

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2022, Vol. 3, No. 9, 1826 – 1847

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.09.23>

Research Article

Research Culture of Public Schools in Tagbilaran City, Bohol

Jhema Faith S. Mangana*

Department of Education – Tagbilaran City

Article history:

Submission September 2022

Revised September 2022

Accepted September 2022

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

jhemafaith.mangana@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

DepEd strives to promote and strengthen the culture of research in basic education. Along with this goal, this study aimed to determine the research culture and to recognize the extent of influence of the factors on research culture of public schools in Tagbilaran City, Bohol. It employed a quantitative descriptive research design with a survey questionnaire as the main instrument to gather the data needed in the study. Two instruments were utilized and modified in this study adapted from The Factors Influencing the Research Culture by Iqbal and colleagues and the Research Culture and Productivity of the Faculty of Accredited Private Higher Education Institutions by Tagaro. These were administered to 254 public school teachers as respondents from 25 public schools in DepEd Tagbilaran City Schools Division.

Findings revealed a moderate influence on the extent of influence of the factors on research culture of Tagbilaran City public schools. Among the factors, Environmental Factor had a greater influence whereas Personal Factor had a lesser influence on the research culture. There was no significant relationship between the teachers' selected profile and the extent of influence on research culture however sex, designation, and highest educational attainment affect the research productivity level. Moreover, data showed that there was no correlation between the extent of influence of the factors on research culture and research productivity level of the teachers.

Keywords: *research culture, research productivity, extent of influence, environmental factor, institutional factor, personal factor, DepEd*

Introduction

Research culture is a system that places a high value on conducting and communicating scholarly research as stated by Marchant

(2009). According to Cheetham (2007), it is the structure that gives meaning to research behavior, and that allows us to understand and

How to cite:

Mangana, J. F. S. (2022). Research Culture of Public Schools in Tagbilaran City, Bohol. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 3 (9), 1826 – 1847. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.03.09.23

evaluate the research activity. Thus, the research culture of an institution is not just a group of scholars who see the importance of research, it offers a welcoming atmosphere in which work is planned, addressed, created, and respected in a uniform way. Moreover, research culture is described as shared values, beliefs, attitudes, and standards that affect the performance of an institution's research tasks (Dacles,2016).

It is being acknowledged that having a research culture is of increasing importance. Faculties of major research institutions were expected to maintain scholarly activities, including conducting research and publishing scholarly works. But recently, they have been put under pressure to research and publish. Today, that pressure is continuing. Institutions and units that have historically stressed successful faculty communication with students as criteria for performance aim to establish learning cultures and increase the production of research at the faculty (Hanover Research, 2014).

The productivity of research is the result of research activities (Caminiti, C., Iezzi, E., Ghetti, C. et al., 2015). According to Ulla et al. (2017), teachers are to conduct a school-based action study as part of their performance evaluation by the Department of Education and the Commission on Higher Education. However, in recent studies, it has been found out that teachers have trouble performing action research (Tindowel et al., 2019).

The development of valuable professional knowledge is central to positive research culture in schools (Ebbutt,2002). Embracing the research culture, particularly the education sectors, is only timely. Teacher-researchers must strive to contribute to the information field by generating new ideas and does not only apply research for enforcement specified in DepEd's Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). Researchers need to cultivate a growth mindset to promote continuous development, and particularly to improve the academic and behavioral performance of the students, which is a measure of the success of the school. These also ensure that the education that the students receive is learner-oriented and attentive to their needs through ap-

propriate teaching and learning tools. Therefore, everyone in the education sector, teachers, non-teaching personnel, school administrators, and DepEd officials will work together and research to achieve the Department of Education's goal. (Sun.Star Baguio,2016).

The following theories explain why this research study exists. Education Research Acculturation Theory (Chua et al.,2011), refers to the development of culture and environment for promoting the implementation of quality research in school. Research activities improve the expertise of teachers and help them overcome the teaching-learning methods and challenges in the classroom. It takes this effort to acculturate until teachers can deliver quality educational research. Dynamics of Research Culture Theory (Acosta & Clemeña,2007), found that research productivity is the outcome of the complicated relationship between the following research building factors: first, the individual attributes representing the faculty's ability to perform a study, and second, the institutional attributes comprising the institution's support for encouraging the faculty to conduct the work and Theory on Curriculum Development and Research (Corey, 1953), Action research in education is work that professionals conduct so that they can develop their practices.

As stated by Dacles et al. (2016), it is essential to ask: Have schools imbibed and developed a research culture? How does institutional research policy support the development of research culture among its faculty members in public schools? How do faculty researchers perceive other equally important personal and organizational variables as beneficial and contributory to the institution's creation of a research culture? And how are the factors of research culture significant among its faculty members? Specifically, it intends to answer the following questions: What is the extent of influence of the factors on research culture? What is the research productivity level of public school teachers? Is there a significant degree of relationship between the teachers' profile and the ff.: extent of influence of the factors on research culture and research productivity level? Is there a significant degree of correlation between the extent of influence of the factors on

the research culture and the research productivity level? Is there a significant degree of variance on the extent of influence of the factors on research culture to the different factors?

In this context, this study aims to determine the research culture and to recognize the extent of influence of the factors on research culture of public schools in Tagbilaran City, Bohol that will serve as a basis for proposing an action plan.

Methods

To achieve the objectives of this study, the researcher used a quantitative research design, specifically the descriptive survey design. Two instruments were utilized in this study adapted and modified from The Factors Influencing the Research Culture by Iqbal and colleagues, and the Research Culture and Productivity of the Faculty of Accredited Private Higher Education Institutions by Tagaro. These were administered to the public school teachers of Tagbilaran City, Bohol.

This study utilized a random sampling technique as its sampling procedure since it is impossible to study an entire population of all public school teachers of the Tagbilaran City Division. This sampling technique acquires only a representative of the population to be the respondents of this study. Thus, with the use of a sampling size calculator, the entire population of the public school teachers in Tagbilaran was calculated with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. So, out of 316 elementary teachers of 18 public elementary schools, only 174 elementary teachers were selected, and out of 207 secondary teachers of 7 public secondary schools, only 135 secondary teachers were chosen. Accordingly, newly-hired public school teachers or teachers with less than three years' experience were excluded. In total, 309 public school teachers in Tagbilaran City would participate in the conduct of this study. However, in the actual conduct of the study, only 254 public school teachers participated.

