809	Not Significant
	Type of Authorship	0.292	Not Significant	0.334	Not Significant
	Research-related trainings and seminars attended	0.092	Not Significant	0.554	Not Significant
	Number of hours of research related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years	0.002	Significant	0.196	Not Significant
<i>Technical Competencies</i>	Research Theme	0.072	Not Significant	0.092	Not Significant
	Type of Research conducted	0.210	Not Significant	0.311	Not Significant
	Number of completed research	0.044	Significant	0.773	Not Significant
	Research Presentation Done	< 0.001	Significant	0.063	Not Significant
	Research Publication	0.926	Not Significant	0.702	Not Significant
	Type of Authorship	0.444	Not Significant	0.313	Not Significant
	Research-related trainings and seminars attended	0.094	Not Significant	0.538	Not Significant
	Number of hours of research related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years	0.030	Significant	0.334	Not Significant
<i>Dissemination and Utilization Competencies</i>	Research Theme	0.038	Significant	0.181	Not Significant
	Type of Research conducted	0.197	Not Significant	0.765	Not Significant
	Number of completed research	0.226	Not Significant	0.867	Not Significant
	Research Presentation Done	< 0.001	Significant	0.073	Not Significant
	Research Publication	0.617	Not Significant	0.734	Not Significant
	Type of Authorship	0.333	Not Significant	0.341	Not Significant

	Research-related trainings and seminars attended	0.064	Not Significant	0.539	Not Significant
	Number of hours of research related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years	0.018	Significant	0.768	Not Significant

Table 3 presents the One-Way ANOVA results showing that several research characteristics significantly influenced teachers' competencies across conceptual, methodological, data analysis and interpretation, technical, and dissemination and utilization domains. For teachers, research interest, completed studies, research presentations, trainings attended, and training hours generally contributed to stronger competencies, while publications and authorship often showed no significant influence. Research presentations and hours of research-related trainings emerged as the most influential factors, suggesting that active scholarly engagement and sustained professional development enhance research proficiency. For school administrators, only research interest and research presentations significantly influenced conceptual and methodological competencies, while no research characteristics significantly affected data analysis, technical, and dissemination competencies. These findings support Morron (2018) and Tamayo (2021), who emphasized research characteristics as indicators of competence. Tirol et al. (2022) and Morron (2018) further noted that school heads' competence is shaped by educational attainment and school-related factors.

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of research competencies of the teachers and school administrators?

Table 4
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Level of Research Competencies of the Teachers and School Administrators

Research Competencies	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Conceptual	0.816	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Methodological	0.507	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Data Analysis and Interpretation	0.353	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Technical	0.966	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Dissemination and Utilization	0.914	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

Table 4 presents the results of the independent samples t-test conducted to determine the significant difference in the level of research competencies between teachers and school administrators at the 0.05 level of significance. As indicated in the table, the computed p-values for all domains of research competencies exceeded the 0.05 threshold. Consequently, the null hypothesis is accepted, signifying that no significant difference exists between the two groups. These findings imply that teachers and school administrators exhibit comparable levels of research competence across all dimensions. Specifically, their knowledge and skills in conceptualizing research, applying

appropriate methodologies, analyzing and interpreting data, utilizing technical tools, and disseminating research outputs are relatively uniform

5. What is the level of motivation of the respondents in conducting research in terms of:

5.1. Intrinsic Motivation

Table 5. 1
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to their Level of Intrinsic Motivation in Conducting Research

A. INTRINSIC MOTIVATION				
	Teachers		School Administrators	
Statements	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I conduct research because I am personally interested in it.	2.57	Motivated	2.60	Motivated
2. I enjoy doing research activities, which motivates me to continue.	2.51	Motivated	2.48	Moderately Motivated
3. I engage in research to support my academic and professional growth.	2.72	Motivated	2.64	Motivated
4. I research to improve my knowledge and research-related skills.	2.68	Motivated	2.64	Motivated
5. Completing, presenting, or publishing research gives me a sense of accomplishment.	2.63	Motivated	2.68	Motivated
6. I conduct research because I want my work to be recognized and respected by others.	2.50	Motivated	2.24	Moderately Motivated
7. I participate in research to contribute useful ideas and information to society.	2.61	Motivated	2.60	Motivated
8. I feel it is my responsibility as a teacher to engage in research.	2.62	Motivated	2.80	Motivated
9. I appreciate the challenge and complexity involved in research work.	2.60	Motivated	2.76	Motivated
10. I research to improve teaching and learning.	2.75	Motivated	2.68	Motivated
11. I conduct research because of intellectual curiosity and love of learning.	2.69	Motivated	2.60	Motivated
12. I do research for my professional growth and self-development.	2.75	Motivated	2.60	Motivated
13. I conduct research because I am interested in solving classroom problems.	2.70	Motivated	2.84	Motivated
14. It gives me a sense of autonomy and ownership of knowledge.	2.66	Motivated	2.60	Motivated
15. I conduct research because of my commitment to evidence-based practice.	2.69	Motivated	2.72	Motivated
Average	2.64	Motivated	2.63	Motivated

Table 5.1 presents the intrinsic motivation of respondents in conducting action and basic research. Among teachers, the highest mean scores were in “I research to improve

teaching and learning” and “I do research for my professional growth and self-development,” both with 2.75, interpreted as Motivated. The lowest was “I conduct research because I want my work to be recognized and respected by others,” with 2.50, also Motivated. Among school administrators, the highest mean was “I conduct research because I am interested in solving classroom problems,” with 2.84, while the lowest was recognition and respect, with 2.24, interpreted as Moderately Motivated. Overall, teachers obtained 2.64 and administrators 2.63, both Motivated. Loughran (2006), Bialen (2025), Lastra and Garcia (2025), and Tirol (2022) affirm that research motivation is linked to instructional improvement, professional growth, school performance, and institutional improvement.

