

Development of Research Competency among Grade 12 Students in Schools in Padre Garcia

Mary Rosbel C. Gajiran, Marie Rose F. Oesman, Clarissa O. Valencia and Ernesto C. Mandigma Jr

Abstract: This research aims to identify the extent of exposure of senior high school students to research resources, to determine their research writing competence in various aspects of research, and to specify the relationship that exists between these two variables. The study used the descriptive correlational method of research through survey questionnaires administered to Grade 12 students of Holy Family Academy and Padre V. Garcia National High School. The respondents should have taken already any research subject to qualify. Results revealed that students are least exposed to lectures, seminars, and trainings and that the main concern of students in research writing is their perception of research writing and their own research writing skills. Furthermore, it was found out that there is a significant relationship between the students' exposure to the various research materials and their various research writing competence. Based on the findings, it was recommended that the school should expose students to lectures, trainings and seminars on research writing in school or even outside school.

Citation: Mary Rosbel C. Gajiran, Marie Rose F. Oesman, Clarissa O. Valencia and Ernesto C. Mandigma Jr. 2018. Development of Research Competency among Grade 12 Students in Schools in Padre Garcia. International Journal of Recent Innovations in Academic Research, 2(8): 91-104.

Copyright: Mary Rosbel C. Gajiran, Marie Rose F. Oesman, Clarissa O. Valencia and Ernesto C. Mandigma Jr., **Copyright©2018**. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Introduction

The Philippine educational system is continuously striving to cater the best strategy to help the country. With this, the system had been embracing new challenges that can help the students enhance their critical thinking skills and develop their abilities. One of the challenges is the introduction of research to the senior high school students. With this new strategy, the system is giving the students new opportunities to practice their analyzing skills and train them in solving problems.

Research plays a crucial role in developing students. It gives experiences that allows the students to better understand the use of information, balance work, and collaboration. Research also allows the students to reach beyond academia. It allows them to have tolerance for obstacles, self- confidence, and learning to work independently (Petrella and Jung).

Furthermore, research provides direct benefit to the students. It helps them discover their passion and determine their area of interest (Madan, 2013). By engaging in first hand research, students find it easier to understand the rationale of other studies. In the K-12 curriculum, research is one of the subjects in senior high school which aims to develop the

student's critical thinking and problem solving skills. Research output of students is either quantitative or qualitative. As a culminating activity in research, students need to present their research output through oral defense. To support this, Republic Act No. 2067 integrates, coordinates, and intensifies scientific and technological research and development and to foster invention especially for SHS students to develop their research writing abilities, problem-solving and critical thinking.

However, it is noticeable that most senior high schools students, who are expected to have been already equipped with the necessary writing skills, tend to struggle in terms of research writing and its processes. Skill insufficiency leads them to detachment from the research writing processes (Smith and Hepworth, 2007). Although research is highly contributory to positive societal changes, students seem to not share the same view. They look at research as a taxing activity.

Research, which is anchored in inquiry-based learning, propels students to employ their higher order thinking skills in searching for solutions to existing problems. Henceforth, understanding the background on how students approach the research writing process is essential in providing quality developmental training activities to develop research competency.

Methodology

The study used the descriptive correlational method of research. The researchers made a questionnaire which was then validated and tried out. The validated questionnaires were administered to senior high school students who have taken any research subject. Likert-scale was used to identify the ratings of the respondents in terms of their exposure to research resources and their research writing competence in various areas. Frequency and mean distribution and Pearson correlate were the statistical tools used in quantifying the data gathered.

Results and Discussions

1. Profile of the Student-Respondents

1.1. In Terms of Gender

Table 1. Gender Profile of the Student-Respondents

Gender	School A			School B			Total		
	F	P	R	F	P	R	F	P	R
Male	57	42.22	2	11	45.83	2	68	42.77	2
Female	78	57.78	1	13	54.17	1	91	57.23	1
Total	135	100		24	100	2.5	159	100	

Legend: F = Frequency P = Percentage R = Rank

As seen in the table, female made the highest frequency count of 78 or 57.78% at rank 1 for School A while male made the least frequency count of 57 or 42.22% at rank 2.

