

## Profile and Action Research Competence of Elementary Teachers

**MARICEL R. DIGNOS**

Teacher III

Western Leyte College

Master of Arts in Education

Major in School Administration and Supervision

celdignos@gmail.com

*Abstract* —The study aimed to determine the significant relationship between elementary teachers' profile and action research competence. Utilizing the descriptive-correlational research design for an in-depth analysis of the study, the researcher utilized the researcher-made survey on the profile of elementary teachers in terms of age, highest educational attainment, research training attended, research grants received, and Action Research Survey developed and used by Cortes (2019) in his study on Needs Assessment on Action Research Competencies of Teacher-Researchers in Surigao del Sur, Philippines. Simple Percentage, Weighted Mean, and Pearson  $r$  were the statistical tools used. The researcher found out that most of the teachers have an age range from 31-40 with master's units, could not attend any research training, and no research grants were received. It was also found out that their action research competence based on problem identification, appropriate use of data tools, data gathering, interpretation and reflection, technology application, and knowledge on research ethics are moderate. Moreover, the data revealed no significant relationship between the age, educational attainment, research grants received, and action research competence of elementary teachers. However, it was revealed in this study that there is a significant relationship between the research training attended and the action research competence of elementary teachers. Thus, this study recommends conducting research training to be attended by elementary teachers to improve their competence level and formulate research studies.

*Keywords* — *Profile, Action Research Competence, Elementary Teachers*

---

## I. Introduction

Good teachers and educational leaders do not rely only on traditional ways to solve problems, the advice of others, or even the recommendations of experts. Instead, good teachers and educational leaders conduct their own investigations to identify and solve problems and analyze information about their classrooms and schools; in the process, they also further develop their own professional competence.

The Philippines' educational system is rapidly evolving due to many factors such as ASEAN integration, global competitiveness, globalization, integration of ICT in teaching, and other important internal and external factors. With the implementation of the new K-12 program of the Department of Education across all Basic Education institutions in the Philippines, some key impetus should be considered such as evidence-based policy, better student achievement, enhancement of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, teacher quality, and teacher professionalism (1); (6). With these, many important factors should be considered for basic education institutions to cope with the demands of the fast-changing world. And one of these factors is the inclusion of action research as a major function of a teacher in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (2); (4). Action Research is one such powerful tool for professional development and high-quality teaching to address the factors. It is then imperative for teachers to embrace action research in their professional lives to foster a culture of research among schools to improve educational outcomes for local and global competitiveness.

Further, teachers are known to be the propelling vehicle of knowledge generation and practically contribute to human development sustainability. Teachers are known for playing multitask role in the delivery of quality instruction. Inventions and creativity are embedded in the skills of teaching processes.

For teachers to increase and sustain teaching – profession competence, one must engage in research. Engaging is not only in conducting research but must begin with the development of concept – which eventually means sensing problem. Accordingly, teachers who can research in the context of their own teaching practices can contribute to knowledge about reform-based instruction (7). Meanwhile, Sela and Hary (5) stated that increasing proficiency in combining practice and theory in research will make teachers change perspectives from knowledge consumers to knowledge creators. In the same manner, Garza Mitchell & Eddy (3) argued that to develop skills and knowledge, collaboration among faculty members in deriving new strategies for the classroom and approaches to research must be given importance towards the creation of thinking communities, in this way, passion to work may be re-energized.

With these, the researcher is motivated to conduct this study to determine the profile and action research competence of elementary teachers in Rizal Elementary School, Kananga I District, Leyte Division. A proposed training plan was formulated based on the findings of the study.

It is in the rationale that the researcher who is currently teaching in the above-mentioned local would like to delve into worthy research undertaking that will benefit the school she is currently teaching and that of her Graduate Program.

This study determined elementary teachers' profile and action research competence in Rizal Elementary School, Kananga I District, Leyte Division. A proposed training plan was formulated based on the findings of the study.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of elementary teachers in terms of the following:
  - a. Age;
  - b. Highest educational attainment;
  - c. Research trainings attended; and
  - d. Research grants?
2. What is the level of action research competence of elementary teachers in terms of the following:
  - 2.1 Problem identification;
  - 2.2 Appropriate use of data collection tools;
  - 2.3 Data gathering, interpretation, action and reflection;
  - 2.4 Technology application; and
  - 2.5 Research ethics?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the profile and action research competence of elementary teachers?
4. What training plan can be proposed based on the findings of this study?