To ensure the participants' protection of this study, the research study underwent an ethics review by the University of Bohol Ethics Review Committee. After this, the researcher asked permission in the form of a letter from the Dean of the Graduate School, Vice President

of the Academics, and the Schools Division Superintendent of Tagbilaran City to conduct the study.

After getting permission, the researcher explained the purpose of the study to the respondents to obtain their consent. The questionnaires were distributed upon signing the informed consent form. Next, the questionnaires were retrieved, and the data collected were processed accordingly to answer the main and sub-problems of this study. The coded data entries were to protect the respondents' anonymity.

The researcher followed the ethical guidelines for the whole duration of the research period to conduct the research appropriately. After the administrative procedure for the approval of conduct, the researcher secured the respondents' consent form to participate in the study. There was an assurance of the privacy and confidentiality of data collected.

Tests for normality on the dependent variables was conducted using the Kolmogorov-Smirnova and Shapiro-Wilk Test. The results show a value lesser than 0.05, which signifies a skewed distribution which means that the variables are not normally distributed. Thus, statistical treatment utilized a non-parametric test. In the analysis and presentation of data, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences or SPSS software was utilized with the following statistical treatment: Frequency, Simple Percentage, Rank, Weighted Mean, Composite Mean, Chi-Square, Spearman Rho, and Friedman Test.

Results and Discussions

Data collected from a survey conducted to 25 public schools with 254 public school teachers as the respondents were analyzed and interpreted. These were in accordance to the various aspects of the problem in the study.

Profile of the Respondents. Table 1 displays the age, sex, civil status, designation, length of service, and the highest educational attainment profile of the teacher-respondents.

Age. A mean age of 40.76 is gathered. Majority of the teachers are 30-39 years old and only a few of them are 60 years and above.

Sex. Two hundred twenty-six teachers are female with a percentage of 89.0 while 28

teachers are male with a percentage of 11.0. Majority of the teachers are female and the rest of them are male.

Civil Status. Two hundred one teachers are married with a percentage of 79.1; 44 teachers are single with a percentage of 17.3; 7 teachers are widowed with a percentage of 2.8 while 2 teachers are separated with a percentage of 0.8. Majority of the teachers are married and a couple of them are separated.

Designation. Two hundred twenty teachers are Teacher I, II, and III with a percentage of 86.6; 19 teachers are Master Teachers with a percentage of 7.5; 11 are Principals with a percentage of 4.3 while 4 are Head Teachers with a percentage of 1.6. Majority of the teachers are

Teacher I, II and II and only a few of them are Head Teachers.

Length of Service. A mean of 12.08 is generated. Majority of the teachers are 1-10 years in the service and only a few of them are 31 years and above in the service.

Highest Educational Attainment. One hundred fifty-six teachers have Master's degree units with a percentage of 61.4; 43 teachers have Bachelor's degree with a percentage of 16.9; 25 teachers have Master's degree with a percentage of 9.8; 16 teachers have a Doctorate degree with a percentage of 6.3 while 14 teachers have Doctorate degree units with a percentage of 5.5. Majority of the teachers have Master's degree units and only a few of them have Doctorate degree units.

Table I. Profile of the Respondents

N=254			
Age Group	Frequency	Percent	Rank
20 - 29	38	15.0	4
30 - 39	92	36.2	1
40 - 49	66	26.0	2
50 - 59	54	21.3	3
60 years and above	4	1.6	5
Total	254	100.0	
Mean Age	40.76	SD = 9.6136	
Sex	Frequency	Percent	Rank
Male	28	11.0	2
Female	226	89.0	1
Total	254	100.0	
Civil Status	Frequency	Percent	Rank
Single	44	17.3	2
Married	201	79.1	1
Separated	2	.8	4
Widowed	7	2.8	3
Total	254	100.0	
Designation	Frequency	Percent	Rank
Teacher	220	86.6	1
Master Teacher	19	7.5	2
Head Teacher	4	1.6	4
Principal	11	4.3	3
Total	254	100.0	
Length of Service	Frequency	Percent	Rank
1 - 10 years	138	54.3	1
11 - 20 years	67	26.4	2
21 - 30 years	43	16.9	3
31 years and above	6	2.4	4

Total	254	100.0	
Mean	12.08	SD=8.7433	
Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent	Rank
Bachelor's Degree	43	16.9	2
with Master's units	156	61.4	1
Master's Degree	25	9.8	3
with PhD units	14	5.5	5
Doctoral Degree	16	6.3	4
Total	254	100.0	

Data above support an article of Chowdhury (2017) on Developing Research Culture that younger researchers' think tanks are more efficient.

Number of Research Trainings Attended. The table below presents the number of research trainings attended by the teachers categorized by school, division, regional, national and international levels.

Majority of the teachers have not attended research trainings in school and only a few of them have attended 4-10 research trainings in school. Majority of them have not attended

research trainings in the division and only a few of them have attended 10-20 research trainings in the division. Majority of the teachers are have not attended research trainings in the region and only a few of them have attended 2-10 research trainings in the region. Majority of the teachers have not attended research trainings in the national level and only one has attended 5 research trainings in the national level. Majority of the teachers have not attended research trainings in the international level and only one of them has attended 3 research trainings in the international level.

Table 2. Number of Research Trainings Attended

N=254			
Number of Research Trainings Attended in School	Frequency	Percent	Rank
.00	134	52.8	1
1.00	82	32.3	2
2.00	18	7.1	3
3.00	12	4.7	4
4.00	1	.4	7.5
5.00	4	1.6	5
8.00	1	.4	7.5
10.00	1	.4	7.5
30.00	1	.4	7.5
Total	254	100.0	
Number of Research Trainings Attended in the Division	Frequency	Percent	Rank
.00	174	68.5	1
1.00	52	20.5	2
2.00	16	6.3	3
3.00	6	2.4	4
4.00	2	.8	5.5
5.00	2	.8	5.5
10.00	1	.4	7.5
20.00	1	.4	7.5
Total	254	100.0	
Number of Research Trainings Attended in the Region	Frequency	Percent	Rank

.00	236	92.9	1
1.00	15	5.9	2
2.00	1	.4	4
3.00	1	.4	4
10.00	1	.4	4
Total	254	100.0	
Number of Research Trainings Attended in the National Level			
	Frequency	Percent	Rank
.00	247	97.2	1
1.00	3	1.2	2.5
2.00	3	1.2	2.5
5.00	1	.4	4
Total	254	100.0	
Number of Research Trainings Attended in the International Level			
	Frequency	Percent	Rank
.00	251	98.8	1
1.00	2	.8	2
3.00	1	.4	3
Total	254	100.0	

Number of Research Trainings Facilitated. The table below presents the number of research trainings facilitated by the teachers categorized by school, division, regional, national and international levels.

