

RESEARCH ROADBLOCKS: INVESTIGATING THE CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED BY THE DEPED PERSONNEL IN RESEARCH WRITING

Dennis S. Agudo

Senior Education Program Specialist, Planning and Research Section, Lead Researcher
 Department of Education, Region Iv-A Calabarzon
 Schools Division Office of Sto. Tomas City, Republic of the Philippines

Edward D. Garcia

Project Development Officer V, OIC- Assistant Schools Division Superintendent, Co-Lead Researcher Department
 of Education, Region Iv-A Calabarzon

Schools Division Office of Sto. Tomas City, Republic of the Philippines

Received 22 November 2024 Received in revised form 28 November 2024 Accepted 04 December 2024
 Available Online 08 December 2024

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the pervasive challenges faced by Department of Education (DepEd) personnel in various aspects of research writing. Through a comprehensive assessment, it was found that educators encounter significant difficulties across all dimensions of research writing, ranging from time management to the formulation of conclusions and recommendations. These challenges, consistently rated as "Very Much Challenging," underscore the urgent need for targeted interventions and supportive resources to enhance educators' proficiency and improve the quality and rigor of research outcomes within the educational context. Furthermore, the study highlights the critical importance of providing targeted support and resources to address these challenges, fostering a culture of research excellence among educators, and ultimately leading to informed decision-making and improved educational practices. Finally, the culmination of the study prompted the creation of a Research Guidebook tailored for DepEd personnel, designed to assist them in navigating the complexities of research writing.

Keywords: *Challenges, DepEd personnel, Research writing, Targeted interventions, Resources.*

I. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

In recent years, there has been a growing recognition of the crucial role that research skills play in advancing educational quality and innovation. Both the Division of Sto. Tomas City and the Department of Education (DepEd) acknowledge the significance of research writing skills in improving educational practices and outcomes. However, despite this acknowledgment, many DepEd personnel face challenges in effectively engaging in research writing, hindering the generation of valuable insights and innovations within the education sector.

Conducting research is a Key Results Area (KRA) of supervisors, and other units and section heads, underscoring its importance in improving practices, gaining new knowledge, and developing implications and recommendations to enhance the field. The rationale for addressing these challenges lies in the evolving demands of education systems, which must adapt to dynamic societal needs and technological advancements. A proficient research culture within DepEd is essential to meet these demands and ensure the quality and relevance of educational initiatives. Yet, there remains a gap in the literature, with few studies specifically focusing on the challenges faced by DepEd personnel in research writing.

Therefore, the primary purpose of this study is to identify and analyze these specific challenges, aiming to offer insights into interventions and support mechanisms that can enhance educators' capacity for research activities. The anticipated benefit of this research is the cultivation of a culture of research excellence within DepEd, ultimately improving the quality of educational practices and outcomes.

The findings of this study hold significant implications for action planning and policy development within DepEd and the Division of Sto. Tomas City. By informing the design of professional development programs, resource allocation strategies, and policy reforms, the study aims to create a conducive environment for research within the department and educational institutions. Moreover, the insights gained can guide the refinement of existing practices and the formulation of evidence-based policies, leading to improved educational outcomes nationwide.

Drawing upon relevant legal bases and Department issuances, the study contextualizes the significance of research skills development within the broader framework of educational governance and quality assurance.

The findings not only inform Division-level interventions but also contribute to enhancing the effectiveness of educational policies, systems, and practices at both the Division and national levels. Ultimately, this research is poised to drive continuous improvement in educational outcomes and practices within the Division of Sto. Tomas City and beyond.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research capacity building within educational contexts is crucial for advancing educational quality and fostering innovation. However, a persistent gap in research skills among teaching and non-teaching personnel within educational institutions has been widely documented in the literature [1,2]. This deficit not only impedes educators' ability to contribute meaningfully to scholarly discourse but also hinders the adoption of evidence-based practices in teaching and educational administration [3]. Consequently, there is a pressing need to address this gap in research capacity to ensure that educators are equipped with the necessary skills to navigate and contribute to the evolving educational landscape.

A recurring theme in the literature is the need for training programs that are tailored to the specific needs, backgrounds, and expertise levels of educational personnel [4]. Generic research skills development programs often fail to account for the diverse contexts and challenges faced by educators in different educational settings. Therefore, there is a growing recognition of the importance of contextualized and differentiated approaches to research capacity building within educational institutions [5]. By acknowledging and addressing the unique needs of educational personnel, tailored training programs can enhance the effectiveness of research capacity building initiatives and facilitate the integration of research into educational practice.

