*The Level of Attitude of System Users toward Learner Information System Management in the Division of Tangub City*

**DOROTHY P. NERI**
Planning Officer III
dorothy.neri@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

An accurate and reliable registry of learners and schools ensures the availability of data and information needed for planning and budgeting, allocation of resources, and setting operational targets to provide access to complete quality basic education. This quantitative study using descriptive design was intended to investigate the attitude of the different school system users toward Learner Information System (LIS) management. The main objective of this study is to identify the attitude of School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisors towards the management of the system in terms of utilization, error resolution, and user support. Through the quota sampling method, 170 LIS users from the Division of Tangub City were identified as respondents. A researcher-made questionnaire was used to gather the data, which was then treated with statistical techniques such as mean and analysis of variance. The study revealed that system users have an average level of attitude towards the management of Learner Information System. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), with a 95% confidence level, revealed that there exists a significant difference in the attitude among the mean scores of School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers towards the management of the system.

**Keywords**: *learner information system, attitude, school heads, system administrators, class adviser*

**Acknowledgment**

With profound gratitude, the researcher would like to acknowledge the following people whose expertise, encouragement, and sincere support in any form have contributed to the fulfillment of this research.

To the Division Research Coordinator, Mr. Shieldon F. Honculada, for his encouragement and insights in completing this research.

To Mrs. Lorna C. Peňonal, Chief ES of the School Governance and Operations Division, Tangub City Division, for her support throughout this research.

To all those in a simple way shared their time, efforts, and treasure that contributed to the completion of this undertaking.

Above all, to God Almighty, for the gift of knowledge, wisdom, and strength from the beginning to the end of this endeavor.

## Introduction of the Research

To establish an accurate and reliable registry of learners and schools that will ensure the availability of data and information needed for planning and budgeting, allocation of resources, and setting operational targets to provide access to complete quality basic education, the Department of Education (DepEd) has implemented Enhanced Basic Education Information System (EBEIS) and Learner Information System (DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2015).

The system has three groups of users, with different accountabilities, at the school level, namely:

a. School Head/Representative – shall be responsible for implementing necessary policies and procedures in his/her school to ensure that the collection and processing of learner information is carried out by the guidelines provided in the policies and that sensitive learning information is protected from unauthorized access or disclosure (DepEd Order No. 26, 2015);
b. System Administrator – maintains school LIS/BEIS accounts (username and passwords) and mentors LIS/EBEIS online encoding (DepEd Memorandum No. 191, s. 2019), and;
c. School Personnel/Class Adviser – shall collect and update information on learners in the formal school, ensuring that the data captured is supported by appropriate legal documents (DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2015).

In SY 2021-2022, the Division of Tangub City was not able to finalize its EOSY status for the first time since the implementation of the system due to some schools not able to finalize their own EOSY status because of pending service requests to LIS Helpdesk lodged at the office of Information and Communications Technology Service (ICTS) at the Central Office. These requests were for resolution to errors committed by the system users at the school level.

These are the schools that have not finalized their EOSY 2021-2022 status:

Table 1. Schools With Unfinalized EOSY Status, SY 2021-2022

| **Elementary** | **JHS** | **SHS, 1st Semester** | **SHS, 2nd Semester** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Location ES | Bongabong NHS | Maquilao Integrated School | Bongabong NHS |
| Maloro Integrated School | Northwestern Mindanao State College of Science and Technology | Northwestern Mindanao State College of Science and Technology | Maquilao Integrated School |
| Maquilao Integrated School | Shekinah Learning School of Tangub City, Inc. | | Northwestern Mindanao State College of Science and Technology |
| Tangub City Central School | Tangub City NHS | | |

Finalization of the EOSY status of the school is very important because it locks the scholastic record of each learner officially enrolled in the school in a specific School Year. It will then be the basis for the computation of efficiency indicators, such as Promotion Rate,

Graduation Rate, Completion Rate, and Cohort Survival Rate at the Division, Region, and National levels.