For School B, female also gained the highest frequency count of 13 or 54.17% at rank 1 while male yielded the least frequency count of 11 or 45.83% at rank 2.

In totality, female garnered the highest frequency count of 91 or 57.23% at rank 1 while male obtained the least frequency count of 68 or 42.77% at rank 2.

1.2. In Terms of School

Table 2. School Profile of the Student-Respondents

School	F	P	R
School A	135	84.91	1
School B	24	15.09	2
Total	159	100	

Legend: F = Frequency P = Percentage R = Rank

As presented in Table 2, School A made the highest frequency count of 135 or 84.91% at rank 1 while School B got the least frequency count of 24 or 15.09% at rank 2.

1.3. In Terms of Strand

Table 3. Strand Profile of the Student-Respondents

Strand	School A			School B			Total		
	F	P	R	F	P	R	F	P	R
ABM	29	21.48	3	0	0	3	29	18.24	3
HUMMS	75	55.56	1	0	0	2	75	47.17	1
STEM	31	22.96	2	24	100	1	55	34.59	2
Total	135	100		24	100	2.5	159	100	

Legend: F = Frequency P = Percentage R = Rank

As stated in Table 3, HUMMS Strand for School A got the highest frequency count of 75 or 55.56% at rank 1 while ABM Strand gained the least frequency count of 29 or 21.48% at rank 3.

With respect to the strand of the student-respondents from School B, all of them (24 or 100% at rank 1) were from STEM.

2. Extent of the Student's Exposure to Various Research Resources

2.1. In Terms of Reading Materials

Table 4. Extent of the Students' Exposure to Reading Materials

Items	School A			School B			Total		
	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
The school has varied reading materials available for my reading writing.	3.07	A	3	2.79	A	5	3.03	A	3
The school has reading materials with contents relevant to my research topic.	2.96	A	4	2.83	A	4	2.94	A	4
The reading materials in school are accessible and available for use.	3.24	A	1	3.17	A	3	3.23	A	1
The school provides updated reading materials.	2.87	A	5	2.71	A	6	2.85	A	6
In research-related subjects, we are given the chance to utilize the	3.14	A	2	3.33	A	2	3.17	A	2

schools available reading materials.									
I have access to other reading related materials in places outside schools like community library and home.	2.82	A	6	3.78	A	1	2.91	A	5
Composite mean	3.02	A		3.10	A		3.02	A	

Legend: HA = Highly Agree; VI = Verbal Interpretation; A = Agree WM = Weighted Mean; R = Rank

The Table 4 shows the extent of students’ exposure to reading materials. As gleaned in the table, the student-respondents agreed on all the items, wherein the item about the accessibility of reading materials in school made the highest total mean of 3.23. This result implies that the both schools offer reading materials ready for use. According to the Department of Education, the unavailability of learning materials is just one of the problems they are overcoming to uplift the country’s new basic education program (Legaspi, 2014).

While the item on the provision of updated reading materials obtained the lowest mean of 2.85. This could mean that although materials are available in school, some of them might be old and outdated. The K to 12 program coordinator of the Department of Education, admitted that there have been delays in the past in the delivery of learning materials such as activity sheets and modules for the students resulting to the lack of resources inside the school (Legaspi, 2014). The composite means were 3.02 (agree), 3.10 (agree) and 3.02 (agree), respectively. These show that, generally, the schools provide reading materials for the students. Research has found that when children read extensively they become better writers. Reading a variety of genres helps children learn text structures and language that they can then transfer to their own writing (Anon).

2.2. In Terms of Lectures, Seminars and Trainings

Table 5. Extent of the Students' Exposure to Lectures, Seminars and Trainings

Items	School A			School B			Total		
	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
I am exposed to lectures, seminars and/or trainings about research writing in school.	2.84	A	4	2.96	A	4	2.86	A	4
I am exposed to lectures, seminars and/or trainings research writing hosted outside the school.	2.19	D	5	2.04	D	5	2.17	D	5
I ask questions/queries to resource speakers/teachers regarding my research.	3.07	A	1	3.17	A	1	3.09	A	1
I have gained some of my research writing skills from lectures, seminars and trainings.	3.02	A	2	3.13	A	2	3.04	A	2

