

THE ROLE OF LEARNING ACTION CELL SESSION IN RESEARCH SELF-EFFICACY LEVEL: BASIS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ACTION PLAN

*Victor Reyes

**Melanie Camara

***Aprille Bantigue

****Mark Angelo Caling

Paper Received: 21.04.2022 / **Paper Accepted:** 24.06.2022 / **Paper Published:** 01.07.2022

Corresponding Author: Victor Reyes; doi:10.46360/globus.met.320221013

Abstract

The study attempted to determine whether there had been significance difference in the Research Self-Efficacy Level of 13 Junior High School Language Teachers in Guiguinto National Vocational High before and after their Learning Action Cell session School-Annex in Guiguinto, Bulacan utilizing purposive sampling.

The study utilized one-group pretest–posttest quasi-experimental research design in which standardized instrument was used the primary data gathering tool. The data were presented using tables and the results of the study were tabulated and processed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The results of the study revealed that the respondents had a “Moderate Extent” level of Research self-efficacy during the Pre-Test. However, after the Learning Action Cell session when the Post-Test was administered, the respondents reported a “Great Extent” level of Research Self-Efficacy with the mean average of 3.98.

Thus, the study rejected the null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant difference between the level of Research Self-Efficacy of the respondents and Learning Action Cell session during pre-test and post-test. An action plan on the further enhancement of Learning Action Cell session was generated based on the findings of the study.

Keywords: Action Cell, Self-Efficacy, Development.

Introduction

The teachers in the Philippines are tasked to develop learners that are equipped with 21st Century skills as it is mandated in the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 which commonly known as the “K to 12 Curriculum” (Official Gazette, 2018). In order to achieve this goal, teachers must continuously engage in classroom research.

Coghlan and Brydon-Miller (2014) [5] defines classroom-based research as the conduct of collaborative and evidence-based inquiry in one’s classroom practices and strategies in order to develop pedagogy which would lead to a beneficial learning experience of students.

The Department of Education (DepEd) singles out the importance of engaging in classroom research as stipulated in DepEd Order No. 39 (2016) [10]. The said order adopts the Basic Education Research Agenda which institutionalizes the policies and programs for research. It also advocates teachers’ engagement in research for the agency believes that through research initiatives improvements, innovations and interventions based in research results and findings.

Moreover, the agency acknowledges the need for professional learning communities among its teachers and as a response, DepEd established the Learning Action Cell (LAC) as a K to 12 Education Program School Based Continuing Professional Development Strategy for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning. The said program intends to develop and nurture teachers’ competence in terms of curriculum, instruction and assessment. Furthermore, the LAC session serves as the safe space for teachers to improve their content and pedagogical knowledge, practice, skills, and attitudes (DepEd Order No. 25, s. 2016) [9].

More importantly, LAC sessions directly aims to significantly affect the student learning and holistic development. With the advancing demands of the 21st Century world, teachers must always prioritize

on which topic should be discussed for each session. In order to become reflective teachers, conducting LAC session on Action Research is hypothesized to bridge the teachers' reluctance to conduct classroom-based research and to successfully author one.

A study by Ulla (2018) [23] that explored on the experiences of Philippine 11 public school teachers in Mindanao, Philippines who had classroom research project suggested that although teachers' motivations to do research were more personal rather than professional although they acknowledged that there are some benefits of doing school and classroom-based research for their teaching practices and career development.

It is also noteworthy to mention that aside from LAC sessions, the research self-efficacy level of the teachers should also be looked into. It is believed that self-efficacy plays a significant role to individuals as it is defined as the beliefs in the ones' ability to execute courses of action or attain specific performance outcome (Chea & Shumow, 2015) [4].

Bandura in Amini et al (2014) [1] believed that there is a difference between individuals with high self-efficacy and those with low self-efficacy. Individuals with high level of self-efficacy believe that they can carry out task than those with low self-efficacy levels. Dullas (2018) noted that the impact of perceived efficacy is significant in human functioning which includes goals, aspirations, outcome expectations, affective proclivities and perception impediments and opportunities in the social environment.