5.2 Extrinsic Motivation

Table 5. 2
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to their Level of Extrinsic Motivation in Conducting Research

B. EXTRINSIC MOTIVATION				
Statements	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I do research to meet performance requirements at work.	2.81	Motivated	3.04	Motivated
2. I conduct research for promotion and career advancement.	2.83	Motivated	2.84	Motivated
3. I engage in research for financial incentives.	2.52	Motivated	2.00	Moderately Motivated
4. I do research to increase my salary.	2.57	Motivated	2.00	Moderately Motivated
5. I participate in research to receive awards and recognition	2.55	Motivated	1.96	Moderately Motivated
6. I do research to gain respect and admiration from others.	2.46	Moderately Motivated	1.72	Not Motivated
7. I conduct research to be recognized by my peers.	2.40	Moderately Motivated	1.56	Not Motivated
8. I engage in research to improve my social status.	2.52	Motivated	1.80	Moderately Motivated
9. I do research because it allows flexible time management.	2.57	Motivated	2.40	Moderately Motivated
10. I participate in research to attend local, national, or international conferences or fora.	2.63	Motivated	2.08	Moderately Motivated
11. Publication requirements motivate me to conduct research.	2.52	Motivated	2.08	Moderately Motivated
12. Support from my administrators motivates me to conduct research.	2.76	Motivated	2.40	Moderately Motivated
Average	2.59	Motivated	2.16	Moderately Motivated

Table 5.2 presents the extrinsic motivation of respondents in conducting research. Among teachers, the highest mean was recorded in “I conduct research for promotion

and career advancement,” interpreted as Motivated, while the lowest was “I conduct research to be recognized by my peers,” described as Moderately Motivated. Among school administrators, the highest mean was “I do research to meet performance requirements at work,” also interpreted as Motivated, while the lowest was “I conduct research to be recognized by my peers,” categorized as Not Motivated. Overall, teachers obtained a grand mean of 2.59, interpreted as Motivated, while administrators obtained 2.16, interpreted as Moderately Motivated. Corpuz and Salandanan (2013), Castañeros and Sumbilon (2023), and Esturas (2023) affirm that extrinsic factors such as promotion, performance requirements, recognition, professional advancement, and personal satisfaction influence research engagement and productivity.

6. Is there a significant difference in the level of motivation of the respondents when grouped according to their research characteristics?

a. Teachers

Table 6.1
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Level of Motivation of Teachers in Conducting Research When Grouped According to Their Research Characteristics

Motivation	Research Characteristic	p-value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Intrinsic	Research Interest	0.144	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Type of Research conducted	0.129	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Number of completed research	0.260	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research Presentation Done	< 0.001	$P < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
	Research Publication	0.954	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Type of Authorship	0.383	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research-related trainings and seminars attended	0.180	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Number of hours of research related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years	0.011	$P < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Extrinsic	Research Interest	0.089	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Type of Research conducted	0.888	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Number of completed research	0.131	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research Presentation Done	0.330	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research Publication	0.981	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Type of Authorship	0.847	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research-related trainings and seminars attended	< 0.001	$P < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
	Number of hours of research related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years	0.453	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

Table 6.1 presents the One-Way ANOVA results on differences in teachers' motivation to conduct research when grouped according to research characteristics. For intrinsic motivation, research interest, type of research conducted, completed projects, publications, authorship, and attendance in research-related trainings yielded p-values greater than 0.05, indicating no significant influence. However, research presentations and the number of hours devoted to research-related trainings and seminars yielded p-values below 0.05, showing significant effects on intrinsic motivation. For extrinsic motivation, only attendance in research-related trainings and seminars showed a significant difference, while other variables were not significant. These findings imply that presenting research, longer training exposure, and seminar participation enhance teachers' motivation. Cortes et al. (2024), Narbarte and Balila (2018), and Tirol et al. (2022) support the role of training, collaboration, and capability-building in strengthening motivation and self-efficacy.

b. School administrators

Table 6.2
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Level of Motivation of School Administrators in Conducting Research When Grouped According to Their Research Characteristics

Motivation	Research Characteristic	p-value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Intrinsic	Research Interest	0.094	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Type of Research conducted	0.428	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Number of completed research	0.761	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research Presentation Conducted	0.052	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research Publication Conducted	0.807	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Type of Authorship Conducted	0.624	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research-related trainings and seminars attended	0.673	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Number of hours of research related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years	0.427	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Extrinsic	Research Interest	0.045	$P < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
	Type of Research conducted	0.408	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Number of completed research	0.988	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research Presentation Conducted	0.535	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Research Publication Conducted	0.590	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Type of Authorship Conducted	0.262	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

	Research-related trainings and seminars attended	0.585	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
	Number of hours of research related trainings and seminars for the past 3 years	0.454	$P > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

Table 6.2 presents the One-Way ANOVA results on the significant difference in school administrators' motivation to conduct research when grouped according to research characteristics at the 0.05 level of significance. For intrinsic motivation, none of the research characteristics yielded significant differences, supporting the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This suggests that administrators' internal drive to engage in research remains stable regardless of variations in their research-related attributes. For extrinsic motivation, most characteristics likewise showed no significant differences, indicating generally uniform external motivation across research profiles. However, research interest demonstrated a significant difference, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This implies that the domain or focus of research interest influences administrators' extrinsic motivation, possibly through external incentives, recognition, or institutional support. Deci and Ryan (2008) support this view, emphasizing autonomy, competence, and relatedness as drivers of motivation.