## II. Methodology

**Design.** This study employed the descriptive-correlational research design to determine the relationship between elementary teachers' profile and action research competence. Rizal Elementary School, Kananga I District, Leyte Division is the main locale of the study. The 30 elementary teachers teaching in the said locale are the main respondents of the study, and an action research competence survey developed and used by Cortes (2019) in his study on Needs Assessment on Action Research Competencies of Teacher-Researchers in Surigao del Sur, Philippines was used. This research mainly focuses on determining the significant relationship between the profile and action research competence of elementary teachers. A Proposed Training Plan based on the findings of the study is the output.

**Sampling.** There are 30 elementary teachers involved in this study. An action research competence survey was distributed personally with consent from the Local IATF and strictly following the prescribed Health Protocol.

**Research Procedure.** The researcher prepared the research design and tools to be utilized in the study. Approval and recommendation from the Panel of Examiner of the Graduate Studies was

sought. A letter request to conduct this study was forwarded to the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent. Upon approval, permission from the District Supervisor and School Head was secured before the actual gathering of data. Validation of the instruments through the School Head and District Supervisor was sought. Orientation of the participants was done during the teacher's convergence through face-to-face since the respondents are co-teachers of the researcher. Permission from the Barangay was secured. Administering of the survey followed. After accomplishing the survey, the researcher collected. Data were tallied and submitted for statistical treatment. Analysis and Interpretation of Data. Making of Proposed Training Plan followed.

***Ethical Issues.*** The right to conduct the study was strictly adhered through the approval of the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division, District Supervisor of the District, and school principal. Orientation of the respondents was done using face to face modality. In the orientation, issues and concerns were addressed, and consent to be included in the study were signed.

***Treatment of Data.*** The Simple Percentage and Weighted Mean was employed to determine elementary teachers' profile and action research competence. Pearson r was used to determine the significant relationship between the dependent and independent variables of the study.

### III. Results and Discussion

**Table 1**  
**Profile of Elementary Teachers (N=30)**

| <b>Profile</b>                            | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage</b> |
|---|------------------|-------------------|
| <b>1.1 AGE</b>                            |                  |                   |
| 51-60                                     | 1                | 3.5               |
| 41-50                                     | 1                | 3.5               |
| 31-40                                     | 19               | 63                |
| 21-30                                     | 9                | 30                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                              | <b>30</b>        | <b>100</b>        |
| <b>1.2 HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT</b> |                  |                   |
| Master's Graduate                         | 1                | 3.5               |
| Master's Units                            | 23               | 76.5              |
| College Graduates                         | 6                | 20                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                              | <b>30</b>        | <b>100</b>        |
| <b>1.3 RESEARCH TRAINING ATTENDED</b>     |                  |                   |
| Research DIRECT Trainings                 | 2                | 7                 |
| None                                      | 28               | 93                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                              | <b>30</b>        | <b>100</b>        |
| <b>1.5 RESEARCH GRANTS</b>                |                  |                   |
| None                                      | 30               | 100               |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                              | <b>30</b>        | <b>100</b>        |

Table 1 presents the profile of elementary teachers in terms of age, highest educational attainment, research trainings attended, research conducted, and research grants. It was revealed on the table that among the 30 elementary teacher-respondents, there is 1 or 3.5% of the teacher whose age is between 51-60, 1 or 3.5% with age of 41-50, 19 or 63% with an age between 31-40 and 9 or 30% aged 21-30. This means that most of the elementary teachers teaching in Rizal Elementary School has an age of 31-40. This implies that most of them are young, and they still have time to develop professionally because they will still serve the school for many years.

Moreover, this table also presents the highest educational attainment of the elementary teachers. It was revealed on the table that among the 30 elementary teachers, 1 or 3.5% is a full pledge master's graduate, 23 or 76.5% have master's units and 6 or 20% are college graduates. This means that most of the elementary teachers has started pursuing graduate degree. This implies that these teachers have the possibility to be promoted in the years to come, and they have the chance to learn more, especially in conducting research for the development of their pupils.

Likewise, this table also presents the research trainings attended by the elementary teachers. It was revealed on the table that there are only 2 or 7% teachers from the 30 respondents who were able to attend a training in Project DIRECT (Division-Based Instruction for Research Education for Committed Teaching). This means that most of the elementary teachers need to be trained to formulate an action research. This implies that the school should initiate research training for the teachers to attend for their professional development.

Finally, this table also presents the research grants received by the elementary teachers. It was revealed on the table that none of the elementary teachers can receive a research grant due to non-submission of research study. This implies that elementary teachers are to be honed in order for them to be productive and likewise develop them professionally.