Hence, the paradigm of self-efficacy deals how professionals like teachers can regulate their human functions and over the events that affects their lives especially their professional growth. This is particularly evident particularly when teachers are given research tasks inside the classroom. Likewise, the learners' choices, level of motivation, quality of functioning, resilience to adversity and vulnerability to stress and depression are inclusive of teachers' self-efficacy.

As the country highlights the significance of lifelong learning experiences for both learners and teachers in the K to 12 Enhanced Basic Education curriculums, it is truly of significance to check on the role of Learning Action Cell session in the Research Self-Efficacy Level which will serve as the basis for the development of an action plan.

Given the abovementioned premises, the study postulated that there was no significant difference between the level of Research Self-Efficacy of the respondents and Learning Action Cell session during pre-test and post-test.

Statement of the Problem

The research aimed to improve the level of Research Self-efficacy of Language Teachers of a Public School through Learning Action Cell session.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. How may the level of Research Self-efficacy of the respondents be described before the Learning Action Cell session?
2. How may the level of Research Self-efficacy of the respondents be described after the Learning Action Cell session?
3. Is there a significant difference between the level of Research Self-Efficacy of the respondents and Learning Action Cell session during pre-test and post-test?
4. What action plan maybe suggested furthering enhancing the level of Research Self-Efficacy of the respondents based from the findings of the study?

Methods

Research Design: The research study used quasi-experimental design to determine the significant difference between research self-efficacy level of language teachers and learning action cell session. A quasi-experiment is an empirical interventional study used to estimate the causal impact of an intervention on target population without random assignment. This method fitted the study well since the study utilized one-group pretest-posttest in determining the significant difference in Language Teachers' research self-efficacy level before and after their learning action cell session.

Respondents: The research study used purposive sampling. According to Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2011) [12], purposive sampling is a sampling, in which researchers do not simply study whoever is available but rather uses their judgment to select a sample they believe, based on prior information, will provide the data they need. The respondents of the study were Junior High School Language teachers in Guiguinto National Vocational High School-Annex in Guiguinto, Bulacan. A total of 13 Junior High School Language teachers were assigned as samples of the study which is shown in Table 1 presenting its percentage in terms of gender.

Table 1: Respondents of the Study

	F	%
Male	4	30.77
Female	9	69.23
Total	13	100%

The study's respondents included four (4) males (30.77 percent) and nine (9) females (69.23 percent). This signifies that the female has a larger number than the man.

Instrument of the Study: The instruments utilized in this study were a pretest and a posttest to assess the respondents' research self-efficacy. The Research Self-Efficacy Scale (RSS), a survey questionnaire, was used as the study's principal tool to assess Language instructors' research domain specific self-efficacies. This measure comprised of 19 questions ranging from 1 (Very Little Extent) to 5 (Very Great Extent) on a 5-point Likert-type scale (Büyüköztürk, Atalay, Sozgun, & Kebapç, 2011) [3]. There was no scoring in reverse. Teachers with high ratings had a high level of research self-efficacy. Büyüköztürk et al. (2011) reported that the scale's alpha coefficient and split-half reliability coefficient were .87 and .85, respectively. In the current study, reliability analysis found an alpha coefficient of .89 for RSS.

The pretest was given before the groups were given the learning action cell session, and the posttest was given after the groups were given the learning action cell session. According to Section 35 of DepEd Order No. 35, In 2016, a Learning Action Cell

(LAC) is a group of teachers who participate in collaborative learning sessions guided by the school head or a certified LAC Leader to solve shared concerns in the school. Teachers' awareness and expertise of the curriculum and classroom procedures improve as a result of LAC sessions, which stimulate critical reflection.