Additionally, unresolved errors will carry through the next School Year and consequently affect the updating of the BOSY status of the learners.

Hence, proper management of the Learner Information System by the school system users (School Head, System Administrators, and Advisers) is required to have an accurate and reliable registry of learners which will ensure the availability of data and information needed for planning and budgeting, allocation of resources, and setting operational targets to provide access to complete quality basic education.

## Literature Review

The Learner Information System (LIS) was implemented in government schools and Community Learning Centers (CLCs) in September 2012 through DepEd Order Nos. 67, s. 2011 and 22, s. 2012. In School Year 2015-2016, all public and private elementary and secondary schools, state universities and colleges (SUCs) offering elementary and secondary education, and all programs under Alternative Learning System (ALS), including *Abot Alam*, were directed to register and update their learners' profiles through the LIS (DepEd Order No. 26, 2015).

Since its implementation in School Year 2012 up to School Year 2021, and after annual orientation about the different facilities of the system, the Division Planning Officer still encountered errors carried out by the school users.

There are two important timelines that the system follows to generate up-to-date learner information. First is the Beginning of the School Year (BOSY) updating, and second is the End-of-School Year (EOSY) updating.

Data encoded in the LIS at the Beginning of the School Year is the basis for resource allocation such as Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE), and teacher and classroom allocation (DepEd Order No. 45, s. 2017). It is also the basis for the computation of BOSY key performance indicators such as Gross Enrolment Rate, Net Enrolment Rate, Transition Rate, and Retention Rate. These indicators are called Access Indicators and are used to assess the level of participation of learners or school-age children in a particular level of education (Unnumbered DepEd Memorandum dated October 12, 2022).

On the other hand, End-of-School Year (EOSY) data give information on the academic accomplishment of the learners. This data shall be the basis for the computation of EOSY key performance indicators such as Promotion Rate, Graduation Rate, Completion Rate, and Cohort Survival Rate. These indicators are used to monitor the objectives of the education system to produce desired results at the least possible cost as well as measure the quality of the education system in general (Unnumbered DepEd Memorandum dated October 12, 2022).

In the School Year 2021-2022, there were a total of eight schools that were not able to finalize their end-of-school-year data. This is alarming since the DepEd Central Office is expecting every recognized school in the Philippines to finalize and lock in their EOSY data.

There are many factors affecting this gap. In a 2019 descriptive study conducted by Basilio, he found the following difficulties in using LIS and EBEIS: conflict in time between teaching and updating of LIS and EBEIS, no or poor and slow internet connection, no funds available intended for LIS and EBEIS, many class advisers are computer illiterate, internet

connection issues, spending own money to pay for internet load, lack of required legal documents needed to enroll the students in LIS, system errors, and delayed confirmation of transfers among others.

In another study by Matias and Timosan (2021), they found that the perceived usefulness of the system is a determining factor of behavioral intention and attitude. These results indicated that teachers believe that these services will enhance their job performance, and even if they experience difficulties in using the system, they still use it since they see it to be useful. The study concluded that a positive teacher attitude will be developed if teachers find the technology to be beneficial and straightforward.

According to Allport (1935), attitude is a mental or neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence on the individual's response to all objects and situations to which it is related.

Typically, when we refer to a person's attitude, we are trying to explain his or her behavior. In the context of this study, an LIS user's attitude toward the system encompasses his or her point of view about the system, how he or she feels about the system, as well as the actions he or she engages in because of his or her attitude.

As attitudes have a direct influence on behavior, it is important to understand the LIS users' attitudes in operating and managing the system for the Division Office to formulate policies and interventions that will support the School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers in updating and, consequently, finalizing their LIS data.

**Research Questions**

This quantitative study sought to identify the attitude of school-level system users towards the management of the Learner Information System (LIS) in the Division of Tangub City.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the school heads' attitudes towards the management of LIS?
2. What are the system administrators' attitudes towards the management of LIS?
3. What are the advisers' attitudes towards the management of LIS?
4. Is there a significant difference in the attitude among School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers towards the management of LIS in terms of:
    a. Utilization of the system
    b. Error resolution
    c. User support
5. What policy recommendations can be made from the findings of the study?

## Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was focused on the attitude of school heads, system administrators, and advisers in managing the Learner Information System. The participants were from different levels of education from the schools within the Division of Tangub City for the School Year 2022-2023.

School Head participants were assigned to a specific school with an assignment order signed by the Schools Division Superintendent. They were given the "School Head/Representative" account in the LIS.

System Administrators have a designation order duly signed by the School Head and a "System Admin" account in the LIS while class advisers are assigned with the "School Personnel" account in the LIS and handle classes.

## Research Methodology

This endeavor was quantitative research and used descriptive design to determine the attitude of school users toward the management of the Learner Information System. Descriptive research is a quantitative research method that attempts to collect quantifiable information for statistical analysis of the population sample (QuestionPro n.d.).

### a. Sampling Design

This study was conducted at the public elementary and secondary schools of Tangub City Division during the School Year 2022-2023.

The respondents of the study were 170 or 20.58% of the total. The population is segregated into three sub-groups according to their role in the management of the system. These sub-groups were the School Head, System Administrator, and Class Adviser. The number of respondents for each sub-group was computed using Slovin's formula and was selected through a non-probability sampling method called quota sampling.

Table 2. Distribution Sample

| User Account | Population | Sample |
|---|---|---|
| | N | n |
| School Head | 65 | 39 |
| System Admin | 75 | 43 |
| Class Advisers | 710 | 88 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 826 | 170 |

Table 2 presents the total identified respondents out of the population using Slovin's Formula with a 0.10 (10%) acceptable margin of error. Out of the total identified respondents 170, 39 were from the School Heads group, 43 were from the System Administrators group, and 88 were from the Class Advisers group.

**a. Methods of Data Collection**

A researcher-made questionnaire was used to gather the attitude of school LIS users towards the management of the system. The questionnaire was a Likert-type rating scale that consisted of 20 questions under three categories in system management, namely:

1. Utilization of the system
2. Resolution of errors
3. User support

Within this format, the respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with an attitude statement.

Table 3. **Survey Questions**

| Utilization of the System |
|---|
| *1. I need to access my LIS account regularly (more than 2 times a week).* |
| *2. I do not use other accounts, nor do I allow other people to use my account to access the LIS.* |
| *3. I must explore the system in my free time to familiarize myself with it.* |
| *4. I immediately make updates in the LIS as soon as it opens for the School Year. / I immediately enroll learners as soon as the School Head creates my class.* |

*5. I update the list of personnel in the system before the SY starts and/or when there are new personnel in the school. / If I'm transferred to another school, I bring my LIS account with me to my new station.*

*6. I know how to navigate the different facilities in the LIS (e.g. creation of classes, quick count, early registration, transfers, change requests, etc.)/ I know the policies behind the different tags of learners (e.g. Balik Aral, Repeater, Temporary Enrolled)*

*7. I am familiar with the different facilities available to my role as School Head/System. / As a class adviser, I know of my responsibilities and accountabilities in managing the LIS.*

*8. There are policies and procedures implemented in our school to ensure that the collection and processing of learner information is carried out by the guidelines set by DepEd.*

*9. The system reduces the time and effort of the school personnel for clerical tasks and records management.*

*10. The system is easy to use and navigate.*

Utilization of the System

*11. I give technical assistance to my teachers on how to resolve issues in the LIS without escalating it to higher offices. / When I commit an error, I know how to resolve it at my level without asking for assistance from other school personnel.*

*12. I immediately act on requests at my level of approval/confirmation. / I immediately perform housekeeping when I encounter an error/discrepancy in the learner's data based on supporting documents.*

*13. It is my responsibility to ensure data accuracy and completeness of the school's LIS. / It is my responsibility to request correction of learner's data even if the errors were made by previous teachers.*

*14. The errors I made in the system, whether resolved or not, have no bearing on my performance rating.*

*15. I require supporting documents before approving change requests. / I submit supporting documents needed for the approval of my requests.*

*16. I know what Request Form (RF) to use for every LIS issue. / I need to refer to my School Head/System Admins the issues I encounter with the system.*

User Support

*17. It's easy for me to ask a TA from Division personnel.*

*18. The process of sending RFs to the LIS Helpdesk is clear to me.*

*19. I have other support groups, aside from Division Office personnel, where I can ask TA about LIS.*

*20. I need regular Capacity Building in managing the LIS.*

This study used a five-point scale, namely: Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. Each scale was coded accordingly.