Table 3. Number of Research Trainings Facilitated

N=254			
Number of Research Trainings Facilitated in School			
	Frequency	Percent	Rank
.00	223	87.8	1
1.00	25	9.8	2
2.00	1	.4	4
3.00	5	2.0	3
Total	254	100.0	
Number of Research Trainings Facilitated in the Division			
	Frequency	Percent	Rank
.00	239	94.1	1
1.00	13	5.1	2
2.00	2	.8	3
Total	254	100.0	
Number of Research Trainings Facilitated in the Region			
	Frequency	Percent	Rank
.00	252	99.2	1
1.00	2	.8	2
Total	254	100.0	
Number of Research Trainings Facilitated in the National Level			
	Frequency	Percent	Rank
.00	252	99.2	1
1.00	1	.4	2.5
2.00	1	.4	2.5
Total	254	100.0	
Number of Research Trainings Facilitated in the			
	Frequency	Percent	Rank

International Level			
.00	253	99.6	1
3.00	1	.4	2
Total	254	100.0	

Majority of the teachers have not facilitated research trainings in school and only one has facilitated 2 research trainings in school. Majority of the teachers have not facilitated research trainings in the division and only 2 of them have facilitated 2 research trainings in the division. Majority of the teachers have not facilitated research trainings in the region and only 2 of them have facilitated 1 research training in the region. Majority of the teachers have not facilitated research trainings in the national level and only 2 teachers have facilitated 1-2 research trainings in the national level. Majority of the teachers have not facilitated research trainings in the international level and only one teacher has facilitated 3 research trainings in the international level.

Extent of Influence on Research Culture.

The succeeding tables display the extent of influence of the factors namely: environmental, institutional, and personal towards the research culture of public schools in Tagbilaran City, Bohol.

Data exhibits an overall composite mean of 2.9064 interpreted as Moderate Influence with Environmental Factor having a greater influence and Personal Factor having a lesser influence among the other factors.

This affirms the theory on Education Research Acculturation to which an environment that encourages teacher cooperation and encouragement from school managers for educational research creates a big impact on the research culture of a school while issues result from a lack of resources such as reference sources. Furthermore, it supports the Education Research Acculturation Theory which states that a school emphasizing on research activities, including departmental support, trainings, and securing financial support for research activities promote the research culture of a school. These also confirm that a researcher is affected by the institutional support provided such as prizes and recognition based on the Theory on Dynamics of Research Culture.

Table 4. Summary Table on the Extent of Influence on Research Culture as to All Factors

N=254				
Factors	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation	Rank
Environmental Factor	3.0707	.57195	MI	1
Institutional Factor	2.8423	.50855	MI	2
Personal Factor	2.8069	.44668	MI	3
Overall Composite Mean	2.9064	.42010	Moderate Influence	
Scaling	Interpretation	Descriptive Value		
1.00-1.74	NI	No Influence		
1.75-2.49	SI	Slight Influence		
2.50-3.24	MI	Moderate Influence		
3.25-4.00	HI	High Influence		

Table 5. Extent of Influence on Research Culture as to Environmental Factor

N=254				
Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation	Rank
1. The school is open to opportunities involving research activities.	3.2283	.63107	MI	2

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation	Rank
2. Research issues are communicated by the Principal/Head Teacher/ Master Teachers to the teachers.	3.1181	.67261	MI	3
3. The school head is supportive to research projects and research activities of teachers.	3.2441	.66197	MI	1
4. Coaching and mentoring are observed to enhance research skills of the teachers.	3.0079	.76995	MI	5
5. Teachers exchange information or share ideas with one another to succeed in their action research.	3.0551	.73109	MI	4
6. Resources and facilities to collaborate and access local and international researchers are available in the school.	2.7717	.77703	MI	6
Composite Mean	3.0707	.57195	Moderate Influence	
Scaling	Interpretation	Descriptive Value		
1.00-1.74	NI	No Influence		
1.75-2.49	SI	Slight Influence		
2.50-3.24	MI	Moderate Influence		
3.25-4.00	HI	High Influence		

Extent of Influence on Research Culture as to Environmental Factor. Data shows that all items of environmental factor are interpreted as having Moderate Influence on the research culture of public schools in Tagbilaran City. It shows a mean of 3.0707 with an interpretation of Moderate Influence. The school

head being supportive to research projects and research activities of teachers is perceived by the respondents as more influential while resources and facilities to collaborate and access local and international researchers available in the school is least influential.

Table 6. Extent of Influence on Research Culture as to Institutional Factor

N=254				
Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation	Rank
1. The school demands to be productive in research.	2.8701	.63093	MI	7
2. Teaching and research activities have equal importance.	2.9449	.63254	MI	3
3. Potential rewards such as promotion are awarded by the school for completing the research activities.	2.8386	.67824	MI	9
4. Potential reward such as recognition is awarded by the school for completing the research activities.	2.9567	.63658	MI	2
5. Potential reward such as money is awarded by the school for completing the research activities.	2.4488	.73003	MI	14

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation	Rank
6. Research policies are communicated by the Principal / Head Teacher / Master Teachers to the teachers.	2.9409	.59681	MI	4
7. Research activities are rewarded in accordance with defined benchmarks of achievement.	2.8228	.61928	MI	10
8. Measures are taken like seminars, trainings and workshops for improvement of research skills.	3.0000	.65336	MI	1
9. The school arranges seminars, trainings and workshops with reputable competent researchers as resource speakers.	2.9370	.70288	MI	5.5
10. The school provides administrative support for presentation of research papers in academic conferences.	2.8622	.64782	MI	8
11. Successful research projects are presented to get new knowledge.	2.9370	.67418	MI	5.5
12. Scholarships are granted to teachers who are into research.	2.7756	.74444	MI	11
13. Funds are allocated for training of research skills.	2.7717	.69087	MI	12
14. Teaching workload and ancillary functions are adjusted with research work.	2.6850	.75653	MI	13
Composite Mean	2.8423	.50855	Moderate Influence	
Scaling	Interpretation	Descriptive Value		
1.00-1.74	NI	No Influence		
1.75-2.49	SI	Slight Influence		
2.50-3.24	MI	Moderate Influence		
3.25-4.00	HI	High Influence		

Extent of Influence on Research Culture as to Institutional Factor. Data identifies a mean of 2.8423 with an interpretation of Moderate Influence. Measures taken like seminars, trainings and workshops for improvement of research skills is perceived by the respondents as more influential while potential reward such

as money awarded by the school for completing the research activities is least influential.