The school has organized research writing lectures, seminars, and trainings for students.	2.96	A	3	3.00	A	3	2.97	A	3
Composite mean	2.82	A		2.86	A		2.83	A	

Legend: HA = Highly Agree; VI = Verbal Interpretation; A = Agree; WM = Weighted Mean; R = Rank

The Table 5 shows the extent of students’ exposure to lectures, seminars, and trainings. As discussed in Table 5, the student-respondents agreed that they asked questions/ queries to resource speakers/ teachers regarding their research which yielded the highest mean of 3.09 and the highest rank of 1. Asking questions permit the students to use their higher order thinking skills and allow them to think critically (Bloom, 1994).

On the contrary, they disagreed that they were exposed to lectures, seminars and/or trainings about research writing hosted outside the school as shown by the mean of 2.17 and the least rank of 5. This could mean that students lack out-of-school exposure to seminars, lectures, and trainings. According to DepEd, lack of trainings is still an issue they need to address to the students so as the teachers (Legaspi, 2014). Overall, the composite means were 2.82, 2.86 and 2.83 respectively.

2.2. In Terms of Internet

Table 6. Extent of the Students' Exposure to Internet

Items	School A			School B			Total		
	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
In school, the internet is readily available for research activities	2.53	A	5	2.38	D	5	2.50	A	5
At home I could access the internet in times when I need to do research activities	3.07	A	3	2.92	A	4	3.04	A	3
Apart from school and home, there are other accessible areas where internet is available	2.82	A	4	3.00	A	2.5	2.85	A	4
I use the internet searching for information relevant to my research	3.47	A	1	3.50	A	1	3.47	A	1
I maximize the function of the internet	3.10	A	2	3.00	A	2.5	3.09	A	2
Composite mean	3.00	A		2.96	A		2.99	A	

Legend: HA = Highly Agree; VI = Verbal Interpretation; A = Agree; WM = Weighted Mean; R = Rank

The extent of students’ exposure to internet is shown in Table 5. As presented, the student-respondents from both schools agreed that they use the internet in searching for information relevant to their research with a total mean of 3.47 at rank 1. Internet has the capacity to hold

an infinite number of resources, can provide accessible and comprehensive education for students, wherever they may be in the country (Hyte, 2010).

On the other hand, the item about the internet being readily available for research activities yielded the least weighted means of 2.53, 2.38 and 2.50 at ranks 5, respectively. This implies that both the schools lack the provision of internet accessible to the students doing research. Studies indicated that the internet leads to substantially greater communication and enhances human connectivity and sociability (PEW Internet and American Life Project, 2000; UCLA Center for Communication Policy, 2003). The composite means were 3.00 and 2.96 with 2.99 for the total with similar adjective ratings of agree.

3. Research Writing Competence of the Students

3.1. In Terms of Research Writing Skills

Table 7. Research Writing Competence of the Students In Terms of Research Writing Skills

Items	School A			School B			Total		
	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
I understand contents of various reading materials	3.09	S	2	3.08	S	4	3.09	S	2
I can formulate the connection between the materials read and the topic of my research	3.01	S	3	3.13	S	3	3.03	S	3
I can distinguish which concepts from my research are relevant to my study and which are not	3.18	S	1	3.25	S	1	3.19	S	1
I can paraphrase the works of other authors	2.97	S	5	2.75	S	6	2.94	S	5
I construct quality sentences for my research study	2.93	S	6	2.92	S	5	2.92	S	6
I can do necessary writing revisions depending on the suggestions of the teacher	2.98	S	4	3.21	S	2	3.01	S	4
Composite mean	3.03	S		3.06	S		3.03	S	

Legend: HA = Highly Agree; VI = Verbal Interpretation; A = Agree; WM = Weighted Mean
R = Rank

The Table 7 shows the research writing competence of the students in terms of research writing skills. As stated in the table, the students-respondents from both schools agreed that they can sometimes distinguish which concepts from their research are relevant to their study and which are not with the highest total mean of 3.19 at rank 1. This means that the students can sort valuable and significant related studies to their research from those that are not.