7. Is there a significant difference in the level of motivation of teachers and school administrators

Table 7
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the level of Motivation of Teachers and School Administrators

Level of Motivation	Mean	p-value	Analysis	Remarks
Intrinsic Motivation	Teachers 2.64 Administrators 2.63	0.988	$p > 0.05$	Not significant
Extrinsic Motivation	Teachers 2.59 Administrators 2.16	0.010	$p < 0.05$	Significant

Table 7 presents the results of the test of significant difference in the level of motivation of teachers and school administrators in conducting research, using the independent samples t-test at the 0.05 level of significance. The results reveal that the computed p-value for intrinsic motivation exceeds the 0.05 threshold; thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This finding indicates that there is no significant difference in the intrinsic motivation of teachers and school administrators, suggesting that both groups exhibit a comparable degree of internal drive to engage in research-related activities.

On the contrary, the p-value for extrinsic motivation falls below the 0.05 level of significance, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This outcome indicate a significant difference in the extrinsic motivation of teachers and school administrators. This implies that the two groups vary in terms of external motivating factors, with one group being more strongly influenced by external rewards or pressures than the other.

Specifically, the findings of this study reveal that teacher-respondents are more extrinsically driven to conduct action research, underscoring the role of external incentives in shaping their research participation and engagement.

8. Is there a significant relationship between the level of competencies of the respondents and their level of motivation in conducting research?

Table 8
Results of the Test of Significant Relationship Between the Level of Competencies of the Respondents and Their Level of Motivation in Conducting Research

Variables	Mean	Pearson's r - value	p - value	Analysis	Remarks
Level of competence	Teachers 2.56	0.719	< 0.001	p < 0.05	Significant
	Administrators 2.63				
Level of Motivations	Teachers 2.64	0.839	< 0.001	p < 0.05	Significant
	Administrators 2.63				

Table 8 presents the Pearson r correlation results on the significant relationship between respondents' research competencies and motivation at the 0.05 level of significance. Among teachers, the computed Pearson's r value of 0.719 indicates a strong positive correlation, with a p-value less than 0.001; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that teachers with higher research competencies tend to exhibit greater motivation to engage in research activities. For school administrators, the Pearson's r value of 0.839 shows a very strong positive correlation, also with a p-value less than 0.001, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Overall, as research competencies increase, motivation to conduct research likewise rises. Caingcoy (2020) and Parsons emphasized that motivation and research competencies are significantly interrelated in promoting productive, high-quality, and efficient research communities.

9. What are the challenges experienced by the respondents in terms of :

9.1 Time Constraints

Table 9.1
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to the Challenges they Experience in Conducting Research in terms of Time Constraints

A. TIME CONSTRAINTS				
Statements	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I am so busy with my teaching/administrative work and personal life that I have little time for research.	3.10	Agree	3.04	Agree
2. I find doing research very time consuming.	3.01	Agree	2.88	Agree

3. There is no allocated time or reduced work load for research tasks.	3.03	Agree	2.92	Agree
4. I have difficulty finding uninterrupted time to focus on research activities.	3.09	Agree	2.84	Agree
5. Heavy teaching load/ administrative work affects my ability to do research.	3.07	Agree	2.80	Agree
Average	3.06	Agree	2.90	Agree

Table 9.1 presents the respondents' perceived challenges in terms of time constraints in conducting research. Among the teacher-respondents, the highest mean score is recorded for the statement, "*I am so busy with my teaching/administrative work and personal life that I have little time for research*" with a mean of 3.10, interpreted as **Agree**. Similarly, for the school administrators, the highest mean is observed for the same statement, with a mean of 3.04, likewise interpreted as **Agree**.

Overall, the computed grand mean for teachers is 3.06, while that of school administrators is 2.90, both interpreted as **Agree**. These findings underscore that both teachers and school administrators commonly encounter time-related challenges in undertaking research. The results highlight that heavy workloads, multiple professional responsibilities, and competing personal commitments significantly constrain their capacity to engage in research activities. This emphasizes the necessity of institutional support mechanisms, such as workload adjustments, allocation of dedicated research time, and structured policies that enable educators and administrators to balance professional duties with scholarly inquiry.

It can be concluded that the major findings of this study align with those of Arellano (2005), who identified administrative workload and limited resources as critical barriers that hinder educators' capacity to undertake additional tasks such as research. Similarly, Hancock (2002) emphasized that insufficient time, restricted resources, and inadequate research training constitute significant obstacles to research engagement among practitioners. These parallels reinforce the present study's results, underscoring that systemic constraints, particularly workload demands and lack of institutional support—remain pervasive challenges that limit educators' ability to pursue sustained research productivity.