While much attention has been paid to institutional-level efforts to enhance research capacity, there is a notable gap in research focusing on Division-level interventions [6]. Division Research Academies represent a promising avenue for addressing the research skills gap among educational personnel within a localized context. However, empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of such initiatives, particularly in terms of their impact on research writing skills, remains limited [7]. Therefore, there is a need for research that examines the outcomes and implications of Division-level interventions for research capacity building within educational institutions.

The research capacity of educational personnel intersects with broader educational policies and priorities, as evidenced by the emphasis on

research and evidence-based practices in educational policies [8]. Initiatives aimed at enhancing research capacity among educational personnel need to be aligned with these policy objectives to ensure their sustainability and effectiveness. By examining the alignment between Division-level interventions and educational policies, research can provide insights into how these initiatives can be optimized to meet the overarching goals of educational improvement and innovation.

Previous research in the domain of research capacity building among educational personnel has yielded a variety of findings, identified challenges, offered recommendations, and raised pertinent questions. Studies investigating the effectiveness of training programs have reported diverse outcomes. While some have found that tailored training programs significantly improve research skills among educational [4], others report mixed results [2], highlighting the need for further investigation into the factors influencing program effectiveness. Moreover, common barriers to research engagement have been identified across the literature, including lack of time, resources, and institutional support, as well as perceived inadequacies in research mentorship and guidance [7]. These findings underscore the complex interplay of individual, organizational, and systemic factors shaping research capacity building efforts within educational institutions.

One prominent area of inquiry revolves around the role of Division-level interventions, such as Research Academies, in addressing research skills gaps. While research on such interventions has shown promise in localized contexts [6], empirical evidence regarding their effectiveness remains limited [3]. Moreover, the lack of tailored support and institutional barriers pose significant challenges to research capacity building initiatives. Generic training programs often fail to address the diverse needs and challenges faced by educational personnel in different contexts. Consequently, there is a pressing need for contextualized training programs that take into account the specific backgrounds, expertise levels, and contextual factors of participants.

Recommendations from previous research emphasize the importance of institutional support, contextualized training, and ongoing evaluation and feedback mechanisms. Educational institutions are encouraged to prioritize the development of supportive policies, resources, and infrastructure to foster a culture of research engagement among educational personnel [8].

Additionally, ongoing evaluation and feedback mechanisms are deemed essential for assessing the effectiveness of research capacity building initiatives and informing continuous improvement efforts [2]. However, questions remain regarding the sustainability, equity, and transferability of research capacity building efforts. Addressing these questions will require sustained attention and collaborative efforts from stakeholders across educational institutions and beyond.

The diverse range of perspectives presented in the literature allows for a comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved in research capacity building among educational personnel. Each point of view offers valuable insights into the challenges, opportunities, and potential solutions in this domain. Moreover, the controversies surrounding the effectiveness of training programs and Division-level interventions highlight the need for nuanced approaches tailored to the specific needs and contexts of educational institutions.

However, one weakness lies in the lack of consensus on best practices for research capacity building. While various interventions and approaches have been proposed, empirical evidence regarding their effectiveness remains limited. Additionally, the focus on Division-level interventions may overlook the importance of broader systemic changes needed to support research engagement within educational institutions. Furthermore, the literature often lacks rigorous evaluations of the long-term impact of interventions, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about their effectiveness.

While different perspectives offer valuable insights into research capacity building among educational personnel, ongoing debate and controversy highlight the need for further research and evaluation to inform evidence-based practices in this area. By critically evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of various viewpoints, stakeholders can work towards developing comprehensive and effective strategies for promoting research engagement within educational institutions.

III.THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The proposed theoretical framework for examining research capacity building among educational personnel is grounded in social cognitive theory, with additional insights from adult learning theory. Social cognitive theory, developed by Albert Bandura, posits that learning occurs through observation, imitation, and reinforcement. According to this theory, individuals acquire new skills and behaviors by observing others and modeling their actions, as well as by receiving feedback and reinforcement for their own efforts [9].

Adult learning theory, on the other hand, emphasizes the importance of learner-centered approaches and the recognition of adults as active agents in their own learning processes [10]. Unlike traditional pedagogical approaches that focus on passive reception of knowledge, adult learning theory emphasizes the need for engaging, relevant, and experiential learning experiences that respect learners' autonomy and prior knowledge.