Personal Factor. The table below exhibits the data of the sub-factors of Personal Factor namely: Career, Family, Research Attitudes, and Research Knowledge and Skills.

Table 7. Extent of Influence on Research Culture as to Personal Factor

N=254				
Personal Factor	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation	Rank
Career	2.6575	.60532	MI	4
Family	2.9154	.67399	MI	1
Research Attitudes	2.8366	.51966	MI	2
Research Knowledge and Skills	2.8157	.56792	MI	3

Composite Mean	2.8069	.44668	Moderate Influence
Scaling	Interpretation	Descriptive Value	
1.00-1.74	NI	No Influence	
1.75-2.49	SI	Slight Influence	
2.50-3.24	MI	Moderate Influence	
3.25-4.00	HI	High Influence	

Data gives a composite mean of the sub-factors of 2.8069 interpreted as Moderate Influence. Family personal factor is perceived to be of greater influence whereas Career personal factor is of least influence.

research productivity level of public school teachers in Tagbilaran City as to their roles in research, number of research produced, number of research published in refereed journals, research presented, and research published.

Research Productivity Level of Public School Teachers. The tables below show the

Table 8. Research Productivity Level of Public School Teachers as to the Roles in Action Research

Enumerator	Frequency	Percent
.00	210	82.7
1.00	43	16.9
3.00	1	.4
Total	254	100.0
Data Analyst	Frequency	Percent
.00	235	92.5
1.00	19	7.5
Total	254	100.0
Research Assistant	Frequency	Percent
.00	221	87.0
1.00	33	13.0
Total	254	100.0
Co-Proponent	Frequency	Percent
.00	234	92.1
1.00	20	7.9
Total	254	100.0
Proponent	Frequency	Percent
.00	215	84.6
1.00	38	15.0
2.00	1	.4
Total	254	100.0

Table 9. Research Productivity Level of Public School Teachers as to the Roles in Thesis/Dissertation

N=254		
Reader	Frequency	Percent
.00	173	68.1
1.00	81	31.9
Total	254	100.0
Panel Member	Frequency	Percent
.00	214	84.3
1.00	38	15.0

2.00	2	.8
Total	254	100.0
Adviser	Frequency	Percent
.00	228	89.8
1.00	25	9.8
3.00	1	.4
Total	254	100.0

Table 10. Research Productivity Level of Public School Teachers as to the Roles in Funded Research Project

Enumerator	Frequency	Percent
.00	200	78.7
1.00	54	21.3
Total	254	100.0
Data Analyst	Frequency	Percent
.00	240	94.5
1.00	13	5.1
2.00	1	.4
Total	254	100.0
Research Assistant	Frequency	Percent
.00	224	88.2
1.00	30	11.8
Total	254	100.0
Principal Researcher	Frequency	Percent
.00	239	94.1
1.00	15	5.9
Total	254	100.0
Research Supervisor	Frequency	Percent
.00	251	98.8
1.00	2	.8
4.00	1	.4
Total	254	100.0

Table 11. Research Productivity Level of Public School Teachers as to the Number of Research Produced

Number of Research Produced	Frequency	Percent
0	194	76.4
1	41	16.1
2	13	5.1
3	3	1.2
4	1	.4
5	1	.4
10	1	.4
Total	254	100.0

Table 12. Research Productivity Level of Public School Teachers as to the Number of Research Published in Refereed Journals

Number of Research Published in Refereed Journals	Frequency	Percent
0	239	94.1
1	11	4.3
2	4	1.6
Total	254	100.0

Research Presented. The table below represents the research productivity level of public school teachers as to the local, regional, national, and international research presented.

Table 13. Research Productivity Level of Public School Teachers as to the Research Presented

Local	Frequency	Percent
0	205	80.7
1	42	16.5
2	5	2.0
4	1	.4
5	1	.4
Total	254	100.0
Regional	Frequency	Percent
0	251	98.8
1	3	1.2
Total	254	100.0
National	Frequency	Percent
0	253	99.6
3	1	.4
Total	254	100.0
International	Frequency	Percent
0	251	98.8
1	2	.8
4	1	.4
Total	254	100.0

Research Published. The table below represents the research productivity level of public school teachers as to the research published either local, regional, national, or international.

Table 14. Research Productivity Level of Public School Teachers as to the Research Published

Local	Frequency	Percent
0	238	93.7
1	15	5.9
2	1	.4
Total	254	100.0
Regional	Frequency	Percent
0	253	99.6
1	1	.4
Total	254	100.0

National	Frequency	Percent
0	253	99.6
2	1	.4
Total	254	100.0
International	Frequency	Percent
0	253	99.6
1	1	.4
Total	254	100.0

The results gather that the teachers are not productive as to their roles in research, number of research produced, number of research published in refereed journals, research presented and published.

The findings above support a related study of Ramos (2017), it reported that in 2010-2014 only two of ten produced researches in their school, 90 percent of teachers were not skilled in research. Despite numerous attendances to capacity-building research-related programs, membership to professional organizations, and other professional development participation, teachers tend to be reluctant in documenting and reporting their academic efforts through a research paper like action researches. For

instance, DepEd revealed during the 2018 Research Management Conference that there was an increased number of researches, but is still considered few in terms of the number of research proposals with respect to their population size, from 458 to 551 or 20.31 percent markup between 2016 and 2017, and a dip of 11.62 percent in 2017.

Summary on the Relationship Between the Teachers' Selected Profile and the Extent of Influence of the Factors on Research Culture. The table below presents the summary on the relationship between the teachers' selected profile and the extent of influence of the factors on research culture.