Table 4. Scale Code

| *Strongly Disagree* | *Disagree* | *Undecided* | *Agree* | *Strongly Agree* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Once the proposal is approved by the Division Research Team, the survey questionnaires will be administered to the respondents through Microsoft Form, the official online form app used by all DepEd personnel. Retrieval of the instrument was automatic once the respondents finished answering the survey questionnaire since data collection was done online.

The results of the study were analyzed and treated statistically using descriptive and inferential statistics.

b. Statistical Tools and Analysis of Data

The following statistical techniques were used in the analysis and interpretation of the results:

1. Mean. This was used to determine the average score per question. The higher the mean score, the higher the attitude it expresses towards each statement.

   The formula:

   $$\text{Mean} = \Sigma f/n$$

Where: $\Sigma f$ – the sum of all scores

$n$ – number of respondents

The mean scores will be interpreted as follows:

| *Descriptive Interpretation* | *Range of Means* | *Level of Attitude* |
|---|---|---|
| *Strongly Disagree* | 1.0 – 1.89 | Very Low |
| *Disagree* | 1.90 – 2.69 | Low |
| *Undecided* | 2.70 – 3.49 | Neutral |
| *Agree* | 3.50-4.29 | Average |
| *Strongly Agree* | 4.30– 5.00 | High |

2. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Analysis of Variance is the statistical procedure of comparing the means of a variable across several groups of individuals. This was used

to test the significant difference in attitude towards LIS management of different system users in terms of:

a. Utilization of the system
b. Error resolution
c. User Support

The research hypotheses are:

$H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude among School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers in terms of:

a. Utilization of the system
b. Error resolution
c. User support

$H_a$: There is a significant difference in the attitude among School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers in terms of:

a. Utilization of the system
b. Error resolution
c. User support

This research will use 95% as a significant level.

## Discussion of Results and Recommendations

This quantitative study sought to identify the attitude of school-level system users towards the management of the Learner Information System (LIS) in the Division of Tangub City using a self-made questionnaire distributed online to respondents through Microsoft Forms.

The collected data were analyzed using a Microsoft Excel worksheet and statistical computations were done using the Minitab software application.

A detailed description of the analysis and interpretation of the collected data are presented below.

Table 5. Profile of Respondents

| | *Variable* | *F* | *Percent* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Gender* | Male | 29 | 17.06% |
| | Female | 141 | 82.94% |
| *Length of Period in Current User Assignment* | | | |
| *School Heads* | Less than 6 mos | 4 | 10.53% |
| | 6 mos to 1 yr | 4 | 10.53% |
| | 1 yr to 1 yr & 6 ms | 4 | 10.53% |
| | 1 yr & 6 mos to 2 yrs | 2 | 5.26% |
| | More than 2 yrs | 25 | 64.10% |
| *System* | Less than 6 mos | 0 | 0.00% |
| *Administrators* | 6 mos to 1 yr | 2 | 4.76% |
| | 1 yr to 1 yr & 6 ms | 4 | 9.52% |
| | 1 yr & 6 mos to 2 yrs | 7 | 16.67% |
| | More than 2 yrs | 29 | 69.05% |
| *Class Advisers* | Less than 6 mos | 2 | 2.27% |
| | 6 mos to 1 yr | 5 | 5.68% |
| | 1 yr to 1 yr & 6 ms | 10 | 11.36% |
| | 1 yr & 6 mos to 2 yrs | 14 | 15.91% |
| | More than 2 yrs | 57 | 64.77% |

There was a total of 170 identified respondents using Slovin's Formula. Out of those respondents, 39 were from the School Head group (17 males and 22 females), 43 were from the System Administrators group (4 males and 39 females), and 88 were from the Class Advisers group (8 males and 80 females). There was a total of 29 male respondents and 141 female respondents.