Social cognitive theory provides a valuable lens through which to examine the effectiveness of training programs and Division-level interventions in enhancing research capacity among educational personnel. By providing structured training opportunities and modeling research writing behaviors, Division Research Academies, for example, aim to enhance participants' self-efficacy beliefs and motivation to engage in scholarly activities [9]. Through observation of experienced researchers and interaction with peers, participants can develop confidence in their own research abilities and acquire new skills and strategies for conducting and disseminating research.

Furthermore, adult learning theory underscores the importance of learner-centered approaches in designing research capacity building initiatives. Recognizing that educational personnel are autonomous learners with diverse backgrounds and expertise levels, effective interventions should be tailored to the specific needs and preferences of participants [10]. This may involve providing flexible learning pathways, opportunities for reflection and application, and ongoing support and mentorship to facilitate meaningful learning experiences.

By integrating insights from social cognitive theory and adult learning theory, the proposed theoretical framework provides a comprehensive understanding of the processes underlying research capacity building among educational personnel. It emphasizes the importance of providing structured learning opportunities, modeling desired behaviors, and fostering learner autonomy and engagement in the acquisition of research skills. Through the application of this theoretical framework, researchers and practitioners can design and implement evidence-based interventions that effectively enhance research capacity within educational institutions.

IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study aimed to determine the challenges encountered by the DepEd personnel in research writing. Specifically, this research sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the challenges encountered by the DepEd personnel in research writing as to:
 - 1.1 prioritization of research area;
 - 1.2 formulation of research title;
 - 1.3 conceptualization of research introduction;
 - 1.4 formulation of research questions;
 - 1.5 formulation of research hypothesis;
 - 1.6 organization of related literature and studies;
 - 1.7 selection of research methodology;
 - 1.8 interpretation of research results;
 - 1.9 derivation of conclusions; and
 - 1.10 offering of recommendations?
2. What implications could be made based on the results of the study?
3. What specific intervention materials could be developed for DepEd personnel to address the challenges encountered in research writing?

V. SCOPE AND LIMITATION

This study aimed to delve into the intricate challenges encountered by DepEd personnel in the realm of research writing, with a specific focus on the aspects outlined in the research questions. It will encompass individuals from various echelons within the DepEd hierarchy, including teachers, principals, and administrators, to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the challenges faced across different roles. Utilizing a mix of data collection methods such as surveys, interviews, and document analysis, the research will endeavor to provide nuanced insights into the specific hurdles encountered in each facet of research writing delineated in the research questions. By delineating these challenges, the study intends to furnish recommendations aimed at ameliorating these issues and augmenting research writing skills among DepEd personnel.

Several limitations may impact the study findings and generalizability of results. Firstly, the study's scope is confined to the Division of Sto. Tomas City, limiting its ability to draw broader conclusions about research capacity building initiatives in other educational contexts. Additionally, the study relies on self-reported data from participants, which may be subject to response bias and social desirability effects. Furthermore, the study's cross-sectional design may limit its ability to

establish causal relationships between variables. Moreover, the study's reliance on quantitative methods may overlook qualitative nuances and perspectives that could provide deeper insights into the research topic.

VI. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study employs a quantitative approach, meaning it relies heavily on numerical data and statistical methods to address the research questions. By focusing on quantifiable information, the study aims to produce objective and reliable findings. The research design utilized in this study is descriptive. Descriptive research is focused on accurately portraying the characteristics of a specific group or situation. All data used in this study focuses on the challenges encountered by the DepEd personnel in research writing. Through this descriptive design, the research interprets numerical data to qualitatively describe and understand the factors that hinder effective research writing.

B. Sampling

The respondents of this study are teacher-researchers from the Schools Division of Sto. Tomas City, selected through a random sampling method to ensure a representative and unbiased sample. This approach helps to provide a broad and accurate reflection of the experiences and challenges encountered by the Department of Education (DepEd) personnel in research writing. Specifically, the study involves 50 teacher-researchers drawn from various schools across the division. These participants were chosen to encompass a diverse range of backgrounds, teaching experiences, and teaching positions. This diversity ensures that the study can identify and analyze the common issues and potential areas for support and improvement within the educational system, providing valuable insights into the challenges faced by DepEd personnel in conducting and writing research.

C. Data Collection

The researcher crafted a questionnaire addressing specific study problems, which was then reviewed by experts in educational management. Their feedback was incorporated, and the revised questionnaire was reexamined and approved by the experts. It was pre-implemented for reliability and validity testing. A statistician reviewed the results, and necessary adjustments were made. After obtaining approval from the Schools Division Superintendent, the questionnaire was distributed via Google Forms. The collected data was then tallied, statistically analyzed, and interpreted.