Table 15. Summary Table on the Relationship Between the Teachers' Selected Profile and the Extent of Influence of the Factors on Research Culture

Variables	p-value	Result	Decision
Age and Extent of Influence on Research Culture	.887	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Sex and Extent of Influence on Research Culture	.944	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Civil Status and Extent of Influence on Research Culture	.497	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Designation and Extent of Influence on Research Culture	.252	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Length of Service and Extent of Influence on Research Culture	.825	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Highest Educational Attainment and Extent of Influence on Research Culture	.063	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀

Data presents the p-value of the variables greater than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, there is an insignificant degree of relationship between the teachers' selected profile and the extent of influence on research culture hence,

it failed to reject the null hypothesis which means that the teachers' selected profile does not affect the extent of influence of the factors on research culture of public schools in Tagbilaran City.

Summary on the Relationship between the Teachers' Selected Profile and Research Productivity Level. The table below presents

the summary on the relationship between the teachers' selected profile and research productivity level.

Table 16. Summary Table on the Relationship between the Teachers' Selected Profile and Research Productivity Level

Variables	p-value	Result	Decision
Age and Research Productivity Level	.174	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Sex and Research Productivity Level	.000	Significant	Reject H₀
Civil Status and Research Productivity Level	.098	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Designation and Research Productivity Level	.010	Significant	Reject H₀
Length of Service and Research Productivity Level	.443	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Highest Educational Attainment and Research Productivity Level	.000	Significant	Reject H₀

Data indicates that the sex, designation and highest educational attainment profile of the teachers have a p-value lesser than the significance level of 0.05 resulting to a significant degree of relationship to the research productivity level which leads to the decision of rejecting the null hypothesis whereas age, civil status, and length of service have a p-value greater than the significance level of 0.05 resulting to an insignificant degree of relationship to the research productivity level which leads to the decision as failed to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, it implies that sex, designation, and highest educational attainment affect the research productivity level of the teachers while age, civil status, and length of service do not affect the research productivity level of the teachers.

It contradicts the statement on Faculty Research Productivity: Exploring the Role of Gender and Family-Related Factors (Sax et al., 2002) as to sex which indicated that factors affecting faculty research productivity are nearly identical for men and women, and family-

related variables, such as having dependent children, exhibit little or no effects on research productivity however supports the statements on the Predictors of Teacher Educators' Research Productivity by Nasser-Abu Alhija et al., (2017), it examined the relationship between teacher educators' research productivity (RP) and their background and professional characteristics, attitudes, motives, obstacles and time devoted to research. The findings indicated the significance of five variables for predicting Research Productivity: academic degree, rank, administrative position, desire to develop new knowledge and learn from research findings and perceived insufficient research competence and self-confidence.

Summary on the Correlation between the Extent of Influence of the Factors on Research Culture and Research Productivity Level. The table summarizes the correlation between the extent of influence of the factors on research culture and research productivity level using Spearman's correlation.

Table 17. Summary Table on the Correlation between the Extent of Influence of the Factors on Research Culture and Research Productivity Level

Variables	p-value	Result	Decision
Environmental Factor vs Research Productivity	.035	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Institutional Factor vs Research Productivity	.089	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀
Personal Factor vs Research Productivity	0.127	Insignificant	Failed to reject H₀

Data reveals that the p-value of the variables are greater than 0.05 level of significance. It means that there is no significant correlation between the extent of influence of the factors on research culture and research productivity level. Therefore, it failed to reject the null hypothesis which means that there is no association between the extent of influence of the

factors on research culture and research productivity level of the teachers.

Analysis of Variance Among the Factors on the Extent of Influence on Research Culture. The table below constitutes the result on the analysis of variance among the factors on the extent of influence on research culture using the Friedman Test.

Table 18. Analysis of Variance among the Factors on the Extent of Influence on Research Culture

Friedman Test		
	Mean Rank	Mean
Environmental Factor	2.44	3.0707
Institutional Factor	1.83	2.8423
Personal Factor	1.73	2.8069

p-value = 0.000
 Result: Significant
 Decision: Reject H₀

As reflected in the table, data computed a p-value of .000 which is lesser than the significant level of 0.05 resulting to a significant difference among the factors on the extent of influence on research culture. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected which means the extent of influence of the factors on research culture varies significantly from one another.

Conclusion

The following conclusions are drawn from the findings mentioned above: **Profile of the Teachers.** Majority of the teachers are female, married and in their thirties. The teachers involved in this study are young, experienced and are capable to handle research however involvement in refining these research skills are non-existent.

Extent of Influence on the Research Culture of the Factors. There is a Moderate Influence among the factors and Environmental Factor has a greater influence on research culture which means that there are still measures taken to intensify research in schools.

Research Productivity Level of the Teachers. The teachers are not productive as to: their roles in action research, thesis/dissertation, and funded research projects; number of research produced; number of research published in refereed journals; research presented and published.

Degree of Relationship Between the Teachers' Selected Profile and Extent of Influence of the Factors on Research Culture.

There is no significant relationship between the teachers' selected profile and the extent of influence of the factors on research culture so the teachers' selected profile does not affect the extent of influence of the factors on research culture.

Degree of Relationship Between the Teachers' Selected Profile and Research Productivity Level.

There is a significant degree of relationship between sex, designation, and highest educational attainment to the research productivity level while there is no significant degree of relationship between age, civil status, and length of service to the research productivity level. It signifies that sex, designation, and highest educational attainment affect the research productivity level while age, civil status, and length of service do not affect the research productivity level of the teachers.

Degree of Correlation Between the Extent of Influence of the Factors on Research Culture and Research Productivity Level.

There is no significant degree of correlation between both variables. The extent of influence of the factors on research culture is not correlated to the research productivity level of the teachers. This is due to the great number of

respondents with no research productivity and the level of research platforms assessed that are beyond public school teachers' research capacity.

Degree of Variance on the Extent of Influence on Research Culture of the Factors.

The extent of influence of the factors on research culture varies significantly from one another.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following measures are recommended: Information dissemination of the findings to DepEd Tagbilaran; Implementation of the proposed action plan; DepEd should continue to promote open discussion and continuous learning experiences for education leaders, researchers, policy-makers, and educators in the basic education sector such as research trainings and workshops; DepEd should strengthen local implementation of programs and policies on building a research culture in public schools in particular: resources and facilities, research incentives and teaching load allocations; DepEd should raise awareness on the Research Management Guidelines and Basic Education Research Agenda to provide guidance to teacher-researchers in managing research initiatives in the national, regional, schools division, and school levels; Teachers should pursue advance studies to enhance their research knowledge and skills; and Future researchers may investigate other inhibiting factors not covered in the study that may build the research culture of public schools.