Furthermore, the table shows that the construction of quality sentences for the research study garnered the least weighted mean of 2.92 with a verbal interpretation of sometimes, and least rank of 6. Generally, students still consider their ability to write quality sentences as their area to improve on. Studies showed that one of the skills a student should have in writing a

research paper is to express their ideas and arguments effectively (Bender & Tipton). The composite means were 3.03 and 3.06, with a total of 3.03 with similar verbal interpretations of sometimes.

3.2. In Terms of Teacher

Table 8. Research Writing Competence of the Students In Terms of Teacher

Items	School A			School B			Total		
	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
My teacher taught research writing in an engaging way	3.42	S	5	3.63	A	4.5	3.45	S	5
My teacher has mastery about research writing.	3.49	S	1.5	3.71	A	3	3.52	A	2
My teacher used various strategies in presenting research writing	3.45	S	3	3.54	A	6	3.47	S	4
My teacher updated with the present trends relevant to the research writing	3.44	S	4	3.75	A	2	3.48	S	3
My teacher helps us to develop our research writing abilities	3.49	S	1.5	3.83	A	1	3.54	A	1
My teacher proves challenging opportunities for research writing	3.40	S	6	3.63	A	4.5	3.43	S	6
Composite mean	3.45	S		3.68	A		3.48	S	

Legend: HA = Highly Agree; VI = Verbal Interpretation; A = Agree; WM = Weighted Mean
R = Rank

The research writing competence of the students-respondents in terms of teacher is shown in Table 8. Combining all the results, the table shows that the item about the teacher helping students to develop their research writing abilities has the highest mean of 3.54. This implies that the students’ research teachers developed their research writing skills. Teachers allow the students to leverage their strengths and passion in writing (Connelly, 2006).

The item about the teacher providing challenging opportunities for research writing gained the lowest mean of 3.43. The teacher must recognize individual differences among his/her students and adjust instructions that best suit to the learners (Connelly, 2006). The composite means were 3.45 and 3.68 with 3.48 for the total with verbal interpretations of sometimes, always and sometimes, respectively.

3.3. In Terms of Financial Aspect

Table 9. Research Writing Competence of the Students In Terms of Financial Aspect

Items	School A			School B			Total		
	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
I am at ease when it comes to spending because my parents support me when it	3.03	S	3	3.25	S	1	3.06	S	3

comes to my research project.									
I can provide financial contribution to my group in research.	3.23	S	1	3.00	S	2	3.19	S	1
I do not worry over printing, binding and other research writing expenses.	2.72	S	5	2.67	S	5	2.72	S	5
My parents can support my research writing expenses.	3.15	S	2	2.92	S	4	3.11	S	2
My research writing capabilities are not hindered by my financial status	2.99	S	4	2.96	S	3	2.98	S	4
Composite mean	3.02	S		2.96	S		3.01	S	

Legend: HA = Highly Agree; VI = Verbal Interpretation; A = Agree; WM = Weighted Mean
R = Rank

As given in Table 9 which show the research writing competence of the students in terms of financial aspect, the item indicating that students can provide financial contribution to their group mates in research got the highest mean of 3.19 and the highest rank of 1 for School A.

On the other hand, the item indicating that students are at ease when it comes to spending because their parents support them in their research writing expenses got the highest rank in School B. Since School A is a private school and school B is a public school, it can be gleaned that students from the public school are highly dependent on their parents in terms of research writing expenses. Students usually depend their school expenses to their parents because they know that it is one of the parents’ responsibility (Wicker, 2001).

The lowest mean of 2.72 was reflected in the item about printing, binding and other research writing expenses. The composite means were 3.02 and 2.96 with 3.01 for the total with similar rating of sometimes.

