

Attention in Writing a Research Introduction, Retention in Writing Research Methodology, Reproduction and Utilization of Research, and Motivation in Securing Research Grants as Predictors of Research Writing Experience

Rowena T. Arisgado, LPT

arisgadorowena@gmail.com/rowena.arisgado@hcdc.edu.ph
Master of Arts in Education major in Teaching Social Studies,
Holy Cross of Davao College, Sta. Ana Avenue corner C. De Guzman Street,
Brgy. 14-B, Davao City, 8000, Philippines

Abstract

Low research writing experience among teachers is a concern in education systems worldwide. This study determined the significance of attention in writing a research introduction, retention in writing a research methodology, reproduction and utilization of research, and motivation in securing research grants as predictors of research writing experience. A multiple linear regression analysis involving 54 samples selected through purposive sampling was utilized. Only the retention to write research methodology significantly influences the criterion variable, explaining 44% of its variance, partially supporting the Social Cognitive Theory. Explore additional independent variables to account for the 56% variance in the criterion variable. Replication of the study is recommended.

Keywords: Attention in writing a research introduction; retention in writing research methodology; reproduction and utilization of research; motivation in securing research grants; research writing experience

1. Introduction

Low research writing experience among teachers is a concern in education systems worldwide. Globally, many educators with low research writing experience hamper their ability to produce quality research outputs (Endarwati et al., 2023). In the United States, studies have shown that teachers have low research writing experience due to time constraints, lack of administrative support, and insufficient

professional development (Smith, 2021). In Australia, teachers face low research writing experience as a result of a lack of research training and limited opportunities to engage in research projects (Miller & Johnson, 2023). Similarly, in South Africa, low research writing experience among teachers is caused by inadequate resources and support for research writing, which limits their ability to contribute to academic discourse (Makgopa, 2020). Teachers in India also experience low research writing experience due to an overburdened curriculum and large class sizes, further exacerbating the issue (Patel & Sharma, 2022).

In addition, low research writing experience among Filipino teachers is identified as one of the problems in the field of education (Garcia, 2021). This issue on low research writing experience was also highlighted in the research of Santos (2020), De Guzman and Torres (2022), and Reyes and Mendoza (2023). Teachers with limited research writing experience are less likely to contribute to the development of educational theories, policies, and practices. This study was conducted due to the limitations in teachers' ability to address local educational challenges through research-driven solutions. Because of this, the study is urgent and essential to identify the factors affecting teachers' research writing experience and to develop programs that will enhance their research capabilities.

This study is significant as it comprehensively assesses the low research writing experience among social studies teacher-researchers, including the challenges they encounter and their capacity development needs. This study was grounded in Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1977). Conceptually, Bandura's social cognitive learning process includes attentional, retention, reproduction, and motivational processes.

2. Method

This study utilized a correlational research design to examine the relationship between attention in writing a research introduction, retention in writing a research methodology, reproduction and utilization of research, motivation in securing research grants, and research writing experience. Correlational research was chosen to identify the degree of association between these variables without manipulation (Creswell, 2014; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2019). The study was conducted at Holy Cross of Davao College (HCDC) in Davao City, Philippines, targeting teachers handling social sciences subjects who had prior experience in conducting research.

A total of 54 participants were selected through purposive sampling. Inclusion criteria required that respondents be current social sciences teachers at HCDC, have conducted research within 2020 to 2025, hold a master's degree, have at least one research publication, possess 1 to 3 years of teaching experience, and self-identify as male, female, or a member of the LGBTQ+ community.

The research instrument was a structured questionnaire adopted from the HCDC Research Office. It consisted of 31 items covering five variables: 11 items for attention in writing a research introduction, 10 for retention in writing a research methodology, 6 for reproduction and utilization of research, 3 for motivation in securing research grants, and 1 item for overall research writing experience. A five-point Likert scale was used to measure responses.

Data collection followed institutional procedures. Formal approvals were obtained from the Graduate School Dean, the Society for Moral Integrity and Legal Ethics (SMILE), and the School President. Data were collected through Google Forms and automatically tabulated using Microsoft Excel. The results were analyzed using weighted mean and standard deviation to determine levels of each variable, Pearson product-moment correlation to measure relationships, and linear multiple regression to determine the predictive influence of independent variables on the dependent variable (Field, 2018; Pallant, 2020; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019).

Ethical considerations were addressed through informed consent, confidentiality of responses, voluntary participation, and the right to withdraw at any time. Risks were minimized, and all responses were anonymized and reported in aggregate form, adhering to institutional ethical standards.