References

Abramo, G. & D'Angelo, C.A. (2014). How do you define and measure research productivity? *Scientometrics*, 101(2), 1129-1144. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-014-1269-8. Retrieved from <https://www.core.ac.uk>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Ajjawi, R., Crampton, P. & Rees, C. (2018). What really matters for successful research environments? A realist synthesis. *Medical Education*. 52. 10.1111/medu.13643. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/39tbuEV>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Altbach, P. (2009). Peripheries and Centers: Research Universities in Developing Countries. *Asia Pacific Education*, Vol. 10, pp. 15-27. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Anzaldo, G. & Cudiamat, M. (2019). Teachers' Perception in Writing Action Research in a Public Elementary School in the Philippines. *International Educational Research*. 2.10.30560/ier.v2n3p15. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2P9vDaP>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Bland, C., Center, B., Finstad, D., Risbey, K., & Staples, J. (2005). A Theoretical, Practical, Predictive Model of Faculty and Department Research Productivity. *Academic Medicine*, 80(3). p. 225-237. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wunGGF>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Borg, S. (2014). Teacher research for professional development. In G. Pickering & P. Gunashekar (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teacher education* (pp.23-28). Selected papers from the fourth International Teacher Educator Conference, Hyderabad, India. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Brew, A., Boud, D., Namgung, S. U., Lucas, L. & Crawford, K. (2015). *Research productivity and academics' conceptions of research*. Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2vLRej9>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Brew, A. & Boud, D. (2009). Understanding academics' engagement with research. In Brew, A. and Lucas, L. (Eds.). *Academic Research and Researchers*. London: SRHE and the Open University Press, 189-203. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Buchheit S., Collins, A. B. & Collins, D. L. (2001), "Intra-Institutional Factors that Influence Accounting Research Productivity," *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, 17 (2) Spring, 17-31. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cEnN3g>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. New York: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Cain, T. & Milovic, S. (2010). Action research as a tool of professional development of advisers and teachers in Croatia. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(1), 19-30. Retrieved from

- <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Caminiti, C., Iezzi, E., Ghetti, C., De' Angelis, G., & Ferrari, C. (2015). A method for measuring individual research productivity in hospitals: development and feasibility. *BMC Health Serv Res* 15, 468 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-1130-7>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Cardona, R. (2020). The Enablers and Outcomes of Research Productivity among Junior High School Mathematics Teachers: A Structural Model. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 2020, 16(11), em1901 ISSN:1305-8223. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/8563>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Chaplin, K. & Price, D. (2018). 7 ways to promote better research culture. World Economic Forum. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/39NWfWD>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Cheetham, A. (2007). Growing a Research Culture. Address to the Academic Senate – University of Western Sydney, p. 5. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wunGGF>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Chen, Y., Nixon, M., Gupta, A. & Hoshower, L. (2010). Research productivity of accounting faculty: an exploratory study. *American Journal of Business Education*, Volume 3, No. 2. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cEnN3g>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Chua, Y.P., Tie, F.H., & Mohd Don, Z. (2011). Creating an education research acculturation theory for research implementation in school. *Education and Urban Society* XX(X) 1 –2. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wpdb7s>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Chowdhury, M. (2017). Developing Research Culture. Daily Sun. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2P9PZAO>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Congress of the Philippines. (2001). Governance of basic education. Basic Education Act, Sec. 7(5). Official Gazette. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3avNRvc>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Connell, H. M. (2004). University research management: meeting the institutional challenge. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SijEmY>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Corey, S. (1953). Action research to improve school practices. New York: Teachers College; Columbia University. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32c2l0l>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- D'Andrea, V., & Gosling, D. (2000, November). Promoting research in teaching and learning in higher education: two case studies of multidisciplinary pedagogic research. Paper presented at the ESRC Teaching and Learning Research Programme, Leicester. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SijEmY>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Dacles et al. (2016). Cultivating research culture: an analysis of contributing factors, the institution's research initiatives, and collaboration among the HEI's trifocal functions. *American Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 4, no. 6 (2016): 439-449. doi:10.12691/education-4-6-2. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Deem, R., & Lucas, L. (2007). Research and Teaching Cultures in Two Contrasting UK Policy Contexts: Academic Life in Education Departments in Five English and Scottish Universities. *High Education*, Vol. 54, pp. 1-19. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Department of Education. (2017). Research Management Guidelines. DepEd Order No. 16. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SJqb0k>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Department of Education (2016). Adoption of the Basic Education Research Agenda. DepEd Order No. 39. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SXgv1f>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Department of Education. (2015). Policy Research and Development. DepEd Order No. 13. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2vHjTpn>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Department of Education. (2010). Basic Education Research Fund. DepEd Order No. 24. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2Ilv4XO>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Dever, M., & Morrison, Z. (2009). Women, Research Performance and Work Context. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 15(1), 49-62. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Du, F. (2009). Building action research teams: A case of struggles and successes. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 12(2), 8–18. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cDzd71>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Ebbutt, D. (2002) The development of a research culture in secondary schools, *Educational Action Research*,