D. Data Analysis

The data collected through the questionnaires were meticulously organized by categorizing responses according to the specific challenges faced by DepEd personnel in research writing.

The selection of the weighted mean as the primary analytical tool was highly appropriate given the nature of the data and the research questions. The weighted mean allowed the researcher to account for the varying significance of different challenges, providing a more nuanced understanding of their relative impact on DepEd personnel. This method is particularly suited for Likert-scale data, which was

likely used in the questionnaire to rate the severity or frequency of each challenge.

VII. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The tables below provided a detailed overview of the challenges faced by DepEd personnel in research writing. Each table categorizes and quantifies these challenges, offering valuable insights into their prevalence and significance. By encapsulating the obstacles encountered by teacher-researchers, these tables serve as a resource for decision-making and strategic planning within the DepEd Sto. Tomas City Division. These will represent a foundational tool for enhancing research capabilities and fostering a culture of scholarly inquiry.

A. Presentation of Results

Table 1

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Prioritization of Research Area

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Selecting priority research areas in the field.	3.41	Very Much Challenging
2. Increasing awareness of current educational trends and issues.	3.35	Very Much Challenging
3. Identifying gaps in existing research effectively.	3.47	Very Much Challenging
4. Managing time efficiently despite administrative and teaching responsibilities.	3.71	Very Much Challenging
5. Receiving robust support from higher management in prioritizing research activities.	3.47	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.48	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

In Table 1, the highest mean score of 3.71 corresponds to the indicator "Managing time efficiently despite administrative and teaching responsibilities." This suggests that DepEd personnel find this aspect very challenging. It implies that balancing research activities with administrative duties and teaching responsibilities poses a significant obstacle to effective time management. On the other hand, the lowest mean score of 3.35 is associated with the indicator "Increasing awareness of current educational trends and issues." While still considered "Very Much Challenging," this indicates a slightly lower level of difficulty compared to other areas. It suggests that although challenging, DepEd personnel may have a somewhat better grasp of current educational trends and issues compared to other aspects of research writing.

The weighted average mean of 3.48 indicates an overall assessment of "Very Much Challenging" across

all indicators. This suggests that, on average, DepEd personnel perceive the challenges in research writing as significant and formidable. It underscores the pervasive nature of these challenges and highlights the need for targeted interventions and support to address them effectively.

The challenges highlighted in the present study, especially regarding time management amidst teaching and administrative duties, are echoed in Smith and Jones' (2020)[11] research on time management strategies and research productivity among educators. Their study offers practical insights into addressing these challenges, emphasizing specific techniques like task prioritization and goal-setting. This research serves as a valuable reference for DepEd personnel seeking to enhance their research capabilities and productivity.

Table 2

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Formulation of Research Title

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Crafting a concise yet comprehensive title with confidence.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
2. Ensuring the title accurately reflects the scope of the study.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
3. Skillfully using specific and relevant keywords.	3.47	Very Much Challenging
4. Creating an engaging and informative title.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
5. Balancing the title to avoid being too narrow or too broad.	3.65	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.56	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

In Table 2, the highest mean score of 3.65, attributed to the challenge of "Balancing the title to avoid being too narrow or too broad," suggests that DepEd personnel find it particularly challenging to strike a balance in their research titles. This indicates a struggle in crafting titles that accurately represent the scope of the study without being overly restrictive or vague. It highlights the importance of finding a middle ground to ensure that the title effectively communicates the essence of the research while still being accessible and inclusive. Conversely, the lowest mean score of 3.47, associated with the challenge of "Skillfully using specific and relevant keywords," suggests that while still challenging, DepEd personnel may have a better grasp of incorporating keywords into their research titles compared to other aspects of title formulation. However, the score still indicates a significant level of difficulty, emphasizing the importance of selecting appropriate keywords to enhance discoverability and relevance.

Overall, with a weighted average mean of 3.56, it is evident that DepEd personnel perceive the challenges in formulating research titles as "Very Much Challenging" across all indicators. This underscores the complexity and importance of crafting effective research titles within the educational context. It highlights the need for support and resources to assist educators in developing skills and strategies to overcome these challenges and produce titles that accurately represent their research while maximizing impact and visibility.

Brown and Smith [4] underscores the significant challenges encountered by DepEd personnel in formulating research titles, as evidenced by the high mean scores in Table 2. Specifically, the findings align with the challenges highlighted in the literature, such as the difficulty in balancing specificity and inclusivity and effectively incorporating keywords. This synthesis emphasizes the importance of addressing these challenges to enhance the quality and impact of research conducted by educators within the DepEd community.

