

Research Capability of the Select Senior High School in One Division of Negros Occidental

John Emmil V. Manait

Bato National High School, Philippines

Corresponding email: johnemmil.manait@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the research capability of the Select Senior High School in One Division of Negros Occidental. Using the descriptive method of research, results showed that the respondents' research capability as a whole is average, but when taken as to variables, their capability in terms of performing research output is low. It was recommended that the respondents shall be given training, school and collegial support, and coaching related to research to improve their research capability.

ARTICLE INFO

Received : 1/5/2026

Revised : 2/12/2026

Accepted : 3/14/2026

KEYWORDS

research capability, select Senior High School, personal preparation, school and collegial support, ability to perform research parts, actual performance outputs

Suggested Citation (APA Style 7th Edition):

Manait, J.E.V. & Lobaton, A.M. (2026). Research Capability of the Select Senior High School in One Division of Negros Occidental. *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management*, 6(1), 76-87.

INTRODUCTION

In this VUCA world (volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous) where institutions like the Department of Education and Higher Education Institution have been confronted with many problems a need to innovate practices through well-established research as a mechanism of promoting sustainable, viable, flexible, useful, and fair processes and product ensuring quality assurance to the stakeholders must be sought. Without any doubt, there is a call for capable educational leaders, teachers, and staff to conduct studies to establish a culture of excellence in dealing with problems in schools using relevant research methods. Giving importance to research capability fosters efforts in raising quality researchers who can make an impact on the 21st-century workplace. Its importance cannot be ignored because when a researcher is capable of making a scientific investigation, the culture of excellence in dealing with problems using the scientific method in any work becomes evident.

There is a growing interest in this area of development among educational leaders and teachers. Research is a scientific method of inquiry. According to ‘The Human Resources of the University of Southampton, capability refers to “the skills, ability, aptitude, and knowledge” that ensure successful performance. Research capability is vital in maintaining a quality assurance management system in any institution. Thus, research capacity building and funding program has been established by many institutions to show the importance of upskilling the manpower resources and encourage more research to solve a myriad of existing problems in the workplace. Research as part of evidenced-based practices, as mandated by the Philippine Constitution improving the research process through research dissemination, utilization, and advocacy needs to be taken seriously. Considering that research undertaking has been challenged by many obstacles despite the fact the Basic Education Research Fund has been granting ample support to researchers, there is a gap between what is expected from leaders, teachers, and staff from the division level. Despite the fact that the government has offered scholarship grants for professional growth and development through master’s and doctorate programs, only very few teachers are engaged in research. In this context, the researcher was motivated to conduct a study entitled Research Capability of the Select Senior High School Teachers in the one Division of Negros Occidental during School Year 2020-2021.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main intention of this study was to determine the research capability of the Select Senior High School in One Division of Negros Occidental. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions: 1) What is the profile of the respondents as to the number of research conducted, number of research-related training attended, number of membership in research related organizations, and availability of research support facilities?; 2) What is the level of the respondents’ research capability when taken as a whole and when grouped according to personal preparation, school, and collegial support, ability to perform research parts and actual performance outputs, and 3) Is there a significant difference in the level of the research capability of the respondents when taken as a whole and when grouped according to their profile variables in personal preparation, school, and collegial support, ability to perform research parts and actual performance outputs?

METHODS

This study used the descriptive method of research. The respondents of the study were 114 Senior High School Teachers who were identified using purposive sampling. The instrument used was a researcher-made survey instrument. It was constructed and was subjected to expert evaluation by the 10 experts in the field. Using the widely used appraisal of content validity, the Item Content Validity Index (I-CVI) by Waltz Bausell, 1981 and Lyn 1986, the instrument obtained a computed I-CVIs of .80. This confirms the validity of all items and the appropriateness of all questions in the questionnaire used in the gathering of data. To establish its reliability, the instrument was subjected to a dry-run of 30 individuals who were known to have homogeneity in characteristics. Using the Cronbach Alpha, it yielded a coefficient of .933 which is interpreted as a very high degree of reliability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1.
Profile Variables of the Respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Number of Research Conducted		
None	89	78.1
1-5	24	21.1
6-10	1	.9
Total	114	100.0
Number of Research Training Attended		
None	35	30.7
1-5	72	63.2
6-10	3	2.6
More than 10	4	3.5
Total	114	100.0
Number of Membership in Research-Related Organization		
None	84	73.7
1-5	29	25.4
6 and more	1	.9
Total	114	100.0
Availability of Research Books/Journals In School and at Home		
None	43	37.7
1-5	65	57.0
6-10	3	2.6
More than 10	3	2.6
Total	114	100.0
Internet Connectivity		
with internet connection	98	86
no internet connection	16	14.0
Total	114	100.0
Gadgets Owned		
computer/disk stop/laptop	3	2.6
tablet/cellphone/iPod	5	4.4
with both	106	93.0
Total	114	100.0