9.2 Personal Skills and Knowledge

Table 9.2
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to the Challenges they Experience in Conducting Research in terms of Personal Skills and Knowledge

B. PERSONAL SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE				
Statements	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I do not have enough knowledge on how to conduct research.	2.64	Agree	2.76	Agree

2. I have difficulty analyzing and interpreting research data.	2.65	Agree	2.76	Agree
3. I struggle to write a research report in the proper format.	2.70	Agree	2.76	Agree
4. I feel unsure about how to choose a research topic for my school or classroom.	2.71	Agree	2.80	Agree
5. I have limited confidence in my research skills and abilities.	2.83	Agree	2.92	Agree
Average	2.71	Agree	2.80	Agree

Table 9.2 presents the results on the challenges encountered by the respondents in terms of personal skills and knowledge in conducting research. For the teacher-respondents, the highest weighted mean is on having limited confidence in research skills and abilities, with a mean of 2.83, interpreted as **Agree**. Similarly, among the school administrators, the highest mean was recorded for the same statement, with a mean of 2.92, likewise interpreted as **Agree**.

The computed grand mean for teachers is 2.71, while that of school administrators is 2.80, both interpreted as **Agree**. These findings suggest that both groups encounter comparable challenges related to their research skills and knowledge, particularly in terms of confidence in their research abilities. This underscores the necessity of continuous capacity-building initiatives, including hands-on training, mentoring, and structured professional development programs, to strengthen research competence and self-efficacy among educators and administrators.

These results are congruent with the findings of Vula and Saqipi (2015), who emphasized that teachers' self-confidence and decision-making capabilities improve as they acquire greater proficiency in research practices. In the present study, both teachers and school administrators acknowledged limited confidence in their research skills, indicating that existing gaps in competence significantly influence how they approach and perform research tasks. This finding also corroborates the work of Hung and Hoang (2022), who emphasized that insufficient action research skills can impede pedagogical innovation and constrain teachers' professional growth.

9.3 Workload

Table 9.3
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to the Challenges they Experience in Conducting Research In terms of Workload

C. WORK LOAD				
Statements	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I have too many teaching/ administrative responsibilities that prevent me from doing research.	2.91	Agree	2.80	Agree

2. Administrative tasks take up most of my time, leaving little for research.	2.83	Agree	3.00	Agree
3. I have multiple school-related duties that make it hard to focus on research.	2.94	Agree	2.68	Agree
4. My multiple work-related tasks reduce the time I can allocate to research activities.	2.92	Agree	3.00	Agree
5. I find it challenging to balance research with other work responsibilities.	2.99	Agree	3.00	Agree
Average	2.92	Agree	2.90	Agree

Table 9.3 presents the workload-related challenges encountered by respondents in conducting action research. Among teachers, the highest mean was recorded in “I find it challenging to balance research with other work responsibilities,” with 2.99, interpreted as Agree. Among school administrators, the highest means were in “Administrative tasks take up most of my time, leaving little for research,” “My multiple work-related tasks reduce the time I can allocate to research activities,” and “I find it challenging to balance research with other work responsibilities,” each with 3.00, also interpreted as Agree. The grand means of teachers (2.92) and administrators (2.90) were both interpreted as Agree, showing that workload is a significant barrier to research engagement. Briggs et al. (2012) and Lagrio and Fabonan (2002) support that limited time, heavy teaching loads, administrative demands, insufficient resources, and rigorous research processes hinder research involvement.

9.4 Institutional Support

Table 9.4
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to the Challenges they Experience in Conducting Research in terms of Institutional Support

D. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT				
Statements	Teachers		School Administrators	
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. I do not receive much support from my school to conduct research.	2.21	Disagree	2.52	Agree
2. There is no Research Committee to help improve my research skills.	2.10	Disagree	2.52	Agree
3. The institution does not provide encouragement for teachers/ school administrators to do research.	2.06	Disagree	2.40	Disagree
4. There are no mentorship programs to guide me in conducting research.	2.08	Disagree	2.48	Disagree
5. I feel that my school does not create a research-positive culture.	2.08	Disagree	2.60	Agree
Average	2.10	Disagree	2.50	Agree

Table 9.4 displays the challenges encountered by teachers and school administrators in terms of institutional support for conducting research. From the perspective of the teacher-respondents, the highest mean is on not receiving much support from school to conduct research, with a mean of 2.21, interpreted as **Disagree**. In contrast, among the school administrators, the highest mean is observed in the

statement, “I feel that my school does not create a research-positive culture”, with a mean of 2.60, interpreted as **Agree**.

Overall, the computed grand mean for teachers is 2.10, interpreted as **Disagree**, while that of school administrators is 2.50, interpreted as **Agree**. These findings suggest that teachers generally perceive institutional support for research as present, as reflected in their disagreement with the stated challenges. Conversely, school administrators express moderate concern regarding institutional support, particularly in relation to fostering a research-positive culture. This discrepancy in perceptions highlights the need to strengthen institutional mechanisms—such as mentorship programs, research support systems, and structured incentives—to ensure a more enabling and supportive research environment for both teachers and administrators.

The difference in perceptions of teachers and school administrators may be attributed to their distinct roles, experiences, and levels of involvement in research initiatives within the school. Teachers generally disagreed with statements suggesting a lack of institutional support or research committees, possibly because they benefit from existing training programs, guidance, and initiatives provided by their institutions, which lead them to perceive that adequate support is available.

In contrast, school administrators expressed agreement with these statements, likely due to their broader perspective on the school’s research system. As leaders and implementers of research programs, administrators are positioned to recognize the insufficiency of formal support structures, funding, organized research committees, and institutional mechanisms necessary to sustain research development. Since they are responsible for monitoring and strengthening research initiatives, administrators may view existing support systems as inadequate for cultivating a robust research culture.