Data Gathering Procedures: The researchers used a pretest to acquire the essential information. Following that, a learning action cell session was held. The researchers then conducted a posttest. Initially, the teachers were to be given Likert scale assessments with 19 items in both the pretest and posttest to assess their research self-efficacy.

Statistical Treatment of Data: Frequency counts, percentage distribution, and mean results were used to process the data. Furthermore, the t-test, an inferential statistic, was utilized to assess whether there was a significant difference between the respondents' research self-efficacy and the learning action cell during the pretest and posttest.

Results and Discussion

The data gathered were presented, analyzed, and interpreted as follows:

Table 2: Mean Distribution on Pre-test and Post-Test of Self-Efficacy

Item	Pre-test	Verbal Interpretation	Post-test	Verbal Interpretation
	Mean Average		Mean Average	
1	4.08	Great Extent	4.23	Great Extent
2	3.46	Moderate Extent	4.00	Great Extent
3	3.54	Great Extent	3.85	Great Extent
4	3.46	Moderate Extent	4.00	Great Extent
5	3.77	Great Extent	4.00	Great Extent
6	3.92	Great Extent	4.08	Great Extent
7	3.31	Moderate Extent	3.77	Great Extent
8	3.15	Moderate Extent	3.54	Great Extent
9	3.46	Moderate Extent	3.85	Great Extent
10	3.08	Moderate Extent	3.85	Great Extent
11	3.38	Moderate Extent	4.00	Great Extent
12	3.38	Moderate Extent	4.08	Great Extent
13	3.23	Moderate Extent	3.92	Great Extent
14	3.15	Moderate Extent	3.92	Great Extent
15	3.38	Moderate Extent	4.00	Great Extent
16	3.38	Moderate Extent	4.00	Great Extent
17	3.38	Moderate Extent	3.85	Great Extent
18	3.23	Moderate Extent	3.92	Great Extent
19	3.15	Moderate Extent	3.77	Great Extent
Total	3.42	Moderate Extent	3.93	Great Extent

Table 2 revealed the mean distribution of the pretest and posttest of the Language teachers. As observed, posttest results imply that more teachers who are

likely to have great extent of self-efficacy than during pretest.

Table 3. Distribution on Significant Difference of Pre-test and Post-test in Self-efficacy

	Pre-test	Post-test
Mean	65.15385	74.84615
Variance	68.14103	141.141
Observations	13	13
Pearson Correlation	0.20335	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Df	12	
Ct Stat	-2.68501	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.009926	
t Critical one-tail	1.782288	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.019852	
t Critical two-tail	2.178813	

Table 3 presents the distribution on significant difference of pre-test and post-test in self-efficacy. Since the P-value is 0.01, which is less than the alpha of 0.05, this means that there is a significant difference between the level of Research Self-Efficacy of the respondents and the Learning Action Cell session during pre-test and post-test. The result is supported by Yang, Quadir and Shing Chen

(2015), which found out that self-efficacy, could affect English learning performance, with the results revealing that it had a significant positive influence on learning performance.

Proposed Action Plan

Research Topic	Objectives	Programs/ Strategies/ Activities	Time Frame	Expected Outcome
Conceptualization Phase	The teacher is expected to: 1. to learn on how to identify research topic and problem; 2. to carry out related review of literature using various channels (internets, library, etc); 3. to systematically keep record of the results of the literature survey; 4. to generate research and null hypotheses of the study; 5. to design the conceptual framework of the study; and 6. to write a publication-standard introduction	LAC Session through Webinar Series that centers on Research Conceptualization	June 2022	Matrices of the following: 1. Topic Identification 2. Review of Related Literature Accomplished Introduction of the Study that includes the following: 1. Trends 2. Issues and Problems 3. Objectives of the Study 4. Contributions of the Study
Design Phase	The teacher is expected to: 1. to understand the different research methodologies; 2. to choose an appropriate sampling design for a study; 3. to formulate / to select fitting research instrument for the study; and 4. to decide the appropriate statistical methods for the study;	LAC Session through Write-shop training that center on Research Methodology	August	Formulated and Validated Research Instrument Draft of the Proposed Research Design of the Study as a continuation of the accomplished Introduction