- 10:1, 123-142, DOI: 10.1080/09650790200200171. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Edgar, F., & Geare, A. (2013). Factors Influencing University Research Performance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(5), 774-792. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Ellis, N. & Loughland, T. (2016). The challenges of practitioner research: A comparative study of Singapore and NSW. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Evans, L. (2007). Developing Research Cultures and Researchers in HE; the Role of Leadership. Presentation at the Annual Conference of the Society for Research into Higher Education, p. 1. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2TinH8h>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Fairweather, J. (2002). The Mythologies of Faculty Productivity: Implications for Institutional Policy and Decision Making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1). p. 31-32. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wunGGF>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Fisher, R. L. (2005). The research productivity of scientists: how gender, organisation culture and the problem choice process influence the productivity of scientists. Oxford, UK: University Press of America. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Fox, M. (2005). Gender, Family Characteristics, and Publication Productivity among Scientists. *Social Studies of Science*, 35(1), 131-150. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Gordon, S. P. & Solis, R. D. (2018). Teacher Leaders of Collaborative Action Research: Challenges and Rewards. i.e.: inquiry in education: Vol. 10: Iss. 2, Article 3. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cDzd71>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Gosadan, B. D. & Cagaanan, J. A. (2018). Research Competency among Elementary School Teachers: An evaluative assessment for School-Based Action Research (SBAR). *JPAIR Institutional Research Journal*, 11(1). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3aF8Ls4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Grima-Farrell, C. (2017). What matters in a research to practice cycle? Teachers as researchers. Springer Singapore: Springer Science+Business Media Singapore. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Habibah, A., Hamzah, J., & Buang, A. (2001). Nurturing Research Culture in Malaysia: The Social Sciences Undergraduate's Responses *Medwell Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (SocialSciences), pp. 114-124. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Hanover Research. (May 2014). Building a culture of research: recommended practices. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wunGGF>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Hazelcorn, E. (2005). *University Research Management: developing research in new institutions*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SjEmY>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Hemmings, B. C., Rushbrook, P., & Smith, E. (2007). Academics' views on publishing refereed works: A content analysis. *Higher Education*, 54, 307-332. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SjEmY>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Hernandez, E. & Reyes, R. (2014). Research Culture in Higher Education: The Case of a Foreign Language Department in Mexico. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*. 16. 135-150.10.15446/profile.v16n2.40819. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wFMJH2>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Hine, G. S. C. (2013). The importance of action research in teacher education programs. *Issues in Educational Research*, 23(2): Special Issue. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Hong, C. E. & Lawrence, S. A. (2011). Action research in teacher education: Classroom inquiry, reflection, and data-driven decision making. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 4(2), 1-17. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Hu, Q. & Gill, T. G. (2000), "Is Faculty Research Productivity: Influential Factors and Implications," *Information Resources Management Journal*, 13 (2) April-June, 15-25. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cEnN3g>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Iqbal, M., Jalal, S., & Mahmood, M.K. (2018). Factors influencing research culture in public universities of Punjab: faculty members' perspective. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 40(3). Retrieved from

- <https://bit.ly/3bRb77y>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Jenks, C. (2009). Building a University Research Culture in W. Elali, A. Y. Al-Hawaj & E. H. Twizell (Eds.), *Higher Education in the TwentyFirst Century: Issues and Challenges*: CRC Press. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SljEmY>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Kim, D., Wolf-Wendel, L., & Twombly, S. (2011). International Faculty: Experiences of Academic Life and Productivity in U.S. Universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 82(6), 720-747. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Kim, T. (2005). Internationalisation of Higher Education in South Korea: Reality, Rhetoric, and Disparity in Academic Culture and Identities. *Australian Journal of Education*, Vol. 49, No. 1, pp.1-18. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Kutlay, N. (2013). A survey of English language teachers' views of research. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 188-206. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Kwon, U., Sharon, E., Beatty., & Jason. (2000). Organizational Value, Work Norms, and Relational Role Behaviour: An Empirical Retail Assessment Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 1-16. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Lewin, K. (1944). Action Research and Minority Problems. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/38kMUol>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Lodhi, A. S. (2012). A pilot study of researching the research culture in Pakistani public universities: the academics' perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* Volume 31, 2012, pages 473-479. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SljEmY>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Mahani, S. (2012). Enhancing the quality of teaching and learning through action research. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 9(3), 209-215. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Mantikayan, J. & Abdulgani, M. (2018). Factors Affecting Faculty Research Productivity: Conclusions from a Critical Review of the Literature. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*. 31. 10.7719/jpair. v31i1.561. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2TBYx63>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Marchant, Teresa. (2009). Developing Research Culture – Overcoming Regional and Historical Obstacles. Chapter Five in *Professional Doctorate Research in Australia: Commentary and Case Studies from Business, Education and Indigenous Studies*. Lismore: Southern Cross University Press. p. 6. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wunGGF>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- McBee, M. T. (2004). The classroom as laboratory: An exploration of teacher research. *Roeper Review*, 27(1), 52-58. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cDzd71>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Mirza, N. & Qazi, W. & Rawat, K.J. (2012). Research culture in Teacher Education: A study of the perception of university teacher educators in Pakistan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. 28. 559-568. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2IxIbIj>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Morales, M. P. E. (2016). Participatory action research (PAR) cum action research (AR) in teacher professional development: A literature review. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 2(1), 156-165. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of Organization*. New Delhi: Sage Publication. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Moss, S. (2016). Constructionism. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3bTF6gg>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Muhajir & Rahman, M. (2013). Understanding of Research Culture Levels: A Review of Literature. *The International Journal's Research Journal of Social Science & Management*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Mulder, P. (2013). Organizational Culture Model by Edgar Schein. Retrieved March 3, 2020 from <https://bit.ly/2SHAXV1>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Mullen, C. A. (2009). *The handbook of formal mentoring in higher education: a case study approach*. Norwood, Mass: Christopher-Gordon Publishers. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SljEmY>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Nadeem, M. (2001). Re-Searching Research Culture at Higher Education. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, Vol. 5, No.1, pp. 41-52. Retrieved