This interpretation aligns with the findings of Cabangon (2025), who reported that school administrators face significant challenges in conducting research, including limited training opportunities, insufficient institutional support, inadequate resources and time, and low levels of engagement in research activities. His study revealed that systemic barriers contribute to low research productivity, thereby underscoring the need for capacity-building programs and institutional support systems that can enhance research engagement and foster a stronger research culture.

Thus, it is important to underscore the perspective of Leithwood (2008), who asserted that school leaders who cultivate collaborative environments and provide adequate resources significantly enhance teachers’ participation in research activities. In addition, Robinson (2008) highlighted that instructional leadership practices—particularly those that support teacher inquiry and engagement in research—exert a substantial influence on school improvement and student outcomes. Collectively, these perspectives reinforce the present study’s findings, emphasizing that institutional leadership and support are critical in fostering a culture of research and innovation within educational settings.

9.5 Access to Resources

Table 9.5
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to the Challenges they Experience in Conducting Research in terms of Access to Resources

E. ACCESS TO RESOURCES				
	Teachers		School Administrators	
Statements	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. There are not enough reference materials such as journals, books, or reports.	2.43	Disagree	2.52	Agree
2. I have limited access to online research tools and databases.	2.39	Disagree	2.52	Agree
3. There is a shortage of training or seminars on research activities.	2.54	Agree	2.76	Agree
4. The school has insufficient budget to support research projects.	2.44	Disagree	2.72	Agree
5. I find it hard to access equipment or technology needed for research.	2.41	Disagree	2.64	Agree
Average	2.44	Disagree	2.63	Agree

Table 9.5 presents the challenges encountered by teachers and school administrators in terms of access to resources for conducting research, categorized according to designation. From the perspective of the teacher-respondents, they agree that there is a shortage of training or seminars on research activities, with a mean of 2.54. In contrast, they disagree that they have limited access to online research tools and databases, with a mean of 2.39.

For the school administrators, they agree that there is a shortage of training or seminars on research activities", with a mean of 2.76. On the other hand, the lowest mean was observed in the statements, "*There are not enough reference materials such as journals, books, or reports*" and "*I have limited access to online research tools and databases*", both with a mean of 2.52, also interpreted as Agree. These findings suggest that while both teachers and school administrators acknowledge the insufficiency of training and seminars as a primary challenge, their perceptions diverge slightly in terms of access to reference materials and online research tools. Teachers generally perceive access to digital resources as less problematic, whereas administrators continue to identify gaps in both physical and online research materials. This highlights the importance of strengthening institutional support systems by expanding access to training opportunities, enhancing resource availability, and improving digital infrastructure to ensure equitable and comprehensive support for research engagement across both groups.

Thus, the computed grand mean for teachers was 2.44, interpreted as **Disagree**, while for school administrators it was 2.63, interpreted as **Agree**. Both groups acknowledged the insufficiency of training and seminars, underscoring the need to enhance capacity-building opportunities and improve access to research-related

resources to better support research engagement. The variation in responses may be attributed to the differing roles and experiences of teachers and school administrators in relation to research resources and institutional support. Teachers generally disagreed with the statements, possibly because they are able to utilize available materials, online tools, trainings, and school-provided resources in conducting classroom-based research, leading them to perceive that support is sufficient. Conversely, school administrators agreed with the statements, likely due to their broader awareness of systemic limitations in sustaining research programs. As managers of school resources and budgets, administrators are more directly exposed to concerns such as insufficient funding, limited access to research databases, lack of equipment, and inadequate institutional support for continuous research training. Hence, they may perceive these limitations more strongly and recognize the need for greater investment in research resources and infrastructure.

This interpretation is consistent with the findings of Castañeros and Sumbilon (2023), who reported that educators identified lack of time and limited access to research materials as key reasons for non-engagement in research. Their study reinforces the present findings by highlighting that systemic barriers—particularly resource constraints, remain critical challenges that hinder educators’ sustained participation in research activities. This is further supported by Bacaling (2019), who revealed that school heads require continuous professional development and emphasized the critical need for sustained capacity-building programs. In the same vein, Cortes et al. underscored that training and collaborative practices directly enhance educators’ self-efficacy in conducting research. Moreover, Esturas (2023) highlighted that strengthening a school-based research culture—through organizational structures, support mechanisms, and shared norms—can substantially improve teachers’ research performance, particularly when motivational factors and research competencies are simultaneously nurtured. To achieve this, her study recommended the expansion of mentorship and training opportunities for teachers, the provision of both financial and non-financial incentives, the implementation of capacity-building programs focused on research methods and publication, and the creation of avenues for research dissemination. Collectively, these strategies reinforce the importance of institutional support in cultivating a sustainable and productive research environment.

9.6 Administrative Support and Ethical Requirements

Table 9.6
Weighted Mean Distribution of the Respondents According to the Challenges they Experience in Conducting Research in Terms of Administrative Support and Ethical Requirements

F. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND ETHICAL REQUIREMENTS				
	Teachers		School Administrators	
Statements	Mean	Description	Mean	Description
1. The school administration has not prioritized policies or resources to support research.	2.17	Disagree	2.56	Agree

2. I do not receive proper guidance on following ethical standards in research.	2.19	Disagree	2.60	Agree
3. There is no system for approving or reviewing research proposals.	2.09	Disagree	2.68	Agree
4. The administration does not recognize or reward teachers for conducting research.	2.13	Disagree	2.60	Agree
5. I feel there is little administrative support for attending conferences or research training.	2.20	Disagree	2.48	Disagree
Average	2.15	Disagree	2.58	Agree

Table 9.6 presents the challenges encountered by the respondents in terms of administrative support and ethical requirements in conducting action and basic research, grouped according to designation. It was noted that among the teacher-respondents, the highest mean was observed in the statement “I feel there is little administrative support for attending conferences or research training” with a mean of 2.20, interpreted as Disagree. In contrast, the lowest mean was noted in the statement “There is no system for approving or reviewing research proposals” with a mean of 2.09, also described as Disagree.