Empirical Phase	The teacher is expected to: 1. to choose the appropriate data gathering method necessary for the study; and 2. to identify the ethical considerations for the study	LAC Session through Webinar Series that centers on Data Gathering Method	October 2022	Draft of the Data Gathering Procedures Accomplished Consent Forms of the respondents
Analytical Phase	The teacher is expected to: 1. to learn how to present, analyze and interpret data; 2. to draw conclusion and recommendation based on the findings of the study	LAC Session through Webinar Series that centers on Data Presentation, Analysis, and Interpretation	December 2022	Draft of the Data Presentation, Analysis, and Interpretation of the Study
Dissemination Phase	The teacher is expected to: 1. to join in a Paper Presentation; and 2. to publish the paper presented.	Research Festival: A Celebration of the Faculty Research Findings	February 2022	Published Paper in a Refereed Journal

The proposed action plan includes objectives, programs, activities or strategies, time frame and expected outcome. The main purpose of this plan is to improve the research self-efficacy level through learning action cell session. The said plan focuses in promoting the research culture specifically for language teachers. Utilizing this plan would intensify the research productivity by writing a completed study, presenting it in research colloquium and published it in refereed journals.

Conclusion

In the light of the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Understanding the motivational constructs like self-efficacy is a significant factor in the teaching-learning process as it serves as a gauge on individual's confidence in research engagement.
2. The Learning Action Cell session plays a significant role in teachers' level of research self-efficacy and that LAC sessions should be conducted regularly for teachers' professional growth.
3. The null hypothesis there was no significant difference between the level of Research Self-Efficacy of the respondents and Learning Action Cell session during pre-test and post-test was rejected.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, the following recommendations are hereby offered:

1. That the school heads provide frequent LAC sessions to teachers that will foster a productive research-engaged working atmosphere;
2. That the teachers be aware of their attitudes and their levels of confidence when they are assigned to accomplish any academic writing tasks;
3. That the academic heads, school administrators and curriculum developers will ensure that the research culture among teachers be advocated and should put into considerations of are mindful motivational construct assigning academic writing tasks among the teachers.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest between the authors in this manuscript.

References

1. Amini, Kumarss & Zahraei Salehi, Taghi & Nikbakht, Gholamreza & Ranjbar, Reza & Amini, Javid & Banou Ashrafganjoeei, Shahrnaz, (2016). "article1380368955 Amini et al."
2. Bandura, A., (2006). "Guide for constructing