**Table 2**  
**Action Research Competence based on Problem Identification (N=30)**

| Indicators   | Weighted Mean | Description | Interpretation |
|--|---------------|-------------|----------------|
| I can choose topics which are of interest to me before selecting the one.                    | 4.21          | Advanced    | High           |
| I can narrow the research topic to put it in a researchable concept.                         | 4.10          | Advanced    | High           |
| I can select topics which support my professional development                                | 4.05          | Advanced    | High           |
| I can state research questions in common language  | 4.07          | Advanced    | High           |
| I can think about the practical implications of carrying out an action research.             | 4.11          | Advanced    | High           |
| I can choose questions that interest my teaching colleagues, counselors, and administrators. | 4.12          | Advanced    | High           |
| I can develop concise action research questions  | 3.29          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I consider the needed information after selecting a topic                                    | 3.28          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I undertake a literature search on my proposed topic.  | 3.12          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I think of how would I go about or conduct the chosen topic                                  | 3.00          | Proficient  | Moderate       |

|   |             |                   |                 |
|---|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| I can identify what has been done in previous studies and the gaps when choosing a topic.         | 3.21        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I ensure that the topic I will be working on is grounded in the realities of the school.          | 3.18        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can describe the problem or situation.  | 3.16        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can make a plan to resolve the problem  | 2.92        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can select topics which are manageable  | 2.98        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can state what I will expect to see if the plan works as a research question                    | 3.02        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can turn the problem into research question   | 3.12        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I consider the availability of resources when choosing a topic (e.g., time, people, & materials). | 3.18        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I emphasize the importance of data-gathering within the context of action research.               | 3.23        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| <b>GRAND MEAN</b>   | <b>3.43</b> | <b>Proficient</b> | <b>Moderate</b> |

Table 2 presents the action research competence based on problem identification. It was revealed on the table that the action research competence based on problem identification has a grand mean of 3.43, which is interpreted as moderate. This means that elementary teachers are proficient in identifying problems to study. This implies that the elementary teachers have the knowledge on identifying problems for study. They can see the problems they encounter, especially during this time of pandemic where distance learning has implemented, which needs to be studied for in order to arrive at a solution that will help improve their performance and that of the pupils.

Moreover, the indicator with the highest rating of 4.21, which is interpreted as high, states that "I can choose topics which are of interest to me before selecting the one". This means that elementary teachers are advanced in choosing interested topics for study. This implies that elementary teachers are aware of the topics to studied at and be used in formulating action research to arrive at a concrete solution.

Furthermore, this table also shows an indicator with the lowest mean of 2.92, which is interpreted as moderate states that "I can make a plan to resolve the problem". This means that elementary teachers are proficient in planning for resolving the problems encountered. This

implies that elementary teachers have an initial idea on the parts and contents of an action research.

**Table 3**  
**Action Research Competence based on Appropriate Use of Data Tools (N=30)**

| Indicators   | Weighted Mean | Description       | Interpretation  |
|--|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| I am aware on the usefulness and limitations of observations as data collection tool.              | 3.13          | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I am aware of the usefulness and limitations of surveys as data collection tool.                   | 3.18          | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I am aware on the usefulness and limitations of artefacts as data collection tool.                 | 3.21          | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I am aware on the usefulness and limitations of interviews as data collection tool.                | 3.00          | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I am aware of the usefulness and limitations of assessment data as a data collection tool.         | 2.98          | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I am aware of the usefulness and limitations of log or research journal as a data collection tool. | 2.97          | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can acknowledge the issue of reliability involve in different data collection tools.             | 3.29          | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| <b>GRAND MEAN</b>  | <b>3.11</b>   | <b>Proficient</b> | <b>Moderate</b> |

Table 3 presents an action research competence based on appropriate use of data tools of elementary teachers. It was revealed on the table that the action research competence of elementary teachers based on appropriate use of data tools has a grand mean of 3.11, which is interpreted as moderate. This means that the elementary teachers are proficient aware of the appropriate data tools to be used in conducting an action research. This implies that elementary teachers have the idea of what tools they will use in conducting an action research.

Moreover, the indicator which shows the highest mean of 3.29, which is interpreted as moderate, states that, "I can acknowledge the issue of reliability involve in different data collection tools". This means that elementary teachers are aware that data collection tools should undergo



reliability test before it will be conducted. This implies that elementary teachers can conduct reliability testing on the tools to be used in their research.