3.4. In Terms of Management Skills

Table 10. Research Writing Competence of the Students In Terms of Management Skills

Items	School A			School B			Total		
	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
I make myself well-prepared in doing research writing by studying.	3.10	S	2	3.13	S	2	3.11	S	2
I prioritize my research writing more than other tasks	2.79	S	5	2.92	S	1	2.81	S	4
I prefer finishing my research tasks first before doing any leisure activity	2.98	S	3	3.00	S	3	2.98	S	3
I spend my free time	2.81	S	4	2.67	S	5	2.79	S	5

reading articles that will help me with my research writing.									
I organize my work and make sure to submit it to on time	3.19	S	1	3.33	S	1	3.21	S	1
Composite mean	2.97	S		3.01	S		2.98	S	

Legend: HA = Highly Agree; VI = Verbal Interpretation; A = Agree; WM = Weighted Mean
R = Rank

As seen in Table 10 showing the research competence of students in terms of time management, the item about students’ submission of work on time gained the highest mean of 3.21 with a verbal interpretation of sometimes. This shows that students are still conscious of the deadline of their research work. A realistic timetable and SMART goals would help students in plotting their tasks (Sax, 2007).

On the contrary, the item about students spending their free time reading articles that will help them with their research writing got the least weighted mean of 2.79 and the least rank of 5. Generally, students would not use their free time for research writing because of distractions and other tasks. As a result, they might not prioritize their research all the time. In evaluating one’s schedule, or how to spend time in research tasks, students need to consider goals and priorities (Carveth, 2001).

The composite means were 2.97 and 3.01 with 2.98 for the total with similar ratings of sometimes.

3.5. In Terms of Learning Environment and Peers.

Table 11. Research Writing Competence of the Students In Terms of Learning Environment and Peers

Items	School H			School P			Total		
	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
I feel safe and comfortable in the learning environment where I belong.	3.36	S	1	3.50	A	1	3.38	S	1
I am provided with research materials in the	2.99	S	5	3.25	S	4	3.03	S	5
I receive support from my environment and the people around me during my research writing	3.05	S	4	3.04	S	5	3.05	S	4
I develop research writing skills with the help of my peers	3.11	S	3	3.29	S	3	3.14	S	3
I believe that my learning environment greatly contributes to student engagement and tailors instruction when it comes	3.12	S	2	3.33	S	2	3.15	S	2

to research writing.									
Composite mean	3.13	S		3.28	S		3.15	S	

Legend: HA = Highly Agree; VI = Verbal Interpretation; A = Agree; WM = Weighted Mean
R = Rank

As revealed in table 11 showing the research writing competence of students in terms of learning environment and peers, the item about students feeling safe and comfortable in the learning environment where they belong gained the highest mean of 3.38. It can be inferred that schools regardless of being private and public are perceived by the students as a secured place for learning. Depending on the environment, schools can either open or close the doors that lead to academic performance (Barry, 2005). Additionally, school climate is the general atmosphere that builds the trust between students and teachers (Crosnoe *et al.*, 2004).

On the contrary, the item about the provision of research materials in the learning environment obtained the least weighted mean of 3.03, and least rank of 6. It indicates that the resources such as textbooks, articles and other materials are insufficient, which could mean, that other resources could not be found in relation to the focus of the students’ research. The term resources refer not only to teaching methods and materials but also the time available for instruction and the knowledge and skills of teachers (Owoko, 2010).

The composite means were 3.13 and 3.28 with 3.15 for the total with similar adjective ratings of sometimes.

3.6. In Terms of Perspective

Table 12. Research Writing Competence of the Students In Terms of Perspective

Items	School H			School P			Total		
	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R	WM	VI	R
I feel comfortable with the idea of research writing	2.98	S	1.5	3.17	S	2.5	3.01	S	1
I act positively over reading tasks in the context of my research study.	2.98	S	1.5	3.21	S	1	3.01	S	1
I act positively over writing tasks in the context of my research study	2.91	S	4	3.17	S	2.5	2.95	S	3
I feel equipped with the needed skills for research writing	2.83	S	5	2.88	S	5	2.84	S	5
I have clear point of view in research writing.	2.93	S	3	3.00	S	4	2.94	S	4
Composite mean	2.93	S		3.09	S		2.95	S	

Legend: HA = Highly Agree; VI = Verbal Interpretation; A = Agree; WM = Weighted Mean
R = Rank

As gleaned in Table 12 showing the research writing competence of the students in terms of their perspective, both the items about students feeling comfortable with the idea of research writing and acting positively over reading tasks in the context of research study gained the highest mean of 3.01.