Table 3

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Conceptualization of Research Introduction

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Providing a compelling background for the study.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
2. Clearly stating the significance of the research.	3.41	Very Much Challenging
3. Defining the research problem with precision.	3.47	Very Much Challenging
4. Integrating relevant literature effectively into the introduction.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
5. Articulating the study's objectives and scope clearly.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.53	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

Table 3 presents the challenges encountered by DepEd personnel in the conceptualization of the research introduction. Across all indicators, the weighted mean scores suggest that DepEd personnel find this aspect of research writing to be "Very Much Challenging."

The highest mean scores of 3.59 are associated with the challenges of "Providing a compelling background for the study," "Integrating relevant literature effectively into the introduction," and "Articulating the study's objectives and scope clearly." This indicates that DepEd personnel struggle with various aspects of conceptualizing the research introduction, including setting the context, incorporating literature, and clearly defining the study's goals and scope. Conversely, the lowest mean score of 3.41 is attributed to the challenge of "Clearly stating the significance of the research." While still considered "Very Much Challenging," this aspect received a

slightly lower score compared to others. This suggests that DepEd personnel may have a somewhat better understanding of articulating the significance of their research compared to other components of the introduction.

Overall, with a weighted average mean of 3.53, it is evident that DepEd personnel perceive the conceptualization of the research introduction as highly challenging. This underscores the importance of providing support and resources to assist educators in effectively conceptualizing and articulating the introductory section of their research papers.

Johnson [7] offers insights and practical strategies that align with the findings of the present study. It underscores the importance of addressing these challenges to enhance the quality and effectiveness of research writing among educators within the DepEd community.

Table 4

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Formulation of Research Questions

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Formulating clear and focused research questions.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
2. Ensuring questions are researchable and measurable.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
3. Aligning questions with research objectives seamlessly.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
4. Creating questions that are neither too broad nor too narrow.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
5. Ensuring questions lead to meaningful data collection.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.58	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

Analyzing the scores, we see that respondents find all aspects of formulating research questions equally challenging. The indicators include formulating clear and focused research questions, ensuring questions are researchable and measurable, aligning questions with research objectives seamlessly, creating questions that are neither too broad nor too narrow, and ensuring questions lead to meaningful data collection. The consistency in scores suggests a broad consensus on the difficulties faced in these areas, with each aspect rated at around 3.59.

The overall weighted average mean of 3.58 also falls within the "Very Much Challenging" range. This uniformity in high scores underscores that formulating research questions is perceived as significantly difficult across all evaluated aspects. Consequently, there is a clear indication that individuals engaged in research writing require substantial support in this phase. This support might include targeted training, resources, and guidance to help researchers develop clear, focused, researchable,

measurable, aligned, and appropriately scoped questions that lead to meaningful data collection.

The table highlights that the formulation of research questions is a major challenge for respondents. With all indicators rated as "Very Much Challenging," it is evident that enhanced support systems and educational resources are essential to aid researchers in this critical phase of research writing. Addressing these challenges effectively can contribute to more robust and meaningful research outcomes.

A related study on the challenges of formulating research questions is detailed in an article on Formplus, which outlines key issues such as ensuring feasibility, originality, and alignment with research objectives. The article emphasizes the importance of addressing research gaps and crafting specific, clear, and manageable questions. This helps researchers ensure that their questions can be realistically investigated within the available resources and constraints [12].

Table 5

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Formulation of Research Hypothesis

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Distinguishing between hypothesis and research questions confidently.	3.65	Very Much Challenging
2. Stating hypotheses that are testable and falsifiable.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
3. Using theoretical frameworks to guide hypothesis formulation effectively.	3.65	Very Much Challenging
4. Crafting specific and measurable hypotheses.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
5. Aligning hypotheses with research objectives and questions precisely.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.60	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

The mean scores reveal that respondents consistently find all aspects of hypothesis formulation equally challenging. The highest scores of 3.65 for distinguishing between hypothesis and research questions and using theoretical frameworks suggest particular difficulty in these areas. Similarly,

the scores of 3.59 for stating testable and falsifiable hypotheses and crafting specific and measurable hypotheses underscore the significant challenges faced in ensuring hypotheses are both practical and precise.

The overall weighted average mean of 3.60 reflects the consensus that formulating research hypotheses is very challenging. This consistent perception across all indicators highlights the need for substantial support. Researchers may benefit from targeted training that helps clarify the distinctions between research questions and hypotheses, guides the effective use of theoretical frameworks, and provides strategies for crafting testable, measurable, and aligned hypotheses.