Table 1 shows that on the profile of the respondents, 89 or 78% have no research conducted, 24 or 21.1% have produced 1-5 outputs and only 1 or .9% have 6-10 outputs. As to the number of research training attended, 35 or 30.7 % have no training, 72 or 63.2 % with 1-5, 3 or 2.6 % with 6-10, and 4 or 3.5 % with more than 10. This reveals that the majority of the respondents had attended 1-5 training sessions. On membership, 84 or 73.7 %, have no membership in a research-related organization, 29, or 25.4 percent, have one to five memberships, and one or 9%, have six or more memberships. According to these numbers, the vast majority of respondents do not belong to any research-related organizations. Finally, when it comes to research support facilities at school and at home, 43 (37.7%) do not have research books and journals, whereas 65 (57%) have 1-5; 3 or 2.6% for those with 6-10 and more.

Table 2.
Level of Respondents' Research Capability in terms of Personal Preparation

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
been able to attend trainings and webinars that capacitated me to conduct research.	2.5965	1.21727	Low
attended research fora that enhance my capability in preparing proposal and conducting research	2.5526	1.12173	Low
been reading published research journals that enables me to appreciate and increase my knowledge, understanding and capability in conducting research.	2.5439	1.10622	Low
responded to research requirements required by the school that enhance my research capability.	2.5351	1.19126	Low
set personal goal and commitment to learn how to craft a proposal and conduct research study in my school.	2.6930	1.12986	Average
read and understood the requirements stipulated in the current Department order in preparing proposal and conducting research.	2.7544	1.25198	Average
Mean	2.6126	1.05141	Average

As gleaned from Table 2, on the 6 benchmark provisions of research capability based on the respondents' personal preparation, 4 of them got a Low mean. These are the respondents' attendance to trainings and webinars that capacitated them to conduct research with a mean of 2.5965; attendance to research fora that enhance their capability in preparing proposals and conducting research, 2.5526; reading of published research journals that enables them to appreciate and increase their knowledge, understanding, and capability in conducting research, 2.5439; and the respondents' response to research requirements required by the school that enhances their research capability, which is 2.5351. Only 2 provisions got an Average mean. These are provisions on setting personal goals and commitment to learning how to craft a proposal and conduct a research study in their school, with a mean of

2.6930; and the reading and understanding of the requirements stipulated in the current Department order in preparing a proposal and conducting research, which is 2.7544 respectively. When taken as a whole, the research capability of the respondents in terms of personal preparation is Average with a grand mean of 2.6126.

Table 3.
Level of Respondents' Research Capability in Terms of School and Collegial Supports

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
invited and been involved in regular collegial meetings/discussions concerning research agenda of the school and in addressing existing problem in my class.	2.5351	1.07407	Low
required/motivated to conduct research to increase learning outcomes of my learners	2.7368	1.23412	Average
given opportunity to join research capability workshop and training provided by the Division of Sagay.	2.6228	1.28566	Average
given research support like school internet connection, computer, references, journals , mentoring and coaching together with other colleagues in school.	2.6754	1.20835	Average
required to attend the teacher Induction Program of DepEd that explains the role of research in addressing problems, issues and concerns work.	2.6404	1.25597	Average
supported by learning action cell group of my school that increases my awareness and interest on the value	2.6842	1.20703	Average

of research.			
consistently supported by a research coordinator or by immediate academic leader in our school to use research in dealing problems among learners.	2.5439	1.15322	Low
coached by the research coordinator in school in preparing a research proposal and conducting a research.	2.4825	1.20642	Low
responded the research call as an outcome of collegial discussion in addressing the existing problem in my class	2.4211	1.1666	Low
Mean	2.5936	1.06007	Low

Under the variable of collegial support, five (5) provisions received an Average mean. These are the requiring/motivating respondents to conduct research to improve learning outcomes of their learners with a mean of 2.7368; giving respondents the opportunity to participate in research capability workshops and training provided by the Division, 2.6228; providing respondents with research support such as school internet connection, computer, references, journals, mentoring and coaching them together with other colleagues in school, 2.6754; requiring the respondents to attend the teacher induction program of DepEd that explains the role of research in addressing problems, issues and concerns, 2.6404; and finally on the support given to them by learning action cell group of their school that increases their awareness and interest on the value of research, 2.6842.