In the case of the school administrators, the highest mean was recorded in the statement “There is no system for approving or reviewing research proposals” with a mean of 2.68, interpreted as Agree. On the other hand, the lowest mean was noted in the statement “I feel there is little administrative support for attending conferences or research training” with a mean of 2.48, described as Disagree.

Overall, the computed grand mean for teachers was 2.15, interpreted as Disagree, while for school administrators it was 2.58, interpreted as Agree. Thus, it can be concluded that from the results, teachers generally do not perceive administrative support and ethical requirements as major challenges in conducting research. In contrast, school administrators express concerns regarding the adequacy of administrative systems and ethical guidance, particularly in areas such as research proposal review and institutional support. This disparity highlights the need to strengthen administrative structures and ensure consistent implementation of research policies and ethical standards across the schools. The differing perspectives may be attributed to the different perspectives of teachers and school administrators regarding institutional research support. Teachers generally disagreed with the statements, possibly because they still receive administrative assistance in attending trainings and are able to experience existing forms of support, guidance, and recognition in conducting research.

Conversely, school administrators agreed with most of the statements because they are more aware of the absence or insufficiency of formal research policies, ethical review systems, proposal evaluation mechanisms, and structured reward systems for research engagement. As implementers of school programs and policies, they may recognize the need for stronger institutional frameworks and more organized administrative support to sustain a stronger research culture in schools. Abrenica & Cascolan (2022) say the same that there are procedural difficulties in obtaining approval

from Division Offices in conducting research. The results of this study coincide with Toquero (2022) who reported that the top challenges of teacher in conducting research which are: time constraints (heavy workloads, lack of release time), limited mentoring and technical support, inadequate access to literature and funding and weak institutional research culture.

10. Is there a significant difference in the challenges experienced by teachers and school administrators?

Table 10
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Challenges Experienced by Teachers and School Administrators

Challenges	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Time Constraints	0.393	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Personal Skills	0.236	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Work Load	0.910	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Institutional Support	0.008	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Access to resources	0.932	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Administrative support and ethical requirements	0.012	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 10 reveals the results of the test in significant difference in the challenges experienced by teachers and school administrators in conducting research using the independent T-test at 0.05 level of significance. The findings reveal that time constraints, personal skills, workload, and access to resources have p-values greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis for these variables is accepted. This indicates that there is no significant difference in these challenges between teachers and school administrators. This suggests that both groups experience similar levels of difficulty in terms of time management, research-related skills, workload demands, and availability of resources. On the other hand, institutional support and administrative support and ethical requirements have p-values less than 0.05, indicating a significant difference between the two groups. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected for these variables. This implies that teachers and school administrators differ in their experiences regarding institutional and administrative support, as well as compliance with ethical requirements in conducting research. Based from the responses of the respondents, the teachers have experienced more institutional support as well as administrative support and ethical requirements.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the study affirms that both teachers and school administrators in the Ilagan West District possess comparable levels of research competence, particularly in conceptual understanding, yet remain only moderately proficient in methodological, analytical, and technical domains. While administrators demonstrate greater engagement

due to broader exposure and institutional support, teachers, though strongly motivated are constrained by limited opportunities and systemic barriers. Persistent challenges such as time constraints, heavy workloads, insufficient research skills, and gaps in institutional support continue to impede effective research participation across both groups. These findings underscore that individual competence and motivation, though essential, are insufficient to sustain meaningful research engagement without structured and sustained support systems.

Accordingly, the study concludes with a strong recommendation for the implementation of a Strategic Capacitation Plan designed to enhance methodological, analytical, and technical competencies through targeted training and mentorship, strengthen both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation by providing recognition, incentives, and opportunities for dissemination, address systemic barriers through improved workload management, equitable time allocation, and expanded access to resources and institutionalize support mechanisms via policies, monitoring structures, and sustained mentorship programs.

Recommendations

In light of the foregoing findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are hereby advanced:

1. School Heads and the Division Research Focal Person should implement sustained and inclusive research capacity-building programs for teachers, encompassing structured mentoring, equitable access to funding, and the allocation of dedicated time for research activities.
2. The Schools Division Research Committee is encouraged to conduct intensive, hands-on training sessions on research design, instrument development, data analysis software, data interpretation, technical writing, adherence to standard research formats, and the preparation of articles for publication.
3. School Research Committees should establish differentiated research support programs (beginner, intermediate, advanced) tailored to the varying competency levels of teachers.
4. Collaborative research initiatives between teachers and school administrators should be promoted to foster shared learning and enhance research productivity.
5. School Heads must strengthen incentive systems, including recognition, promotion credits, and workload adjustments, while cultivating a supportive and research-oriented culture.
6. The Division Research Focal Person should design customized motivation strategies aligned with teachers' and administrators' research experience, exposure, and identified needs.