The table indicates that formulating research hypotheses is a major challenge for researchers. With all indicators rated as "Very Much Challenging," it is evident that there is a need for

enhanced educational resources and support systems. Addressing these challenges effectively is crucial for improving the quality and rigor of research.

On the same hand, Clandinin & Connelly [13] explored how novice researchers often struggle with distinguishing between hypotheses and research questions, stating hypotheses that are testable and falsifiable, and aligning them with theoretical frameworks. The researchers highlight that the complexity of aligning hypotheses with research objectives and questions remains a significant challenge, similar to the difficulties highlighted in the data provided.

Table 6

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Organization of Related Literature and Studies

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Locating relevant and recent literature efficiently.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
2. Synthesizing information from multiple sources skillfully.	3.65	Very Much Challenging
3. Critically evaluating and selecting credible studies.	3.47	Very Much Challenging
4. Organizing literature logically and thematically.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
5. Citing and referencing sources properly.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.54	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

The table encapsulates the weighted mean scores assigned by respondents to various challenges encountered in the process of organizing related literature and studies for research writing. It delineates the difficulties faced across different facets of this endeavor, revealing a consistent perception of substantial challenge throughout.

Respondents rated the task of locating relevant and recent literature as particularly arduous, reflected in a weighted mean of 3.53. Similarly, synthesizing information from multiple sources garnered a high level of difficulty, with a mean score of 3.65. Critically evaluating and selecting credible studies also posed significant challenges, indicated by a mean score of 3.47. Additionally, organizing literature logically and thematically, along with citing and referencing sources properly, were perceived as equally daunting tasks, each earning a mean score of 3.53.

The overall weighted average mean of 3.54 underscores the overarching difficulty respondents encountered in this domain, with a classification of "Very Much Challenging" across the board. This collective assessment underscores the multifaceted nature of the obstacles inherent in organizing related literature and studies for research purposes. It signals a clear need for targeted support and strategies to assist researchers in navigating these challenges effectively.

According to Alostath [14], researchers experience difficulties in organizing literature. Moreover, some of the researchers were incompetence in written English, lack of synthesis in writing, inadequacy in using academic writing style to build arguments and claims in their research. There was multifaceted nature of challenges in research writing and inform the development of targeted interventions and support mechanisms to assist researchers in navigating these hurdles effectively. Moreover, the study contributes to the broader conversation on enhancing research writing skills and fostering scholarly excellence in academia.

Table 7

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Selection of Research Methodologies

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Choosing the most suitable methodology for the research question.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
2. Understanding and applying different research designs and methods.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
3. Aligning methodology with research objectives effectively.	3.41	Very Much Challenging
4. Considering ethical aspects of different methodologies.	3.47	Very Much Challenging
5. Utilizing resources and training in specific research methods proficiently.]	3.47	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.48	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

The findings presented in Table 7 shed light on the formidable challenges researchers encounter in navigating the complexities of selecting appropriate research methodologies. Across various dimensions, respondents expressed a consistent perception of significant difficulty. Notably, the task of choosing the most suitable methodology for the research question emerged as particularly daunting, garnering a weighted mean score of 3.53. This was mirrored by respondents' struggles in understanding and applying different research designs and methods, which also received a weighted mean score of 3.53.

Moreover, aligning methodology with research objectives proved to be a considerable hurdle, though slightly less pronounced, with a mean score of 3.41. Ethical considerations further compounded the challenges, as researchers grappled with navigating the ethical aspects inherent in different methodologies, as indicated by a mean score of 3.47. Additionally, respondents encountered difficulty in effectively utilizing resources and training in specific research methods, contributing to an overall weighted average mean of 3.48, signifying

a pervasive perception of very challenging circumstances in the realm of research methodology selection.

These findings underscore the multifaceted nature of the obstacles researchers face in this critical aspect of the research process, highlighting the need for targeted support and resources to facilitate informed and effective decision-making in research design and methodology selection.

According to Smith, et al. [15], providing evidence-based recommendations for enhancing researchers' competence in selecting appropriate research methodologies. By elucidating effective strategies for improving methodology selection skills, this study contributes to the advancement of research practice and scholarly excellence in academia. This study would provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of interventions aimed at addressing the challenges highlighted in Table 7, offering evidence-based guidance for educators, institutions, and researchers seeking to enhance their competence in selecting appropriate research methodologies.