Meanwhile, the item about students feeling equipped with the needed skills for research writing got the lowest mean of 2.84. It can be noted that they perceive themselves as poor in the language especially in reading and writing skills. General language anxiety, according to research, focuses on the negative perspective towards language aspects like reading or writing (Horwitz, 2008).

The composite means were 2.93 and 3.09 with 2.95 for the total with similar adjective ratings of sometimes.

4. Relationship between the Responses of the Student-Respondents in Terms of Their Level of Exposure to the Various Resources and their Research Writing Competence

Table 13 presents the relationship between the responses of the student-respondents in terms of their level of exposure to the various resources and the problems they encountered in research writing.

As stated in the table, the computed r-coefficient of 0.20 between reading materials and learning environment and peers has a corresponding p-value of 0.0060 which was less than the p-value of 0.01, thus rejecting the null hypothesis.

This safely implied that the responses of the student-respondents between their exposure in research writing in terms of reading materials is highly and significantly related to their research writing competence in terms of their learning environment and peers.

Table 13. Relationship on the Responses of the Students in Terms of Their Level of Exposure to the Various Resources and their Research Writing Competence

Variables	Correlation coefficient	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Reading Materials versus:				
Research writing Skills	0.10	0.1064	p>0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Not significant
Teacher	0.06	0.2277	p>0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Not significant
Financial Aspect	0.03	0.3546	p>0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Not significant
Management Skills	0.01	0.4505	p>0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Not significant
Learning Environment and Peers	0.20	0.0060	p<0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Highly significant
Perspective	0.08	0.1596	p>0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Not significant
Lectures, Seminars, training versus:				
Research writing Skills	0.18	0.0120	p<0.05, Reject Ho	Significant
Teacher	0.15	0.0304	p<0.05, Reject Ho	Significant
Financial Aspect	0.07	0.1918	p>0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Management Skills	0.10	0.1064	p>0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Learning Environment and Peers	0.25	0.0008	p<0.05, Reject Ho	Highly Significant
Perspective	0.18	0.0120	p<0.05, Reject Ho	Significant
Internet Versus:				
Research writing Skills	0.31	0.0000	p<0.05, Reject Ho	Highly Significant
Teacher	0.10	0.1064	p>0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Financial Aspect	0.09	0.1312	p>0.05, failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Management Skills	0.22	0.0028	p<0.05, Reject Ho	Highly Significant
Learning Environment and Peers	0.36	0.0000	p<0.05, Reject Ho	Highly Significant
Perspective	0.22	0.0028	p<0.05, Reject Ho	Highly Significant

For lectures, seminars and trainings, the correlation coefficients were 0.18 for research writing skills, 0.15 for teacher and 0.18 for perspective with corresponding p-values of 0.0120, 0.0304 and 0.0120, respectively, which were less than the p-value of 0.05, thus rejecting the null hypothesis. In addition, the computed r-value of 0.25 for learning environment and peers has a corresponding p-value of 0.0060 which was less than the p-value of 0.01, thus rejecting also the null hypothesis.

These safely concluded that the responses of the student-respondents between their exposure in research writing in terms of lectures, seminars and trainings have significant relationships to the research writing skills, teacher and perspective; and high significant relationship in terms of learning environment and peers.

With regards to internet, the computed correlation coefficients were 0.31 for research writing skills, 0.22 for management skills, and perspective and 0.36 for learning environment and peers with corresponding p-values of 0.0000, 0.0028, 0.0028 and 0.0000, respectively, which were less than the p-value of 0.01, thus rejecting the null hypothesis.

These safely generalized that the responses of the student-respondents between their exposure in research writing in terms of internet have high significant relationships to the research writing competence in terms of research writing skills, time management skills, learning environment and peers, and perspective.

5. Based from the findings of the study, what developmental training activities may be designed to develop research competency?

As compared to the other research materials namely reading materials and internet, the lectures, seminars, and trainings result reflects the lowest composite means which implies that students are not very much exposed to lectures, seminars, and trainings in or out of school. Seminars provide latest information about the things happening and makes attendees think about new things which could be implemented practically (Morgan). Looking at the different indicators, it can be gleaned that the teacher indicator gained the highest composite mean of 3.48. It can be inferred that teachers in research from both schools are contributory factors in the research writing competence of the students.