7. DepEd Policy Makers and Schools Division Leaders must enhance external support mechanisms, such as research grants, awards, publication assistance, and transparent career advancement pathways.
8. Division Technical Working Group Members and School Research Committees should integrate mentoring programs that simultaneously develop research competencies and sustain motivation through continuous guidance and constructive feedback.
9. School Administrators must reinforce institutional and administrative support by establishing clear research policies, ethical review systems, and accessible technical assistance.
10. The Schools Division Research Committee should standardize research support structures, including proposal review systems, ethics protocols, and the allocation of dedicated research time for both teachers and administrators.
11. The Schools Division of the City of Ilagan must review and adapt the proposed Strategic Capacitation Plan to further strengthen competencies, motivation, and research productivity among teachers and school administrators

Compliance with Ethical Standards

This study adhered to established ethical standards in educational research by ensuring voluntary participation, informed consent, and the right of respondents to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Confidentiality and anonymity of all teacher and school administrator respondents were strictly maintained through the use of non-identifying codes, and all collected data were used solely for academic purposes. The researcher ensured that no harm, coercion, or undue influence was imposed on participants during data gathering, and all procedures were conducted with respect for their professional roles and time constraints. Permissions from the appropriate school authorities and division offices were duly secured prior to implementation, in accordance with institutional research protocols and the principles of integrity, transparency, and responsible conduct of research.

Acknowledgements

The researcher wishes to express her sincere and most ardent gratitude to her adviser, Dr. Maria Eisa T. Alvaro, for her unwavering guidance, invaluable expertise, patience, and generous assistance throughout the conduct and completion of this research. Her wisdom, encouragement, and constructive insights greatly enriched this undertaking.

Deep appreciation is also extended to Dr. Maricel P. Ramos, Dean of the Graduate School of Saint Ferdinand College, Ilagan, Isabela, for her guidance, supervision, and steadfast support in the pursuit of academic excellence.

The researcher is equally grateful to Dr. Salome S. Carino, Chairman of the Panel, for her meaningful contributions, patience, and scholarly recommendations that significantly improved the quality of this study.

Sincere thanks are likewise conveyed to the panel members, Dr. Marie Rose P. Ramos, Dr. Vilma C. Cabrera, Dr. Mai Rani Zipagan, and Dr. Marites Talosig, for their insightful comments, valuable suggestions, and expert perspectives that strengthened this research.

Special recognition is given to Madam Arcely Q. Say for her invaluable suggestions and encouragement that contributed to the refinement of this work.

The researcher also extends her gratitude to all elementary and secondary teachers and school administrators who willingly participated in this study. Their cooperation and support made the completion of this research possible.

To her beloved parents, brothers, sister, relatives, and friends, the researcher offers her deepest appreciation for their love, encouragement, understanding, and unwavering support throughout this academic journey.

To her husband, Danilo L. Lico Jr., and their son, Dylan Amari P. Lico, heartfelt thanks are given for being her constant source of strength, inspiration, motivation, and unconditional love each day. Their support served as her driving force in pursuing this endeavor.

The researcher is likewise grateful to all her teachers, mentors, and coaches whose knowledge, guidance, and dedication inspired her passion for learning, research, and professional growth.

Above all, the researcher offers her highest praise, glorification, and deepest homage to the Almighty God for His divine guidance, wisdom, strength, and countless spiritual blessings bestowed upon her in every step of this journey. Without His grace and providence, this achievement would not have been possible.

REFERENCES

- Abina, I. L. S., & Evardo, O. (2023). Research competence of out-of-field teachers in teaching practical research: Input to capability building series. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(2), 1–15.
- Abrenica, J., & Cascolan, H. (2022). Impact of action research in education: Experiences and challenges faced by teachers. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 5(2), 1–15.
- Arellano, L. V. (2005). *School management and organization*. Rex Book Store.
- Bacaling, J. B. (2019). Research competence and training needs of school heads in basic education. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 6(4), 87–90.
- Baguhin, M., Ganancial, I. J., & Pregoner, J. D. (2025). What is the research gap? Addressing low scholarly productivity in Philippine basic education (HAL-04879860, Version 1).
- Bialen, V. (2025). Teachers' motivations, challenges, and difficulties in action research: A narrative study. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 10(1), 45–60.
- Bito-onon, J., & Pedrajas, R. (2022). Research competence of faculty in state universities and colleges. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Analysis, Education and Development*, 2(1), 10–22.
- Briggs, A. R. J., Coleman, M., & Morrison, M. (2012). *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