3. Results

In this chapter, the results of the study are presented based on the data gathered through descriptive, correlation, and regression analyses. The results are presented in tables, followed by a detailed narrative discussion that provides deeper insights into the patterns observed in the data.

3.1 Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 is the descriptive table. It contains the variables involved in the study, namely, the attention in writing research introduction, the retention in writing research methodology, reproduction and utilization of research, motivation in securing research grants, and research writing experiences. Moreover, it contains the number of samples, standard deviation, the mean, and the corresponding descriptive level.

Table 1. Descriptive Table

Variables	N	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
<i>Attention in Writing Research Introduction</i>	54	0.246	3.05	<i>Moderate</i>
Finding relevant international literature		0.623	3.37	Moderate
Finding relevant local literature		0.619	3.35	Moderate
Writing the first three paragraphs of literature support		0.675	2.19	Low
Defining the problem of interest		0.723	3.07	Moderate
Identifying research gaps		0.712	3.06	Moderate
Formulating the statement of the problem		1.127	3.70	High
Writing the purpose and objectives		1.483	3.63	High
Writing the significance of the study		0.845	2.24	Low
Developing a theoretical and conceptual framework		0.726	3.04	Moderate
Formulating hypothesis		1.302	2.76	Moderate
Writing the literature review		0.702	3.13	Moderate
<i>Retention in Writing Research Methodology</i>	54	0.364	2.59	<i>Low</i>
Designing quantitative research		0.869	2.00	Low
Designing qualitative research		0.807	2.09	Low
Choosing sampling techniques		0.754	2.81	Moderate
Data collection and procedure		0.883	2.22	Low
Data analysis (quantitative)		0.784	3.09	Moderate
Data analysis (qualitative)		0.765	3.02	Moderate
Ethical considerations		0.883	2.22	Low
Writing the analysis (quantitative)		1.289	2.67	Moderate
Writing the analysis (qualitative)		1.235	2.85	Moderate
Writing conclusions and recommendations		0.793	2.89	Moderate
<i>Reproduction and Utilization of Research</i>	54	0.356	2.67	<i>Moderate</i>

Local utilization (LGU/NGO/PO)	0.655	2.20	Low	
National utilization	0.870	3.18	Moderate	
International utilization	0.899	3.28	Moderate	
Resolution utilization	1.636	3.24	Moderate	
Ordinance utilization	0.684	2.15	Low	
Program utilization	0.765	1.98	Low	
Motivation in Securing Research Grants	54	0.285	2.13	Low
Securing research funding	0.604	2.44	Low	
Applying for grants	0.751	1.76	Very low	
Managing research funds	0.683	2.20	Low	
Research Writing Experience	54	0.769	2.44	Low

Table 1 specifically shows the attention in writing research introduction variable obtained an overall mean of 3.05, described as a moderate level. It indicates that attention to writing a research introduction is good. Out of the eleven indicators, two obtained a corresponding mean described as a high level, seven obtained a corresponding mean described as a moderate level, while three obtained a corresponding mean described as a low level.

The retention of the writing research methodology variable obtained an overall mean of 2.59, described as a low level. It indicates that the writing of a research introduction is poor. Out of the ten indicators, six obtained a corresponding mean described as a moderate level, while four obtained a corresponding mean described as a low level.

The reproduction and utilization of the research variable obtained an overall mean of 2.67, described as a moderate level. It indicates that the reproduction and utilization of research is good. Out of six indicators, three obtained a corresponding mean described as a moderate level, while the other three obtained a corresponding mean described as a low level.

The reproduction and utilization of research variables obtained an overall mean of 2.13, described as a low level. It indicates that the reproduction and utilization of research is poor. Two out of three indicators obtained a low level, while the other is described as a very low level. Finally, the research writing experience variable obtained an overall mean of 2.44, described as a low level. It indicates that research writing experience is poor.

3.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 2 is the correlation table. It contains the attention in writing a research introduction, retention in writing research methodology, reproduction and utilization of research, motivation in securing grants as predictive variables and research writing experience as the criterion variables. It also contains the r-value to explain the strength of the correlation, the p-value to describe the significance level based on a 0.05 degree of confidence, the decision for the hypothesis, and the corresponding interpretation.