Four (4) of the provisions or conditions got a Low mean. These are the provision of the support given as inviting and involving the respondents in regular collegial meetings/discussions concerning the research agenda of the school and in addressing existing problems in their class, which received a mean of 2.5351; consistently given support by a research coordinator or by the immediate academic leader in their school to use research in dealing problems among learners, 2.5439; being coached by the research coordinator in school in preparing a research proposal and conducting a research, 2.4825; and in responding to the research call as an outcome of collegial discussion in addressing the existing problem in their class, with a mean of 2.4211.

When taken as a whole, Table 3 shows that the respondents' level of research capability in terms of collegial support is Low, having only a grand mean of 2.5936. This shows that the respondents are given minimal support by their colleagues, leaders, and research coordinators to enhance their capacity to conduct research and to address problems in their school or class.

Table 4.
Level of Respondents' Research Capability in terms of Ability to Perform Research in terms of Problem Identification and Literature Review

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
1. Identifying and defining a good research problem.	3.1053	.85568	Average
2. Formulating specific statement of the problem.	3.0614	.88533	Average
3. Formulating statement of hypothesis based on the problem postulated.	3.0088	.93596	Average
4. Crafting a conceptual framework.	2.9912	.91686	Average
5. Surveying theoretical framework and connecting it to the present study.	2.9561	.89631	Average
6. Setting of scope and limitation of the study.	3.1228	.98789	Average
7. Enumerating significance of the study.	3.1228	1.04025	Average
8. Giving of the operational and conceptual definitions of the important key terms used in the study	3.0439	.89631	Average
9. Organizing and citing literature	3.0000	.95935	Average
10. Synthesizing literature read	2.9912	.96391	Average
11. Using APA style for citation/referencing	3.0263	.96359	Average
Mean	3.0391	.87532	Average

The respondents obtained a mean of average in all areas in terms of their ability to perform the research part in problem identification and literature review.

Table 5.
Level of Respondents' Research Capability in terms of Ability to Perform Research in terms of Problem Identification and Literature Review

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
Method , Sampling Procedure, Instrumentation , Validity and Reliability of the Instrument and Data Collection			
1. Determining appropriate method of research to be used	2.9211	.91347	Average
2. Defining these research approaches and methods			
2.1 Quantitative	3.0088	.96391	Average
2.2 Qualitative	2.7456	1.12739	Average
2.3 Descriptive	2.8684	.95485	Average
2.4 True Experimental	2.8333	.90149	Average
2.5 Quasi Experimental	2.7632	.88550	Average
2.6 Correlational	2.8684	.86744	Average
2.7 Case Study	2.6228	1.00785	Average
2.8 Phenomenology	2.5965	1.06197	Low
2.9 Ethnography	2.5877	1.02025	Low
3. Choosing study population	3.0351	1.00380	Average
4. Determining sample size	3.0789	.97894	Average
5. Administering appropriate sampling technique	3.0354	.97220	Average
6. Selecting actual subjects or respondents of the study	3.1053	1.07562	Average
7. Identifying types of data to be collected	3.0965	1.03880	Average
8. Coding and classifying data	2.9912	1.05172	Average
9. Considering ethical issues in data collection	3.0526	.99416	Average
10. Applying techniques in collecting qualitative data	2.8947	1.00766	Average
11. Applying techniques in collecting quantitative data	2.9912	.96391	Average
12. Conducting interviews (in-depth and focus group discussion)	2.8509	1.03250	Average
13. Performing/conducting observations	3.0088	1.02617	Average
14. Conducting content analysis	2.8596	1.02082	Average
15. Tabulating quantitative data	2.9386	.94340	Average
16. Tabulating qualitative data	2.8158	1.00939	Average
Mean	2.9000	.87541	Average