Furthermore, the indicator that shows the lowest mean of 2.97, which is interpreted as moderate, states, "I am aware of the usefulness and limitations of log or research journal as data collection tool". This means that elementary teachers are proficient in the usefulness and limitations of research journal as data collection tool. This implies that they are aware that data are useful and important in completing a research study.

**Table 4**  
**Action Research Competence based on Data Gathering, Interpretation, Reflection**  
**(N=30)**

| Indicators  | Weighted Mean | Description | Interpretation |
|---|---------------|-------------|----------------|
| I can present qualitative data in graphs, charts and networks when necessary  | 3.29          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I can reduce qualitative data in such a way that 'final conclusions can be drawn and verified.  | 3.12          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I can draw and verify conclusions based on data regularities, patterns, and explanations.   | 3.13          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I can display data collected involving questionnaires or quantifiable information through observations using tables and diagrams                | 3.18          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I can alter one variable at a time to determine which action is responsible for the outcome.  | 3.27          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I can make visual display to break continuous prose for a reader to make sense of the data.   | 3.17          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I know how to use student profiles and diary entries to create an authentic story of what had happened when the research involves intervention. | 3.16          | Proficient  | Moderate       |
| I can record changes in the attitudes and behaviors of a small group of children in the form of a case study.                                   | 3.19          | Proficient  | Moderate       |



|   |      |            |          |
|---|------|------------|----------|
| I can present written observation notes as findings in the case of interviews.  | 3.21 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can put data together in a way that the evidence used to generate hypotheses and consequent action is clearly documented      | 3.31 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can act on the information once I have collected the data and analyzed it   | 3.21 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can present the findings in percentage terms when dealing with small numbers  | 3.12 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can put data together in a way that the action taken as a result of the research is monitored                                 | 3.18 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I know that to represent the data depends on the type of data I will collect.   | 3.17 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can identify themes and patterns in order to be able to present robust evidence for any claims I will make.                   | 3.19 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can put data together in a way that the reader finds the research accessible and it resonates with his or her own experience. | 3.29 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can put data together in a way that the research could be replicated on another occasion.                                     | 3.12 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can document and collect data on performance while the new intervention is being implemented                                  | 3.18 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can use descriptive statistics in my action research when necessary   | 3.31 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can create a coherent story from all the data collected   | 3.29 | Proficient | Moderate |
| I can write the report based on my target audience  | 3.28 | Proficient | Moderate |

|  |             |                   |                 |
|--|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| I can make visual display for the reader to easily understand information.   | 3.28        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can design an action plan according to information from the data collection and review of current literature                     | 3.29        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can use variety of data collection tools –quantitative, qualitative, or both– for each topic                                     | 3.22        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can identify the threats to internal validity of my study.   | 3.21        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I am aware that I have to revisit the aims and expectations of the project before analyzing the data                               | 3.08        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can organize data according to characteristics to answer research questions.   | 3.09        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can organize data in a way that makes it useful to identify trends and themes.   | 3.07        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can raise questions on the data  | 3.06        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I consider how I would continue to involve others in this action research process because of its cyclical and collaborative nature | 3.17        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can plan for additional improvements of the study  | 3.18        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can observe the results of my action and collect evidence  | 3.18        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| I can seek regularities in data by comparing different participants, settings, and activities to identify recurring results        | 3.21        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| <b>GRAND MEAN</b>  | <b>3.19</b> | <b>Proficient</b> | <b>Moderate</b> |

Table 4 presents the action research competence of elementary teachers based on data gathering, interpretation and reflection. It was revealed on the table that the action research competence of elementary teachers based on data gathering, interpretation, and reflection has a grand mean of 3.19, which is interpreted as moderate. This means that elementary teachers are

proficient on data gathering, interpretation and reflection. This implies that elementary teachers need to be trained on action research formulation to improve their competencies.

Moreover, this table also shows the highest mean of 3.31, which is interpreted as moderate, stating that, "I can put data together in a way that the evidence used to generate hypotheses and consequent action is clearly documented". This means that elementary teachers are proficient in bringing data together to be used in their research. Though this is the highest, elementary teachers can already comply with the requirements of conducting research. This implies that they should attend training or LAC sessions to formulate action research and other research studies.

Likewise, this table also shows the lowest mean of 3.06, which is interpreted as moderate which states that "I can raise questions on the data". This means that elementary teachers are proficient in raising questions regarding the data presented. This implies that due to the lack of knowledge on action research formulation, teachers had a hard time deciding what questions they would ask, which is related to the data collected.