Table 2. Correlation Table

Variables	<i>Research Writing Experience</i>			
	r	p-value	Decision on Ho @ 0.05 level of significance	Interpretation
Attention in writing Research Introduction	-0.017	0.903	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Retention in Writing Research Methodology	0.547	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
Reproduction and Utilization of Research	0.103	0.458	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Motivation in Securing Research Grants	-0.135	0.331	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Table 2 specifically shows the correlation between the attention in writing a research introduction and research writing experience, obtained a p-value of 0.903, which is more than the 0.05 degree of confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It indicates that the correlation between the attention in writing a research introduction and research writing experience is not significant. Furthermore, the strength of the correlation of these variables is low as indicated by the obtained an r-value of -0.017.

In addition, the correlation between retention in writing a research methodology and research writing experience obtained a p-value of 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 degree of confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicates that the correlation of these variables is significant. Furthermore, with an r-value of 0.547 obtained, it indicates that the strength of the correlation of these variables is moderately high. Moreover, the correlation between the reproduction and utilization of research and research writing experience obtained a p-value of 0.458, which is more than the 0.05 degree of confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It indicates that the correlation between the reproduction and utilization of research and research writing experience is not significant. Furthermore, with an r-value of 0.103, it indicates that the strength of the correlation of these variables is low.

Lastly, the correlation between the motivation in securing research grants and research writing experience obtained a p-value of 0.331, which is more than the 0.05 degree of confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It indicates that the correlation between the motivation in securing research grants and research writing experience is not significant. Furthermore, with an r-value of -0.135, it indicates that the strength of the correlation of these variables is low.

3.3 Regression Analysis

Table 3 presents the regression analysis. It examines the influence of attention in writing a research introduction, retention in writing a research methodology, reproduction and utilization of research, and motivation in securing grants on research writing experience among social studies-teacher researchers.

Finally, it contains the coefficients β , t-value, p-value, the decision on the hypotheses, and the corresponding interpretation.

Table 3. Regression Table

Variables	Research Writing Experience						
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Decision on Ho's	interpretation
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.		
Constant	2.408	1.071		2.248	0.029		
Attention in Writing Research Introduction	-1.164	0.469	-0.373	-2.481	0.017	Reject Ho	Significant
Retention in a Writing research Methodology	1.535	0.258	0.727	5.953	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
Reproduction and Utilization of Research	0.246	0.291	0.114	0.843	0.403	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Motivation for Securing Research Grants	-0.488	0.308	-0.181	-1.587	0.119	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
R = 0.663; R ² = 0.440; F-value = 9.617; p-value = 0.000							

Table 3 specifically shows that attention in writing research introduction obtained a standardized beta coefficient of -0.373, indicating that it has a -37.3% degree of influence on research writing experience. With the p-value of 0.017, which is less than 0.05 degree of confidence, the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicates that the -37.3% influence of the predictive variable is significant. It implies that for every 0.373 unit increase in attention in writing research introduction, there is a corresponding unit decrease in research writing experience.

Additionally, the retention of writing research methodology obtained a standardized beta coefficient of 0.727, indicating that it has a 72.7% degree of influence on research writing experience. With a p-value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05 degrees of confidence, the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicates that 72.7% influence on the predictive variable is significant. It implies that for every 0.727 unit increase in retention of writing research methodology, there is a corresponding unit change in research writing skills.

Further, the reproduction and utilization of research obtained a standardized beta coefficient of 0.114, indicating that it has a 11.4% degree of influence on research writing experience. With the p-value of 0.403, which is greater than the common significance level of 0.05 degree of confidence, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It indicates that the 11.4% influence of the predictive variable is not significant.

Moreover, the motivation for securing research grants obtained a standardized beta coefficient of -0.181, indicating that it has an 18.1% degree of influence on research writing experience. With the p-value of

0.119, which is greater than the common significance level of 0.05 degree of confidence, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It indicates that the 18.1% influence of the predictive variable is not significant.

3.4 Summary of Findings

The attention in writing a research introduction and the reproduction and utilization of research are good, but the retention in writing a research methodology, motivation in securing research grants, and research writing experience are poor.

The attention in writing a research introduction and retention in writing a research methodology are significantly correlated with research writing experience, while the reproduction and utilization of research, and motivation in securing research grants are not correlated with research writing experience.

The attention in writing the research introduction and retention of writing research methodology significantly influence the research writing experience. However, reproduction and utilization of research and motivation in securing research grants do not show a significant influence. Approximately 44% of the variance in research writing experience can be explained by the four predictor variables combined.