As far as the length of the period in their current user assignment is concerned, most of the respondents reported having been assigned more than two years in their current system user account.

The overall mean per area is the following:

Table 6. Overall Mean Per Area

| *Area* | *Overall Mean* | *Descriptive Interpretation* | *Level of Attitude* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Utilization of the system* | 3.90 | Agree | Average |
| *Error Resolution* | 3.84 | Agree | Average |
| *User Support* | 3.84 | Agree | Average |
| *Total* | 3.87 | Agree | Average |

The above data shows that the overall mean among all the respondents is 3.87. It means that they have an average level of attitude towards the management of LIS.

Breaking it down by area, the respondents have an average level of attitude towards the utilization of the system, error resolution, and user support.

The following table shows the summary of responses per user group.

Table 7. Summary of Responses per System User Group

| *Area* | *School Heads* | *System Admin* | *Class Advisers* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Utilization of the System* | | | |
| *Mean Score* | 4.44 | 4.13 | 3.56 |
| *Descriptive Interpretation* | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |
| *Level of Attitude* | High | Average | Average |
| *Error Resolution* | | | |
| *Mean Score* | 4.33 | 4.10 | 3.48 |
| *Descriptive Interpretation* | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided |
| *Level of Attitude* | High | Average | Neutral |
| *User Support* | | | |
| *Mean Score* | 4.20 | 4.18 | 3.51 |
| *Descriptive Interpretation* | Agree | Agree | Agree |
| *Level of Attitude* | Average | Average | Average |
| *Total* | | | |
| *Mean Score* | 4.36 | 4.13 | 3.52 |
| *Descriptive Interpretation* | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |
| *Level of Attitude* | High | Average | Average |

According to the preceding data, the mean score of School Heads for system utilization is 4.44, which is interpreted as "Strongly Agree." Error Resolution and User Support received ratings of 4.33 and 4.20, respectively interpreted as "Strongly Agree" and "Agree". Hence, the level of attitude of School Heads toward system utilization is high while error resolution and user support are average.

The mean scores for each category for system administrators are 4.13, 4.10, and 4.18, respectively. Hence, the level of attitude of system administrators in the three areas of LIS management is average.

For Class Advisers, Utilization of the System has a mean score of 3.56 while User Support has a mean score of 3.51. Both scores have a descriptive interpretation of “Agree”. On the other hand, Error Resolution questions have a mean score of 3.48 which is interpreted as “Undecided”. Hence, the attitude of Class Advisers toward utilization of the system and user support is average while neutral for error resolution.

Statistical Analysis

A. Utilization of the System

**Analysis of Variance**

| Source | DF | Adj SS | Adj MS | F-Value | P-Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor | 2 | 3.996 | 1.99804 | 43.83 | 0.000 |
| Error | 27 | 1.231 | 0.04559 | | |
| Total | 29 | 5.227 | | | |

The P-value /0.000/ is smaller than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. With a 95% confidence level, we can say that there is a significant difference in attitude towards utilization of the system among School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers.

Class advisers have more work to do than the other two users. They enroll learners at the beginning of the school year, update learner profiles accordingly, input quarterly grades

into the system, update the end of the school-year status of each learner, and generate School Forms (SFs) for the checking of forms at the end of the school year.

On the other hand, School Heads only need to create classes at the beginning of the school year and finalize end-of-school-year data. They also need to approve or disapprove requests by advisers to update learners' profiles.

However, previous years' training on system management and administration was conducted for school heads since they are expected to relay it to their school personnel through School Learning Action Cells (SLAC).