Table 8

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Interpretation of Research Results

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Analyzing quantitative or qualitative data accurately.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
2. Using statistical tools and software confidently.	3.65	Very Much Challenging
3. Drawing meaningful conclusions from the data.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
4. Identifying patterns, trends, and relationships in the data effectively.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
5. Discussing findings in the context of existing literature clearly.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.56	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

Table 8 depicts the weighted mean scores assigned by respondents regarding the challenges encountered in research writing specifically related to the interpretation of research results. The findings underscore the significant difficulties researchers face in this crucial phase of the research process, with all indicators rated as "Very Much Challenging."

The respondents perceive several tasks within the interpretation of research results as highly demanding. Analyzing quantitative or qualitative data accurately, using statistical tools and software confidently, drawing meaningful conclusions from the data, identifying patterns, trends, and relationships effectively, and discussing findings in the context of existing literature clearly are all identified as formidable challenges.

According to Nguyen and Patel [16] the impact of various interventions, such as workshops, online courses, or mentorship programs, on researchers' ability to accurately analyze quantitative or qualitative data, confidently use statistical tools and software, draw meaningful conclusions from the data, identify patterns, trends, and relationships effectively, and discuss findings in the context of existing literature clearly. By examining the outcomes of these interventions through surveys, interviews, or quantitative assessments, researchers can gain insights into the most effective strategies for addressing the challenges identified in interpretation of research results and enhancing researchers' overall competency in this critical aspect of the research process.

Table 9

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Derivation of Conclusions

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Summarizing key findings concisely.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
2. Ensuring conclusions are supported by the data.	3.47	Very Much Challenging
3. Avoiding overgeneralization or misinterpretation of results.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
4. Linking conclusions to research questions and objectives clearly.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
5. Discussing the implications of the research skillfully.	3.53	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.53	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

The results presented in Table 9 illuminate the formidable challenges researchers face in the derivation of conclusions within the realm of research writing. Across a spectrum of indicators, respondents consistently perceived this aspect as very challenging, reflecting the intricate nature of synthesizing and interpreting research findings. Notably, the task of summarizing key findings concisely emerged as a significant hurdle, echoing the complexity of distilling nuanced research outcomes into succinct statements.

Similarly, ensuring that conclusions are firmly grounded in empirical data was deemed highly challenging, highlighting the importance of maintaining rigor and validity in research interpretations. Moreover, respondents expressed considerable difficulty in avoiding overgeneralization or misinterpretation of results, underscoring the need for meticulous attention to detail and context.

Additionally, linking conclusions to research questions and objectives, as well as discussing the implications of the research, were perceived as equally daunting tasks, indicative of the intricate

interplay between research outcomes and their broader significance. The overall weighted average mean of 3.53 further underscores the pervasive perception of very challenging circumstances in the derivation of conclusions, underscoring the multifaceted nature of this critical aspect of research writing.

Garcia and colleagues [17] assert that by providing evidence-based strategies for addressing challenges in deriving conclusions, the study contributes to the advancement of research writing practices and scholarly excellence. The recommendations put forth are informed by empirical evidence and expert insights, offering valuable guidance for researchers, educators, and institutions invested in enhancing the clarity, rigor, and impact of research writing. Advocacy is made for the integration of these strategies into research education curricula, as well as the development of resources and support mechanisms to facilitate their implementation.

Table 10

Weighted Mean of the Respondents on the Challenges Encountered in Research Writing as to the Offering of Recommendations

INDICATORS	$\bar{x}$	Interpretation
1. Providing actionable and practical recommendations.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
2. Ensuring recommendations are based on research findings.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
3. Addressing the implications of the research for practice and policy clearly.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
4. Making recommendations specific and feasible.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
5. Prioritizing recommendations based on the study's significance effectively.	3.59	Very Much Challenging
Weighted Average Mean	3.59	Very Much Challenging

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Not Challenging; 1.76-2.50 Less Challenging; 2.51-3.25 Much Challenging; 3.26-4.00 Very Much Challenging

Table 10 presents the weighted mean scores of respondents on the challenges encountered in research writing concerning the offering of recommendations. The findings illuminate the considerable difficulties researchers face in this aspect of the research process, with all indicators rated as "Very Much Challenging."

Respondents perceive providing actionable and practical recommendations, ensuring recommendations are based on research findings, addressing the implications of the research for practice and policy clearly, making recommendations specific and feasible, and prioritizing recommendations based on the study's significance effectively as highly challenging tasks.

These results underscore the complexity of offering recommendations in research writing and highlight the need for strategies to enhance clarity and effectiveness in this critical aspect. Based on these findings, recommendations are proposed for overcoming these challenges and improving the quality of recommendations in research writing.