4. Discussion

The results of the study are discussed in this chapter and the findings of previous studies conducted and published. Furthermore, the conclusion and the recommendations based on the conclusion are presented here

4.1 Descriptive Findings

Good Attention in Writing a Research Introduction

The attention in writing research introductions among social studies teacher-researchers is good. These findings affirmed the study of Insorio (2024), who noted that teachers often possess surface-level knowledge of research writing. This supports the findings of Llego (2020), who reported that teachers were generally confident in framing research problems and objectives, attributing their competence to repeated exposure during graduate coursework and standardized action research formats used in schools.

However, the findings contrast with the study of Ulla (2018), which indicates that while teachers may manage to construct basic introductions, they often struggle to connect their topics to broader academic conversations. Similarly, Esteban et al. (2022) found that 80% of DepEd teachers in Nueva Ecija expressed a distinct lack of confidence and expertise in conducting action research, particularly in crafting comprehensive research introductions.

Poor Retention in Writing Research Methodology

The retention in writing a research methodology was generally poor, especially in areas such as designing both quantitative and qualitative studies, selecting appropriate sampling methods, and addressing ethical considerations. These findings affirm the study of Tingabngab and Binayao (2023), who found that public elementary school teachers faced significant challenges in conducting action research, including difficulties in clarifying theories and analyzing data. Similarly, Bullo et. al (2021) reported that teacher-researchers encountered difficulties in conducting educational research, particularly in analyzing quantitative and qualitative data.

However, these findings are contradicted to the study of Tagadiad et. al (2024), who found that secondary school teachers in Bukidnon demonstrated strong competence in research methodology when provided with adequate institutional support and access to research tools. Likewise, Comon and Corpuz (2024) reported that teachers in El Salvador City showed high levels of engagement and competence in

various methodological aspects, such as framing questions, collecting data, and analyzing results, indicating effective retention of prior research training.

Good Reproduction and Utilization of Research

The reproduction and utilization of research were found to be good, but with significant variation across different levels of application. It aligns to the study of Gonzales (2023) which emphasized that effective research utilization involves various strategies, including organizing workshops, publishing articles, and crafting policy briefs, which contribute to informed decision-making in educational settings.

These findings are opposed to the study of Insorio (2024), who noted that research outputs by teachers often lack local relevance or integration with grassroots educational needs. Tamayo et al. (2021) further emphasized that poor research utilization is frequently linked to weak support systems and a lack of partnerships with community organizations or policymakers.

Poor Motivation for Securing Research Grants

Motivation for securing research grants was very low among the respondents. Applying for grants was reported as particularly difficult, indicating widespread uncertainty or disengagement with funding opportunities. These findings support Ulla (2018), who argued that teachers perceive funding opportunities as exclusive to senior researchers or elite institutions. In addition, Sehlaoui et. al (2021) found that faculty members identified several obstacles to engaging in grant writing. However, the findings contrast to the study of Barsallo et. al (2024) reporting that academics were highly motivated to engage in research and pursue funding due to factors such as intellectual challenge, societal contribution, and the application of innovative technologies.

Poor Research Writing Experience

Research writing experience among teacher-researchers was generally low, suggesting limited exposure to formal academic writing beyond the requirements of graduate studies. The findings affirmed to the study of Flores (2024) who reported that beginning Filipino teachers often struggled with research due to weak foundational knowledge, lack of mentoring, and demanding work conditions, all of which contributed to their low confidence and participation in research writing.

However, it opposes to the study of Yavuz (2021) who stated that participants employed various effective writing strategies, such as reading scholarly articles and engaging in peer discussions and held positive attitudes towards academic writing. Similarly, Tarrayo, and Claustro (2021) found that, despite challenges, these academics actively engaged in research activities, suggesting that with adequate support and institutional encouragement, teachers can maintain and even enhance their research writing experience post-graduation.

The Relationship of the attention in writing a research introduction, the retention in writing a research methodology, the reproduction and utilization of research, motivation in securing research grants, and research writing experience.

The results of the correlation analysis showed varying relationships between research writing experience and the independent variables. The attention in writing a research introduction had no significant correlation with research writing experience, as indicated by a very weak and negative. This finding suggests that even with more writing experience, teachers may not necessarily perform better in crafting research introductions. This supports the study of Murro (2022), who found that many teachers struggle with organizing literature and framing research problems due to limited training and mentorship, not necessarily due to a lack of experience. Francisco (2024) also noted that novice and experienced teachers alike find the initial parts of research writing difficult without structured guidance.