B. Error Resolution

Analysis of Variance

| Source | DF | Adj SS | Adj MS | F-Value | P-Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor | 2 | 2.315 | 1.15752 | 11.88 | 0.001 |
| Error | 15 | 1.462 | 0.09745 | | |
| Total | 17 | 3.777 | | | |

The P-value /0.001/ is smaller than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. With a 95% confidence level, we can say that there is a significant difference in attitude toward error resolution in system management among School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers.

For the school year 2021-2022, most of the errors were committed by the Class Advisers. Most of these errors are on the wrong tagging of temporary enrolment. The resolution to this error involves the preparation of documents by the class adviser and compliance with Request Forms (RFs) by the School Heads. These documents will then be submitted to the Division Office for processing at the LIS Helpdesk Ticketing Platform.

This process of error resolution was oriented to the School Heads. This is because they are mandated for the overall management of the Learner Information System in their school. The role of the system administrators in this process is to inform the teacher of what documents to prepare to support the request.

C. User Support

Analysis of Variance

| Source | DF | Adj SS | Adj MS | F-Value | P-Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor | 2 | 1.2339 | 0.61693 | 27.82 | 0.000 |
| Error | 9 | 0.1996 | 0.02218 | | |
| Total | 11 | 1.4335 | | | |

The P-value /0.000/ is smaller than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. With a 95% confidence level, we can say that there is a significant difference in attitude toward user support of system management among School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers.

User support is the role of the system administrators as far as their school's LIS issues are concerned. They are constantly oriented with new processes and procedures on how to resolve issues at their level. If they are unable to resolve the issues at their level, that's the time they escalate the issue to the Division Office level through the endorsement of the School Head.

D. Overall Management of System

**Analysis of Variance**

| Source | DF | Adj SS | Adj MS | F-Value | P-Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor | 2 | 7.406 | 3.70305 | 68.34 | 0.000 |
| Error | 57 | 3.089 | 0.05419 | | |
| Total | 59 | 10.495 | | | |

The P-value /0.000/ is smaller than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. With a 95% confidence level, we can say that there is a significant difference in attitude toward system management among School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers.

After analysis and interpretation of collected data, the following findings emerged in the present study.

- The overall level of attitude of the respondents toward the management of LIS is average.

- The school head group has the highest level of attitude toward system management.
- Out of the three system user groups, the class adviser group has the lowest mean scores in all three categories, namely: utilization of the system, error resolution, and user support.
- The Class Advisers group has a neutral attitude towards error resolution.
- The category with the lowest mean for Class Advisers is Error Resolution. The following are the attitude statements under that category:
    - When I commit an error, I know how to resolve it at my level without asking for assistance from other school personnel.
    - I immediately perform housekeeping when I encounter an error/discrepancy in the learner's data based on supporting documents.
    - It is my responsibility to request correction of learner's data even if the errors were made by previous teachers.
    - The errors I made in the system, whether resolved or not, have no bearing on my performance rating.
    - I submit supporting documents needed for the approval of my requests.
    - I need to refer to my School Head/System Admins the issues I encounter with the system.

**Recommendations:**

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are formulated:

1. Include in the capacity building the Class Advisers on LIS management.
2. Strengthen the capacity of the school heads to give technical assistance to teachers in terms of system support and error resolution.

3. Strengthen the capacity of the System Administrators to support the School Heads in the overall management of the Learner Information System in their schools.
4. Include as topics for School Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions the policies related to system management per DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016. Accordingly, "*LAC sessions also cover DepEd thrusts and policies relevant to priority needs*."
5. Inculcate the importance of the roles of the different system user groups in LIS management.

**Dissemination and Advocacy Plans**

The results of this research will be disseminated in a forum with the presence of the different LIS users, namely: School Heads, System Administrators, and Class Advisers. Furthermore, a capacity-building budget proposal, which includes class advisers as participants, will be crafted for implementation in School Year 2023-2024.

Part of the next step is the crafting of an LIS Manual that will be used by all system users at the school level.