As reflected in Table 5, on the respondents’ research capability in terms of their ability to perform research methodology, all of the provisions got an Average mean except for provisions on defining research approaches on Phenomenology and Ethnography which yielded a computed mean of low. Phenomenology got a mean of 2.5965 while Ethnography got a mean of 2.5877. The specific computed mean of all provisions in research methodology that obtained an Average mean are as follows: Determining the appropriate method of research to be used, 2.9211; Defining these research approaches and methods, 2.9474; defining Quantitative approaches, 3.0088; Qualitative, 2.7456; Descriptive, 2.8684; True Experimental, 2.8333; Quasi-Experimental, 2.7632; Correlational, 2.8684; and Case study, 2.6228. Choosing the study population got a mean of 3.0351; Determining sample size, 3.0789; Administering appropriate sampling technique, 3.0354; Selecting actual subjects or respondents of the study, 3.1053; Identifying types of data to be collected, 3.0965; Coding and classifying data, 2.9912; Considering ethical issues in data collection, 3.0526; Applying techniques in collecting qualitative data, 2.9912; Considering ethical issues in data collection, 3.0526; Applying techniques in collecting qualitative data, 2.8947; Conducting interviews (in-depth and focus group discussion), 2.8509; Performing/conducting observations, 3.0088; Conducting content analysis, 2.8596; Tabulating quantitative data, 2.9386; and Tabulating qualitative data, which is 2.8158.

Table 6.
Level of Respondents’ Research Capability in terms of Ability to Perform Research

in terms of Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
1. Presenting the data	3.0614	.95273	Average
2. Analyzing/interpreting data	3.0439	.93497	Average
3. Using verbal description in analyzing the data	3.0175	.98648	Average
4. Coding qualitative responses and formulating themes out of the coded responses	2.8772	1.05713	Average
5. Treating data using appropriate statistical tool	2.9298	1.04517	Average
6. Using software like SPSS to interpret data	2.8070	1.01211	Average
7. Supporting results based on previous studies conducted	2.9211	.96985	Average
Mean	2.9511	.91124	Average

The respondents' research capability in performing analysis and interpretation of data revealed that all conditions or provisions under it obtained an Average mean. The same average mean was obtained when these provisions are taken as a whole with a computed mean of 2.9511. The presenting data got a mean of 3.0614; Analysing/interpreting data, 3.0439; Using verbal description in analysing the data, 3.0175; Describing themes and sub-themes for qualitative data, 2.8772; Treating data using the appropriate statistical tool, 2.9298; Using software like SPSS to interpret data, 2.8070; and Supporting results based on previous studies conducted, 2.9211 respectively.

Table 7.
Level of Respondents' Research Capability in terms of Ability to Perform Research in Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
1. Summarizing key findings, outcomes or information of the entire report.	3.0439	1.05922	Average
2. Acknowledging limitations and making recommendations for future work (if applicable)	3.0526	.99416	Average
3. Indicating the extent to which the aims of the study have been achieved.	3.0614	1.02435	Average
4. Drawing conclusions based on the findings raised.	3.0877	1.01808	Average
5. Presenting recommendations based on the findings enumerated.	3.0877	1.04383	Average
Mean	3.0667	1.00641	Average

As to the level of respondents' research capability in terms of ability to perform research part in making summary, conclusion and recommendations, Table 6 has shown that when taken as whole and when classified according to variables on its specific provisions, this part obtained an Average mean. The computed grand mean as a whole was 3.0667. For specific provisions, summarizing key findings, outcomes or information of the entire report, 3.0439; acknowledging limitations and making recommendations for future work (if applicable), 3.0526; indicating the extent to which the aims of the study have been achieved, 3.0614; drawing conclusions based on the findings raised, 3.0877; and presenting recommendations based on the findings enumerated, 3.0877.

Table 8.
Level of Respondents' Research Capability in terms of Ability to Perform Research in Actual Accomplishments/Outputs

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
1.presented research proposals at least in the division level	1.4737	.99743	Very Low
2.conducted research based on the approved proposal I presented	1.4912	.96161	Very Low
3.presented research outputs in local, regional, national and international research for a	1.4737	.98852	Very Low
4.published research outputs in different Journal Articles	1.3947	.93712	Very Low
Mean	1.4583	.91685	Very Low

On actual research performance of the respondents, Table 8 reveals that the respondents have a Very Low, performance both when taken as a whole and when classified as to specific provisions or variables. When taken as a whole, the respondents obtained a grand mean of 1.4583; and when taken according to specific provisions, presented research proposals at least in the division level got a mean of 1.4737; conducted research based on the approved proposal they presented, 1.4912; presented research outputs in local, regional, national, and international research fora, 1.4737; and published research outputs in different Journal Articles, got a mean of 1.3947.