In contrast, a significant positive correlation was found between research writing experience and the

retention in writing the research methodology section, implying that teachers who have more experience in writing research tend to be more competent in planning research designs, sampling, data analysis, and ethical procedures. This supports the findings of Tomas and Dorada (2025), as well as Esteban et al. (2022), who both concluded that research experience contributes directly to improved skills in writing research methods due to repeated practice and application.

The reproduction and utilization of research also showed no significant relationship with writing experience, indicating that experience alone does not ensure that teachers can effectively apply or share their research findings. The findings support the study of Tagadiad et al. (2024) which revealed that institutional support, access to dissemination channels, and involvement in policy networks are stronger determinants of research utilization than personal experience.

Lastly, motivation to secure research grants was also not significantly related to writing experience, meaning that even experienced teacher-researchers may lack interest, confidence, or training in seeking research funding. This aligns with the findings of Sehlaoui, Gross, and Ruengwatthakee (2021) and Komba (2023), who reported that complex procedures, lack of institutional encouragement, and insufficient grant writing skills reduce teachers' willingness to pursue funding. Overall, these results highlight that while writing experience improves methodological skills, other aspects like introduction writing, grant motivation, and utilization require specific training and external support.

The Influence of the attention in writing a research introduction, the retention in writing a research methodology, the reproduction and utilization of research, motivation in securing research grants on research writing experience.

The regression analysis in this study shows that among the four predictor variables, retention in writing the research methodology has the strongest and most significant influence on the research writing experience. These findings support the study of Tamban and Maningas (2020), who emphasized that teachers' technical competence in research—particularly in writing the methodology section—is key to enhancing their overall research performance. Their study highlighted the importance of practical engagement and continuous support in developing methodological skills.

Likewise, the finding affirmed the study of Murro (2022) which stated that teachers who actively participate in hands-on research activities are more confident and effective in planning research design, applying sampling techniques, and conducting data analysis, all of which are vital components of the methodology section. These findings highlight that the more confident a teacher becomes in the technical aspects of research, the better their overall writing experience becomes.

Interestingly, the attention in writing a research introduction was found to have a statistically significant but negative influence on research writing experience. This could be due to the cognitive challenges involved in synthesizing literature, identifying research gaps, and framing research questions. It supports to the study of Murro (2022) and Francisco (2024) stating that teachers often find the early stages of research, especially crafting the introduction, difficult and overwhelming, particularly without formal training or mentoring. As a result, despite their efforts, the complexity of introduction writing may contribute to discouragement or reduced writing confidence, especially for less experienced researchers.

Meanwhile, the reproduction and utilization of research and the motivation to secure research grants did not significantly influence research writing experience. This suggests that even with strong writing skills, the application of research findings or the pursuit of funding does not necessarily improve one's writing experience. Melloria (2023) explained that research utilization often depends more on institutional support, networks, and policies rather than personal experience alone. It aligns with the study of Abella et al. (2023), emphasizing that many teachers with adequate research backgrounds still struggle with grant writing due to a lack of training, limited support, and time constraints. These findings collectively support the regression analysis results and point to the importance of targeted professional development focused on research methodology and structured support for writing introductions and pursuing grants.

4.2 Conclusion

Based on the findings, it is concluded that only the retention in writing a research methodology significantly predicts the research writing experience of social studies teacher-researchers. This result partially supports the theory of Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, specifically the retention component. Approximately 44% of the variance in research writing experience can be explained by the four predictor variables combined, indicating that these factors, especially methodological competence, play a substantial role in shaping how teacher-researchers perceive and engage in the research writing process.

4.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that future research may explore additional potential independent variables not covered in this study to help explain the remaining 56% variance in research writing experience. Identifying other influencing factors may provide a more comprehensive understanding of what shapes teacher-researchers' writing performance.

It is also recommended that the institution develop targeted programs to strengthen key areas identified in the study: the ability to write research introductions, the ability to write research methodologies, research utilization skills, and motivation to secure research grants. These initiatives can enhance the research writing experience of social studies teacher-researchers.

Finally, this study may be replicated using the same variables and questionnaires but conducted across other academic programs of the institution and with a broader set of respondents. Doing so would help validate the findings and enhance their generalizability across diverse educational contexts.