- self-efficacy scales”, In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.). *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*, (Vol. 5, pp. 307-337). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
3. Büyüköztürk, (2011). “The development of research self-efficacy scale”, Turkey: Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences
 4. Chea, Sathya & Shumow, Lee, (2015). “The Relationships Among Writing Self-Efficacy, Writing Goal Orientation, and Writing Achievement”. *Language Education in Asia*, 5, 253-269.
10.5746/LEiA/14/V5/I2/A07/Chea_Shumow.
 5. Coghlan, D. & Brydon-Miller, M., (2014). “The SAGE encyclopedia of action research (Vols. 1-2)”. London, SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446294406.
 6. Demir, S., (2018). “The Relation between the Awareness Level of Writing Strategies and Writing Self-Efficacy”. *International Education Studies*, 11(5), 59-73. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1177079&site=ehost-live>
 7. DepEd, (2012). “Policy Guidelines on the implementation of Grades 1 to 10 of the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) Effective School Year 2012-2013 (DO 31 s. 2012).”
 8. DepEd, (2015). “Policy Guidelines on the Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program (DO 8 s. 2015).”
 9. DepEd Order No. 35 s., (2016). “Learning Action Cell (LAC) as a K to 12 Education Program School Based Continuing Professional Development Strategy for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning.”
 10. DepEd Order No. 39 s., (2016). “Adoption of the Basic Education Research Agenda.”
 11. Dupeyrat, C. & Mariné, C., (2005). “Implicit theories of intelligence, goal orientation, cognitive engagement, and achievement”. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 30(1), 43-59.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2004.01.007>
 12. Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E. and Hyun, H.H., (2012). “How to design and evaluate research in education (8th ed)”. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
 13. Gündogmus, H. D., (2018). “Self-Efficacy of Teacher Candidates for Teaching First Reading and Writing”. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 13(6), 224-229. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1173557&site=ehost-live>.
 14. Hodges, T. S., Wright, K. L. & McTigue, E., (2019). “What Do Middle Grades Preservice Teachers Believe about Writing and Writing Instruction?”. *RMLE Online: Research in Middle Level Education*, 42(2). Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1206474&site=ehost-live>.
 15. Lent, R. W., (2005). “A social cognitive view of career development and counseling”. In *Career Development and Counseling: Putting Theory and Research to Work*, eds S. D. Brown and R. T. Lent (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley), 101–127.
 16. Liem, A. D., Lau, S. & Nie, Y., (2007). “The role of self-efficacy, task value, and achievement goals in predicting learning strategies, task disengagement, peer relationship, and achievement outcome”. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(4), 486-512.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2007.08.001>
 17. Phan, H. P., (2009). “Relations between goals, self-efficacy, critical thinking and deep processing strategies: A path analysis”. *Educational Psychology*, 29(7), 777-799.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410903289423>
 18. Phan, H. P., (2010). “Students’ academic performance and various cognitive processes of learning: An integrative framework and empirical analysis”. *Educational Psychology*, 30(3), 297-322.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410903573297>
 19. Prat-Sala, M. and Redford, P., (2010). “The interplay between motivation, self-efficacy, and approaches to studying”. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(2), 283-305.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000709909X480563>
 20. Perry, Kyle R., (2011). “Implicit Beliefs About Writing: A Task-Specific Study of Implicit Beliefs”. *Public Access Theses and Dissertations from the College of Education and Human Sciences*. 119.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsdiss/119>
 21. Ruegg, R., (2018). “The Effect of Peer and Teacher Feedback on Changes in EFL Students’ Writing Self-Efficacy”. *Language Learning Journal*, 46(2), 87-102. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1172660&site=ehost-live>
 22. The K to 12 Basic Education Program, (2012, November 30). Retrieved from: <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/k-12-old/>
 23. Ulla, M., (2018). “Benefits and challenges of doing research: Experiences from Philippine public school teachers”. *Issues in Educational Research*, 28(3), 797-810. Retrieved from https://www.iier.org.au/iier28/ulla.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3s5rOOkgmRhygtVv4p_v79SfY8qT2SaWgvB5iCjIdTYe1gDe9lA-XNh4.

24. Van Blankenstein, F. M., Saab, N., Van derRijst, R. M., Danel, M. S., Bakker-Van den Berg, A. S. & Van den Broek, P. W., (2019). "How Do Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Academic Writing and Collaboration and Intrinsic Motivation for Academic Writing and Research Develop during an Undergraduate Research Project?". *Educational Studies*, 45(2), 209–225. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1205151&site=ehost-live>.
25. Zheng, L., Cui, P., Li, X. & Huang, R., (2018). "Synchronous Discussion between Assessors and Assesseees in Web-Based Peer Assessment: Impact on Writing Performance, Feedback Quality, Meta-Cognitive Awareness and Self-Efficacy". *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(3), 500-514. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1172320&site=ehost-live>.
26. Zimmerman, B. J. and Cleary, T. J., (2006). "Adolescents' development of personal agency". In *The Role of Self-Efficacy Belief and Self-Regulatory Skill* (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing), 45. Available at: <http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/ZimmermanClearyAdoEd5.pdf> (Accessed: June 24, 2016).