- from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Nasser-Abu Alhija, Fadia & Majdob, Arin & Nasser-Abu, Fadia & Ahija. (2017). Predictors of Teacher Educators' Research Productivity. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. 42. <https://10.14221/ajte.2017v42n11.3>.
- Nor' Azah, B. A. S. (2007). Kesiediaan pengetahuan, kemahiran dan sikap guru perdagangan melaksanakan kajian tindakan dalam amalan pendidikan. *Kertas Projek Sarjana*. University Kebangsaan Malaysia. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2TTBRNw>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- O'Connor, K. A., Greene, H. C. & Anderson, P. J. (2006). Action research: A tool for improving teacher quality and classroom practice. *Ontario Action Research*, (1). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Othman, N. & Yee, C. (2015). Empowering Teaching, Learning, and Supervision. *Journal of Management Research*. 7. 98. 10.5296/jmr.v7i2.6931. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2V8JCBw>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Padilla-Gonzalez, L., Metcalfe, A. S., Galaz-Fontes, J. F., Fisher, D., & Snee, I. (2011). Gender Gaps in North American Research Productivity: Examining Faculty Publication Rates in Mexico, Canada, and the U.S. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(5), 649-668. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Painter, D. D. (n.d.). *Teacher Research Could Change Your Practice*. National Education Association. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/39eRzsX>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Parker, A. (2007). *Resourcing a Research Culture: The Roles of the Library and the Research Assistant at Whitireia Community Polytechnic*. Paper presented at the Library Conference Papers. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Philippine Constitution. (1987). Education, science and technology, arts, culture and sports. The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines-Article XIV. *Official Gazette*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2TIDmVE>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Price, J.N. & Valli, L. (2005). Preservice teachers becoming agents of change: pedagogical implications for action research. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56 (1), 57-72. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2TTBRNw>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Quimbo, M.-A. T., & Sulabo E. C. (2014). Research productivity and its policy implications in higher education institutions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(10), 1955-1971. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Research Culture (2019). Royal Society. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3bRAuHg>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Robbins, S., & Judge, T. (2006). *Organizational Behavior* (12 ed.). San Diego: Prentice Hall. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Saad, N. & Kaur, P. (2020). *Organizational theory and culture*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/38GNBfq>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Salazar-Clemeña, R.M. & Almonte-Acosta, S. (2007). Developing research culture in philippine higher education institutions: perspectives of university faculty. *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2P7t3SM>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Salazar, R., & Almonte, S. (2003). *Developing Research Culture in Philippine Higher Education Institutions: Perspectives of University Faculty*. *Higher Education*, pp. 1-13. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Sardo-Brown, D., Welsh, L. & Bolton, D. (n.d.). *Practical strategies for facilitating classroom teachers' involvement in action research*. West Chester University, Department of Counselor, Secondary, and Professional Education. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2v1A8x9>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Sax, L., Hagedorn, L., Arredondo, M., & Dicrisi, F. (2002). Faculty Research Productivity: Exploring the Role of Gender and Family-Related Factors. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(4), 423-446. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40196891>. Accessed last November 16, 2020.
- Schein, E. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Shamsahimi, H. (2007). *Kesiediaan gurumelaksanakan kajian tindakan di sebuah sekolah menengah di daerah Kinta, Perak*. (Unpublished master's thesis.)

- Institut PengajianKepengetuaan, Universiti Malaya, KualaLumpur, Malaysia. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wH1fy7>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Smeby, J. C., & Try, S. (2005). Departmental Contexts and Faculty Research Activity in Norway. *Research in Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Stack, S. (2004). Gender, Children and Research Productivity. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(8), 891-920. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32Qw0N4>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Studman, C. (2003). Growing a Research Culture. *Journal of Research Administration*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 1, pp. 19-27. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Subahan, T., Meerah, M. & Othman, K. (2013). What is 'Action' in action research: A Malaysian exposure. *Asian Social Science*, 9(16), 148-153. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2TTBRNw>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Tagaro, C. A. (2015). Research Culture and Productivity of the Faculty of Accredited Private Higher Education Institutions. *IAMURE International Journal of Education*,15(1). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2PZj9ya>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Tagbilaran City Travel Guide. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2PKgavc>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Taylor, L. (2020). Supporting continuous development in schools – how to develop a culture of practitioner research. *Cambridge Assessment International Education*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2HI41VW>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Thompson, D. (2003). Fostering A Research Culture in Nursing. *Nursing Inquiry*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 143-144. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2wwuXWB>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Tien, F. F. (2000). "To What Degree Does the Desire for Promotion Motivate Faculty to Perform Research?" *Research in Higher Education*, 41 (6), 723-752. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cEnN3g>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Ulla, M. B. (2016). Pre-service teacher training programs in the Philippines: The student-teachers' practicum teaching experience. *EFL Journal*, 1(3). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Ulla, M. B. (2018). Benefits and challenges of doing research: Experiences from Philippine public school teachers. *Issues in Educational Research*, 28(3),797-810. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier28/ulla.pdf>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- 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). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/38bdzUy>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Van Vliet, V. (2013). Action Research. Retrieved March 3, 2020 from <https://bit.ly/38MeThu>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Vogrinc, J. & Zuljan, M. V. (2009). Action research in schools – an important factor in teachers' professional development. *Educational Studies*, 35(1), 53-63. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- West, C. (2011). Action research as a professional development activity. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 112(2), 89-94. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cJK67B>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Yamin-Ali, J. (2014). The Research Culture in Five Secondary Schools—A Case Study. In: *Data-Driven Decision-Making in Schools: Lessons from Trinidad*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2vUscyn>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Youn, T. I. K., & Price, T. M. (2009). Learning from the Experience of Others: The Evolution of Faculty Tenure and Promotion Rules in Comprehensive Institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(2), p. 205. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3292TnX>. Accessed last March 3, 2020
- Zhou, Jun. (2012). Problems Teachers Face When Doing Action Research and Finding Possible Solutions. *Chinese Education & Society*. 45. 68- 80. 10.2753/CED1061-1932450405. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2TBZTh9>. Accessed last March 3, 2020

Proposed Action Plan

REAS OF CONCERN	OBJECTIVES	STRATEGIES	DATE	PERSONS INVOLVED	EXPECTED OUTCOME
Environmental Factor					
1. Resources and Facilities for Research	To equip teachers in the production of research outputs	Budget Proposal for procurement of resources / Tap Stakeholders	Beginning of School Year 2021-2022	DepEd Procurement Division/ Schools Superintendent/School Administrators	Development of Research Culture
2. Coaching and Mentoring	To assist teachers with inadequate research skills	LAC sessions Goal-setting	Quarterly	Supervisors/School Administrators/Master Teachers/Teachers	Increased Research Productivity Level
3. Open and collaborative personal relationships	To foster collaborative research efforts among colleagues	LAC sessions/ Team-Building Activities	Mid-Year 2021-2022	School Administrators/ Master Teachers/ Teachers	
Institutional Factor					
1. Research Trainings and Workshops	To build teachers' research capacities	Attend Relevant Research Trainings and Workshops	In-Service Training of Teachers October 2021	SDS/ Supervisors/ School Administrators/ Master Teachers/ Teachers	Development of Research Culture
2. Research Incentives	To motivate and promote the interest level of the teachers towards research	Provide rewards equitably and in accordance with defined benchmarks of achievement; potential rewards include money, promotion, recognition, and new responsibilities	End of the School Year March 2022	DepEd Budget Division/SDS/Teachers	Increased Research Productivity Level