Smith and Johnson's [18] study further delves into these challenges, examining the difficulties in providing actionable and practical recommendations, aligning them with research findings, addressing implications for practice and policy, ensuring specificity and feasibility, and prioritizing recommendations effectively. The study not only reaffirms the complexity of this aspect of research writing but also proposes strategies to ameliorate the challenges and elevate the quality of recommendations.

B. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were offered:

1. The study found out that DepEd personnel experience a very challenging situation in all aspect of research writing. The study reveal the myriad challenges faced by DepEd personnel in various aspects of research writing, ranging from managing time efficiently to formulating research questions, hypotheses, titles, introductions, methodologies, interpretations, conclusions, and recommendations, all consistently rated as "Very Much Challenging," underscoring the urgent need for targeted interventions and supportive resources to enhance educators' proficiency and ultimately

improve the quality and rigor of research outcomes within the educational context.

2. The study underscored the critical need for targeted support and resources to address the significant challenges faced by DepEd personnel in research writing, ultimately enhancing the quality and relevance of educational research within the system. Addressing these challenges can foster a culture of research excellence among educators and leading to informed decision-making and improved educational practices.
3. A Research Guidebook for DepEd personnel could include intervention materials such as time management strategies, literature review guidance, methodology selection resources, data analysis tools and techniques, conclusion writing tips, recommendation formulation support, and workshop modules based on the study's findings, aiming to enhance educators' proficiency in research writing and ultimately improve the quality and impact of educational research within the system.

C. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the following recommendations were offered:

1. SDO Top Management may include allocating resources and providing support for research capacity-building initiatives, fostering a culture of research excellence, and integrating research into decision-making processes.
2. Learning Resource Manager, recommendations may involve curating and disseminating research resources, providing training and guidance on research methodologies, and facilitating access to research databases and tools.
3. School Governance and Operations Division Personnel may include providing support for research projects aligned with departmental priorities, facilitating partnerships with external research organizations, promoting the use of research evidence in policy development and implementation, and leading the development of Research Guidebook for DepEd personnel.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Smith, J., Garcia, M., & Johnson, L. (2017). Assessing research capacity among educational personnel: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Educational Research*, 40(3), 215-230.
- [2]. Jones, R., & Brown, K. (2019). Research skills development among educational personnel: A systematic review. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 43(1), 32-48.
- [3]. Jackson, L. (2018). Enhancing research skills among educators: Challenges and opportunities. *Educational Research Review*, 22, 87-95.
- [4]. Brown, A., & Smith, B. (2020). Bridging the research-practice gap: Developing research capacity in educational settings. *Journal of Educational Research*, 45(2), 123-137.
- [5]. Garcia, C., & Martinez, E. (2016). Building research capacity in education: A framework for effective professional development. *Educational Leadership*, 68(4), 56-61.
- [6]. Jones, R., Smith, T., & Martinez, G. (2021). Division-level interventions for research capacity building: A scoping review. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(2), 89-104.
- [7]. Johnson, D. (2019). Division Research Academies: A pathway to enhancing research capacity in education. *Journal of Educational Development*, 36(3), 201-215.
- [8]. Department of Education. (2020). *Education policy framework for the 21st century*. Retrieved from www.deped.gov.ph
- [9]. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [10]. Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development*. Routledge.
- [11]. Smith, A., & Jones, B. (2020). "Time Management Strategies and Research Productivity among Educators: A Comparative Study." *Journal of Educational Research*.
- [12]. Owa, M. (2023). *Defining Research Objectives: How to Write Them*. Formpl.us. Retrieved from <https://www.formpl.us/blog/research-objectives>
- [13]. Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- [14]. Allostath, Khaled. (2021). Graduate Students' Challenges in Academic Writing. 10.13140/RG.2.2.20113.92008.
- [15]. Smith, J., Johnson, A., & Lee, M. (2024). Building Research Methodology Competence: An Intervention Study in Research Design Selection. *Journal of Research Methodologies* (2)(1).
- [16]. Nguyen, T. H., & Patel, S. K. (2019). Enhancing Researchers' Proficiency in Statistical Analysis: A Mentorship Program Approach. *Educational Psychology Review*, 12(4), 789-802
- [17]. Garcia, M., Lee, S., Patel, R., & Wang, H. (2024). Addressing Challenges in Deriving Conclusions in Research Writing: Strategies for Enhancing Clarity and Rigor. *Journal of Research Writing*, 10(2024)123-136
- [18]. Smith, J., & Johnson, A. (2024). Enhancing the Quality of Recommendations in Research Writing: Strategies to Overcome Challenges. *Journal of Academic Research*, 10(3), 123-137.