## References


Basilio, G. P. (2019, November 25). *Difficulties Met by Public Schools in the Division of Antique on the Use of Learner and Enhanced Basic Education Information Systems: Bases for Planning and Policy Formulation* [Conference presentation]. DepEd Research O'clock.

*Department of Education Memorandum No. 191, s. 2019 (August 7, 2019)*

*Department of Education Memorandum, Unnumbered (October 12, 2022)*

*Department of Education Order No. 22, s. 2012 (March 20, 2012)*

*Department of Education Order No. 26, s. 2015 (June 26, 2015)*

*Department of Education Order No. 35, s. 2016 (June 7, 2016). The Learning Action Cell as a K to 12 Basic Education Program School-Based Continuing Professional Development Strategy for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning.*

*Department of Education Order No. 45, s. 2017 (August 11, 2017)*

*Department of Education Order No. 67, s. 2011 (August 24, 2011).*

*Department of Education. (2023, January 30). MATATAG: DepEd's New Agenda to Resolve Basic Education Woes*

Hammad, Mohamed. (2018). *Re: Attitudes vs. Perceptions: Can these 2 terms be used interchangeably?* Retrieved from*:* *https://www.researchgate.net/post/Attitudes_vs_Perceptions_Can_theses_2_terms_be_used_interchangeably/5b2f75902018392c4d54da51/citation/download*.

Matias, J. B., & Timosan, J. (2021). *Examining Teachers' Use of Learning Information Systems (LIS) of the Basic Education Schools in the Philippines Using Structural Equation Modeling.* International Journal of Enterprise Information Systems. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJEIS.2021010104

*What is Attitude? Meaning, Components, Types, and Its Formation*. Tyonote. www.tyonote.com

## Annexes

Summary Responses per Group

| Question | School Heads | System Admin | Class Advisers |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I need to access my LIS account regularly (more than 2 times a week). | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |
| 2. I do not use other accounts, nor do I allow other people to use my account to access the LIS. | Agree | Agree | Undecided |
| 3. I must explore the system in my free time to familiarize myself with it. | Strongly Agree | Agre | Agree |
| 4. I immediately make updates in the LIS as soon as it opens for the School Year. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |
| 5. I update the list of personnel in the system before the SY starts and/or when there are new personnel in the school. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided |
| 6. I know how to navigate the different facilities in the LIS (e.g. creation of classes, quick count, early registration, transfers, change requests, etc.) | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |
| 7. I am familiar with the different facilities available to my role as School Head/System. | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | Agree |
| 8. There are policies and procedures implemented in our school to ensure that the | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| collection and processing of learner information is carried out by the guidelines set by DepEd. | | | |
| 9. The system reduces the time and effort of the school personnel for clerical tasks and records management. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |
| 10. The system is easy to use and navigate. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |
| 11. I give technical assistance to my teachers on how to resolve issues in the LIS without escalating it to higher offices. / When I commit an error, I know how to resolve it at my level without asking for assistance from other school personnel. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided |
| 12. I immediately act on requests at my level of approval/confirmation. / I immediately perform housekeeping when I encounter an error/discrepancy in the learner's data based on supporting documents. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |
| 13. It is my responsibility to ensure data accuracy and completeness of the school's LIS. / It is my responsibility to request correction of learner's data even if the errors were made by previous teachers. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14. The errors I made in the system, whether resolved or not, have no bearing on my performance rating. | Agree | Agree | Undecided |
| 15. I require supporting documents approving change requests. / I submit supporting documents needed for the approval of my requests. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Agree |
| 16. I know what Request Form (RF) to use for every LIS issue. / I need to refer to my School Head/System Admins the issues I encounter with the system. | Agree | Agree | Agree |
| 17. It's easy for me to ask a TA from Division personnel. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided |
| 18. The process of sending RFs to the LIS Helpdesk is clear to me. | Agree | Agree | Undecided |
| 19. I have other support groups, aside from Division Office personnel, where I can ask TA about LIS. | Agree | Agree | Agree |
| 20. I need regular Capacity Building in managing the LIS. | Agree | Agree | Agree |