Table 9.
Level of Respondents' Research Capability when taken as a Whole

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
When Taken as a Whole	2.6602	.81733	Average

When taken as a whole the respondent's research capability is Average.

Table 10.
Differences in the Level of Research Capability when taken as a Whole and when grouped According to Selected Variables

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	F	P	Interpretation
Number of Research Conducted					
none	2.4949	.74344	9.899	.000	Significant
1-5	3.2724	.81889			
6-10	2.6782	.00000			
Number of Research Training Attended					
none	2.1457	.68608	10.467	.000	Significant
1-5	2.8311	.75196			
6-10	3.0942	1.08105			
More than 10	3.7592	.28015			
Number of Membership					

in Research-Related Organization					
none	2.4261	.72497	17.234	.000	Significant
1-5	3.3369	.70655			
6 and more	2.6985	.00000			
Availability of Research Books/ Journals In School and at Home					
none	2.4494	.67648	2.675	.051	Not Significant
1-5	2.7498	.87660			
6-10	3.5978	.94448			
More than 10	2.8042	.29283			
Internet Connectivity					
with internet connection	2.7155	.79562	3.133	.047	Significant
no internet connection	2.2579	.84398			
Gadgets					
computer/desktop/laptop	2.8925	.72633	.221	.802	Not Significant
tablet/cellphone/iPod	2.4942	.47869			
with both	2.6614	.83504			

Table 10 showed the significant difference in the Level of Research Capability of the respondents when taken as a whole and when grouped according to selected variables, only the availability of research books, journals, and gadgets were revealed to have no significant difference while the rest of the variables showed a significant difference.

1. The data indicate that the respondents have very limited participation in the following areas. a) attendance to training, webinars, or research fora; b) reading published research journals that enhance their research capability; c) regular collegial meetings/discussions concerning research agenda or problems in school; d) support by research coordinator, academic leader, and learning action cell group that increase their awareness and interest in research; e) coaching from research coordinator in school in preparing a research proposal, and f) responding research calls as an outcome of collegial discussion
2. Availability of Research Journals or books at home does not affect the research capability of the respondents. On the other hand, research conducted, training related to research, membership in research-related professional organizations, and availability of gadgets and internet connectivity affect the research capability of the respondents.
3. Most of the respondents received very limited research support from their immediate academic leaders, research coordinators, and colleagues.
4. Most of the respondents lack personal preparation in conducting research and most of them do not have research outputs.

RECOMMENDATION

The respondents need to be/must:

1. Given training, school and collegial support, and coaching related to research to improve their research capability.
2. Given reinforcement through consistent learning, action cells help them to increase their research capability in the aspects of self-preparation, performing research parts (methodology, data analysis, and interpretation, making a summary, conclusion, and recommendations).
3. Enhance and apply their research competence through actual performance output by conducting studies that are required in research policy and management stipulated in DepEd Memorandum Orders.

REFERENCES

- Abramo, G. & Angelo, C. (2018). How do you define and measure research productivity?. <https://arxiv.org>
- Acompanado, M.M. et. al (2017). Philippine classroom teachers as researchers: teachers' perceptions, motivations and challenges. <https://files.eric.ed.gov>
- Bellen, J.A. Mabalhin, J.Q, & Villocino, A.A. (2019). Increasing Research Capability among Masters Teacher in the Countryside Area of the Philippines - Bases for Proposed Program Intervention. <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Byskov (2020). Functionings and capabilities as doing and being. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://plato.stanford.edu>
- Caingoy, M. & Santos, J. (2020). Research capability of teachers: its correlates, determinants and implication for continuing professional development. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Cardona, R.S. (2020). The enablers and outcomes of research productivity among junior high school mathematics teacher. <https://www.ejmste.com>
- Claustro, J.M. & Hernadez, J.S. et. al (2020). Teachers and research practices: perspectives from English language educators in a Philippine university. <https://files.eric.ed.gov>
- Gay, L.R. et.al (2016). Educational research competence for analysis and application. PEARSON, Boston