**Table 5**  
**Action Research Competence based on Technology Application and Research Ethics**  
**(N=30)**

| <b>TECHNOLOGY APPLICATION</b>   | <b>Weighted Mean</b> | <b>Description</b> | <b>Interpretation</b> |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| I can use technology when presenting data.  | 3.12                 | Proficient         | Moderate              |
| I can use technology when doing bibliographical entries.  | 3.00                 | Proficient         | Moderate              |
| I can use technology when searching literature.   | 3.21                 | Proficient         | Moderate              |
| I can use technology when analyzing data  | 3.12                 | Proficient         | Moderate              |
| <b>GRAND MEAN</b>   | <b>3.11</b>          | <b>Proficient</b>  | <b>Moderate</b>       |
| <b>KNOWLEDGE ON RESEARCH ETHICS</b>   |                      |                    |                       |
| I know the process involved in obtaining approval from administrators when conducting study or collecting data. | 3.18                 | Proficient         | Moderate              |
| I know the ethical concerns associated in conducting action research.   | 3.29                 | Proficient         | Moderate              |

|   |             |                   |                 |
|---|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| I know how to write a letter of consent to parents or legal guardians when collecting data. | 3.28        | Proficient        | Moderate        |
| <b>GRAND MEAN</b>   | <b>3.25</b> | <b>Proficient</b> | <b>Moderate</b> |

Table 5 presents the action research competence of elementary teachers based on technology application and knowledge on research ethics. It was revealed on the table that the action research competence of elementary teachers on technology application has a grand mean of 3.11 which is interpreted as moderate. This means that elementary teachers are proficient in technology application in action research formulation. This implies that the knowledge on ICT and other technologies used in the formulation of action research of elementary teachers are limited. This implies further that they need to upgrade their knowledge on technology application in their action research formulated.

Furthermore, this table also shows the action research competence of elementary teachers based on their knowledge regarding research ethics. The table revealed that the action research competence of elementary teachers based on knowledge on research ethics has a grand mean of 3.25, which is interpreted as moderate. This means that the knowledge on research ethics of elementary teachers is proficient. This implies that elementary teachers lack knowledge on ethical norms in research such as guidelines for authorship, copyright and patenting policies, data sharing policies, and confidentiality rules in peer review, which are designed to protect intellectual property interests while encouraging collaboration.

**Table 6**  
**Test of Relationship**

| <b>Variables Correlated</b>                           | <b>r</b> | <b>Computed value or t</b> | <b>Table Value @.05</b> | <b>Decision on Ho</b> | <b>Interpretation</b>               |
|---|----------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Age and Research Competence</b>                    | 0.00     | 0.111                      | 2.334                   | Fail Reject Ho        | No Significant Relationship         |
| <b>Educational Attainment and Research Competence</b> | 0.00     | 0.776                      | 2.334                   | Fail Reject Ho        | No Significant Relationship         |
| <b>Research Training and Research Competence</b>      | 0.52     | 3.271                      | 2.334                   | Reject Ho             | Significant Relationship (Moderate) |
| <b>Research Grant and Research Competence</b>         | 0.00     | 0.872                      | 2.334                   | Fail Reject Ho        | No Significant Relationship         |

Table 6 presents the test of the relationship between the profile of elementary teachers in terms of age, educational attainment, research training and research grants and action research competence. The table revealed that the computed value or t of 0.111 is less than the tabular value, which is 2.334 at .05 level of significance, so the null hypothesis fails to reject. This means that there is no significant relationship between the age and action research competence of elementary teachers. The r-value of 0.00 shows no significant relationship. This implies that whether the teacher is young or old does not mean that he/she will not be able to formulate or conduct an action research or any studies.

Moreover, this table also presents the test of relationship between the highest educational attainment of elementary teachers and action research competence. The table revealed that the computed value or t of 0.776 is less than the tabular value, which is 2.334 at .05 level of significance, so the null hypothesis fails to reject. This means that there is no significant relationship between elementary teachers' highest educational attainment and action research competence. The r-value of 0.00 shows no significant relationship. This implies that the highest educational attainment does not affect the action research competence of elementary teachers. This implies further that an elementary teacher can formulate or write an action research regardless of educational attainment.