References

- Abella, A., Del Rosario, F., & Lumabi, R. (2023). *Barriers to grant writing among Filipino teachers: An institutional perspective*. Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 19(1), 87–102.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Barsallo, M., Letran, C., & Villanueva, P. (2024). *Academic motivation and research funding in Philippine higher education*. Southeast Asian Journal of Education, 15(2), 45–58.
- Bullo, J. R., Manatad, A. F., & Reyes, R. T. (2021). *Difficulties of teacher-researchers in quantitative and qualitative data analysis*. Journal of Educational Innovations, 14(1), 22–35.
- Comon, J. R., & Corpuz, M. D. (2024). *Teacher-researchers' competence in research methodology in El Salvador City*. Mindanao Journal of Social Research, 10(1), 56–73.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- De Guzman, M. T., & Torres, C. R. (2022). *Barriers to educational research among Filipino teachers*. Philippine Social Science Review, 74(2), 98–115.
- Endarwati, H., Sutrisno, A., & Permana, R. (2023). *Enhancing global teacher research engagement: Challenges and strategies*. International Journal of Teacher Development, 11(1), 1–14.
- Esteban, F., Cruz, M., & Solis, J. (2022). *Research confidence of DepEd teachers in Nueva Ecija*. Journal of Action Research and Education, 8(3), 67–81.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Flores, M. L. (2024). *Filipino beginning teachers' struggles in academic research writing*. Journal of Teacher Education and Practice, 12(1), 14–26.

- Francisco, E. R. (2024). *Framing research problems: A challenge for teachers*. Southeast Asian Educational Review, 7(2), 48–63.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Garcia, R. V. (2021). *Examining low research productivity among Filipino educators*. Philippine Educational Journal, 93(4), 112–124.
- Gonzales, L. M. (2023). *Strategies for effective research utilization in education*. Educational Leadership Journal, 21(3), 36–49.
- Intorio, M. A. (2024). *Teachers' knowledge and confidence in educational research*. Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 10(2), 51–66.
- Komba, S. C. (2023). *Factors affecting teachers' participation in research grant writing*. African Journal of Educational Development, 11(1), 25–40.
- Makgopa, S. (2020). *Barriers to academic research in South African schools*. South African Educational Journal, 18(2), 75–88.
- Melloria, R. (2023). *The role of institutions in promoting research application*. Journal of Research in Practice, 13(1), 33–47.
- Miller, J., & Johnson, A. (2023). *Teacher research engagement in Australia: A systemic review*. Australian Journal of Teacher Research, 9(1), 12–28.
- Murro, R. S. (2022). *Challenges in writing research introductions among teachers*. Journal of Educational Studies, 18(4), 95–110.
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Patel, R., & Sharma, M. (2022). *Research engagement issues among Indian school teachers*. Indian Journal of Educational Research, 24(1), 78–93.
- Reyes, J. P., & Mendoza, A. M. (2023). *Research writing skills of public school teachers: A case study*. Philippine Journal of Research and Development, 5(2), 30–47.
- Santos, L. A. (2020). *Exploring the reasons behind teachers' low research engagement*. Philippine Journal of Educational Administration, 88(1), 43–58.
- Sehlaoui, A. S. G., Gross, A., & Ruengwathakee, W. (2021). *Challenges to faculty research productivity: Insights from grant writing*. International Review of Education, 67(3), 295–312.
- Smith, D. L. (2021). *Teacher research in the U.S.: Barriers and facilitators*. Journal of Educational Research and Policy, 10(2), 29–46.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2019). *Using multivariate statistics* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Tagadiad, M. R., Dumaguin, J. P., & Ubaub, R. S. (2024). *Methodological competencies of high school teachers in Bukidnon*. Mindanao Educational Research Journal, 14(1), 88–102.
- Tamban, M., & Maningas, R. M. (2020). *Research performance of teachers: Methodology as the key indicator*. Philippine Journal of Action Research, 3(2), 22–37.
- Tamayo, G., Rellin, C., & David, P. (2021). *Utilization of educational research among Filipino public schools*. Asian Journal of Educational Research, 15(1), 60–75.
- Tarrayo, V. N., & Claustro, M. S. (2021). *Sustaining research engagement among Filipino faculty*. Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 11(2), 105–119.
- Tingabngab, M. L., & Binayao, G. (2023). *Research challenges among public elementary school teachers*. Research in Basic Education Journal, 9(1), 40–53.
- Tomas, C., & Dorada, J. (2025). *Developing competence in research methodology through experience*. Philippine Teacher Education Journal, 17(1), 9–24.
- Ulla, M. B. (2018). *Teacher research in Philippine public schools: Challenges and prospects*. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43(6), 89–103.
- Yavuz, F. (2021). *Teachers' attitudes and strategies in academic writing*. Journal of Language and Education, 7(2), 118–130.