- Cabangon, R. R. (2025). Unveiling the proficiency of school leaders in action research: A comprehensive examination of practices and impact on educational advancement. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*.
- Caingcoy, M. (2020). Research capability of teachers: Its correlates, determinants and implications for continuing professional development. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 2(5), 1–11.
- Castañeros, J. P., & Sumbilon, M. R. (2023). Research competencies and engagement on performance of administrators in the practice of innovation. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 11(10), 688–704.
- Corpuz, B. B., & Salandanan, G. G. (2013). *Principles of teaching*. Lorimar Publishing.
- Cortes, S. T., Lorca, A. S., Pineda, H. A., & Tubog, R. (2024). Strengthening science education in basic education through a professional development program on participatory action research for science teachers. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 6(3), Article 100489.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- De Asis, A. A., Amoyan, S. K. A., & Tamayo, D. B. (2023). School heads research knowledge, competence, knowledge encountered: Basis for research revitalization program. *WVSU Research Journal*, 1(1).
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3).
- Department of Education. (2010). DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2010: Basic Education Research Fund. Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2016). DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2016: Adoption of the Basic Education Research Agenda. Department of Education.
- Durante, P. (2022). Strengthening collaborative research practices in academia: Factors, challenges, and strategies. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 80(2), 183–197.
- Ecija, J. D. (2024). Project publish: Completing research papers through publication. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(3), 112–125.
- Edralin, D. M. (2017). Research culture in Philippine basic education: The role of school leadership. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 4(3), 1–10.
- Esturas, M. (2023). Cultivating the research culture mediated by motivation factors in enhancing teachers' performance in conducting action research. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(12), 4337–4349.
- Feldman, A., Altrichter, H., Posch, P., & Somekh, B. (2018). *Teachers investigate their work: An introduction to action research across the professions* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Hancock, B. (2002). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Trent Focus for Research and Development in Primary Health Care.
- Hiebert, J., Cai, J., Hwang, S., Morris, A. K., & Hohensee, C. (2022). *Doing research: A new researcher's guide*. Springer.
- Hung, N. T., & Hoang, N. (2022). High-school EFL teachers' action research: Evidence from Vietnam. *VNU Journal of Science: Education Research*.
- Insorio, A. (2024). Teachers' research characteristics, competencies, motivation, and challenges: Basis for research manual. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 10(4), 220–240.
- Jud, J., Hirt, C. N., Daria, T., Rosenthal, A., & Karlen, Y. (2025). Understanding the development of teachers' self-efficacy to promote self-regulated learning: A quasi-experimental study on the role of experience, mindset, and self-regulated learning skills.

- Lagrio, R., & Fabonan, J. (2022). Research competence and productivity among school heads and teachers: Basis for district research capacity building. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 3(8).
- Lastra, M., & Garcia, N. (2025). Exploring the influence of research on professional growth among public elementary school teachers: A case study. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 12(2), 45–65.
- Leithwood, K., et al. (2008). How leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4).
- Loughran, J. (2006). Developing a pedagogy of teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(2).
- Manansala, F. V. (2008). *Research methods*. Rex Book Store.
- Mohammad, N., Ma, H., & Akrim. (2023). Examining assessment practices of K–12 public school teachers in Maguindanao Province. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2960913/v1>
- Morrón, A. (2018). Implementation of BERA of DepEd: Basis for a research capability building plan [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology.
- Morrón, A. P. (2018). Implementation of Basic Education Research Agenda (BERA): Basis for a research capability building plan [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology.
- Narbarte, M. P., & Balila, J. S. (2018). Research involvement, motivation, and university initiatives as agents for enhancing research culture and quality. *Catalyst*, 17, 68–78.
- Oestar, J. M., & Marzo, C. (2022). Teachers as researchers: Skills and challenges in action research making. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, 4(2), 95–104.
- Phuong, H. Y., & Vo, P. Q. (2017). Factors inhibiting teachers from research engagement: A review. *Can Tho University Journal of Science*, 6, 17. <https://doi.org/10.22144/ctu.jen.2017.022>
- Robinson, V. (2008). School leadership and student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5).
- Santos, P. L. D. (2024). Exploring the self-perceptions of Filipino teachers on their community engagement competency. *International Journal of Social Learning*, 4(3), 259–273.
- Saro, J., Apat, J., & Pareja, M. (2023). A descriptive-correlational study of teachers’ motivation, competences, and perceptions in writing action research. *Journal of Advanced Education and Philosophy*, 7(1), 12–28.
- Tamayo, P. A. (2021). Research catalyzing framework for developing the research culture of STEAM faculty in Philippine SUCs [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Philippine Normal University.
- Tindowen, D. I. J., Guzman, R., & Macanang, C. (2019). Teachers’ conception and difficulties in doing action research. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(8), 1787–1794.
- Tirol, J. S. (2022). Motivation and research engagement of school heads under the Basic Education Research Agenda. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 5(2), 112–120.
- Tirol, S., Cortes, S., Tinapay, A. O., & Samillano, J. (2022). A teacher training program on designing participatory educational action research proposal. *Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science - Social Sciences*, 12(1), 23–39.
- Toquero, C. (2021). “Real-world”: Preservice teachers’ research competence and research difficulties in action research. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 13(4), 1014–1031.
- Ulla, M. B., Barrera, K. B., & Acompañado, M. M. (2017). Philippine classroom teachers as researchers: Teachers’ perceptions, motivations, and challenges. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(11). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2017v42n11.4>

- Vasquez, K. M., Torres Rivera, J. L., Mayuri-Ramos, E., Huamani-Torres, R., & Rivera-Zamudio, J. (2022). Research hotbeds: A practice for scientific development in universities. *NeuroQuantology*, 20(5), 568–574.
- Vula, E., & Saqipi, B. (2015). Developing action research for developing teachers in Kosovo. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(4).
- Yaneza, M., Miralles, C., & Morales, G. (2024). Preferred oral corrective feedback through existing internalized language prejudice of students in the Philippines. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 6(1), 199–215.

APA Citation:

Paguirigan, M. B., & Alvaro, M. E. T. (2026). RESEARCH CHARACTERISTICS, COMPETENCIES, MOTIVATION AND CHALLENGES OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS OF ILAGAN WEST DISTRICT IN CONDUCTING RESEARCH AS BASIS FOR A STRATEGIC CAPACITATION PLAN. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(7), 351–390. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21212948>

Corresponding author: *mirasol.paguirigan@deped.gov.ph*