Furthermore, table 6 also presents the test of relationship between the training attended and elementary teachers' action research competence. The table revealed that the computed value or t of 3.271 is greater than the tabular value of 2.334 at 0.05 level of significance, so the null hypothesis is rejected. This means a significant relationship between the training attended and

action research competence of elementary teachers. The r-value of 0.52 shows a moderate significant relationship. This implies that the knowledge gained by elementary teachers from the trainings attended help in improving their action research competence. Research training helps the elementary teachers acquire advanced skills, techniques, and knowledge in the conduct of an action research and requires substantial original research output such as thesis.

Lastly, this table shows the test of the relationship between the research grants and action research competence of elementary teachers. The table revealed that the computed value or t of 0.872 is lesser than the tabular value of 2.334 at .05 level of significance, so the null hypothesis fails to reject. This means that there is no significant relationship between the profile of elementary teachers in terms of research grants and action research competence. The r-value of 0.00 shows no significant relationship. This implies that research grants motivate teachers to conduct research because the Department of Education gives grant in terms of monetary value to pursue the research study, and this has no relationship with action research competence of elementary teachers.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

The data revealed no significant relationship between age, educational attainment, research grants, and action research competence of elementary teachers. However, it was found out in this study that there is a significant relationship between the research trainings attended and action research competence of elementary teachers. Therefore, this study revealed that elementary teachers need to be trained on research writing to improve their level of competence.

#### **V. Recommendations**

1. The Proposed Training Plan formulated should be utilized;
2. School Heads should conduct research trainings to the teachers;
3. School Heads should encourage teachers to conduct research in teaching-learning related problems;
4. Teachers should try themselves to formulate and craft research study;
5. School Administrators should provide technical assistance on research;
6. School Heads should encourage teachers for further learning on research and ICT technology to be used in data treatment, analysis, and interpretation; and
7. Future researchers should replicate this study to include different locale and include different variables aside from the mentioned in this study.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study is in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree Master of Arts in Education major in School Administration and Supervision. Special thanks are extended: To Dr. Jasmine B. Misa, thesis adviser; Dr. Bryant C. Acar, Dr. Annabelle A. Wenceslao, Dr. Elvin H. Wenceslao, panel of examiners; School Administrators and teachers of Rizal Elementary School; Mr. Arnel D. Dignos and kids, her parents, grandparents, siblings, relatives and friends, and To God, her deepest and sincerest gratitude.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abaya, E. (2017). Situating action research in the institutionalization of culture of research and teacher agency. Presented during the National Conference on Research in Teacher Education. University of the Philippines.
- [2] Chou, C. H. (2011). Teachers' Professional Development: Investigating Teachers' Learning to Do Action Research in a Professional Learning Community. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher* (De La Salle University-Manila), 20(3).
- [3] Garza Mitchell, R. & Eddy, P. (2011). Faculty as Learners: Developing Thinking Communities. *Innovative Higher Education*.
- [4] Hazelton, J., & Haigh, M. (2010). Incorporating sustainability into accounting curricula: lessons learnt from an action research study. *Accounting Education: an international journal*, 19(1-2), 159-178.
- [5] Sela, O., & Harel, M. (2012 aug 15). The Role of Teacher Education in Introducing Action Research into the Education System: A Case Study of an Education College. *ERIC Journal*, 14.
- [6] Windows, D. J. C., Bassig, J. M., & Cagurangan, J.-A. (2017). Twenty-First-Century Skills of Alternative Learning System Learners. *SAGE Open*, 7.
- [7] van Zee, E. (2006). Teacher Research: Exploring Student Thinking and Learning. *ERIC Journal*, p29-36.



### AUTHOR'S PROFILE



#### **MRS. MARICEL R. DIGNOS**

The author is a public servant. She serves young children as a primary teacher for almost two decades. She was born on March 1, 1982 and presently residing at Barangay Poblacion, Kananga, Leyte, Philippines. She completed her elementary education at Tongonan Elementary School, Kananga, Leyte and finished her secondary education at Saint Peter's College, Ormoc City. She continued her pursuit in education in college at the Leyte State University, Baybay Leyte and graduated in the year 2003 with the degree of Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Education. She earned units in post graduate studies and obtained a certificate for satisfactorily completed the academic requirements (CAR) for the degree of Master of Arts in Education (MAED) major in School Administration and Supervision at Western Leyte College, Ormoc City.

Presently, she is still serving as a teacher in grade three holding Teacher III position at Rizal Elementary School, Kananga I District, Leyte Division, Region VIII, Philippines. She has been a dedicated teacher. She received awards in school and district level as Outstanding Teacher III and Grade 3 teacher. For professional growth, she attended trainings and received technical assistance from her school head and mentors, which serves as her weapon to face all the challenges in her teaching career.