On the other hand, the perspective indicator garnered the lowest composite mean of 2.95. It indicates that students do not view themselves as ready for research although they might have the necessary research writing skills. Language anxiety interferes with cognitive processing (MacIntyre and Gardner, 2007). Moreover, general language anxiety makes the students tend to think negatively towards the idea of research writing because they worry about how others will perceive them after reading their output (Schallert *et al.*, 2007).

Because of these, it is necessary to design learning opportunities for students to develop their research writing skills and to influence their positive perceptions on tasks and on their own skills.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Most of the respondents are female. Majority came from Holy Family Academy under the Humanities and Social Sciences strand.
2. Students are least exposed to lectures, trainings, and seminars on research writing.
3. In terms of their writing skills, students think that they still cannot construct quality sentences for their research study. However, the main struggle of the students in research writing is how they view research writing and their weak perception of their own writing skills.
4. There is a high and significant relationship between the students' exposure in reading materials and their research writing competence in terms of learning environment and peers. There is also a significant relationship between the lectures, seminars and trainings and their research writing competence in terms of research writing skills, teacher and perspective; and a high significant relationship in terms of learning environment and peers. Lastly, there is also a significant relationship between the internet and their research writing competence in terms of research writing skills, time management skills, learning environment and peers, and perspective.
5. Based on the findings, exposure to all three indicators especially lectures, trainings, and seminars on research writing would increase students' research writing competence.

Recommendations

In view of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are offered.

1. The school should provide updated and available reading materials for research so students may have an enriching learning environment.
2. The school should expose students to lectures, trainings and seminars on research writing in school or even outside school.
3. The school should also provide accessible internet for research writing purposes for students' convenience and efficiency.
4. Psychological conditioning programs must be done to students before and during research writing to avoid language anxiety.

References

1. Anon, 2018. [online] Available at: <https://www.k12reader.com/the-relationship-between-reading-and-writing/http://teachingcenter.wustl.edu/resources/teaching-methods/participation/asking-questions-to-improve-learning/> [Accessed 12 Jul. 2018].
2. Crosnoe *et al.*, 2004. The School Environment. New York, NY: MIT Press.

3. Education.gov.gy. 2018. The Importance of Learning Materials in Teaching. [online] Available at: <http://education.gov.gy/web/index.php/teachers/tips-for-teaching/item/2036-the-importance-of-learning-materials-in-teaching> [Accessed 12 Jul. 2018].
4. GMA News Online. 2018. Lack of materials, facilities still hound K to 12 implementation. [online] Available at: <http://www.gmanetwork.com/news/news/specialreports/363734/lack-of-materials-facilities-still-hound-k-to-12-implementation/story/> [Accessed 12 Jul. 2018].
5. Moschis *et al.*, 2003. Assessment on Excessive Spending. HMSO: Routledge, London.
6. Newarkrutgers.edu. 2018. What Skills Do We Need to Write Good Research Papers?. [online] Available at: <http://newarkwww.rutgers.edu/guides/skills.htm> [Accessed 12 Jul. 2018].
7. Rappler. 2018. Education and the Internet for a sustainable PH. [online] Available at: <https://www.rappler.com/brandrap/tech-and-innovation/126587-education-internet-sustainable-ph> [Accessed 12 Jul. 2018].
8. Sax, 2007. Time-Management Problems. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
9. Schallert *et al.*, 2007. Students' Identity and Writing Anxiety. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
10. Sharma, V., Sharma, V., Solutech, K. and Sharma, V. 2018. Importance of Internet in education at schools. [online] Klient Solutech. Available at: <http://www.klientsolutech.com/importance-of-internet-in-education-at-schools/> [Accessed 12 Jul.
11. Templates, L., Aids, G. and Lists, B. 2018. The relationship between reading and writing. [online] Reading Worksheets, Spelling, Grammar, Comprehension, Lesson Plans. Available at: <https://www.k12reader.com/the-relationship-between-reading-and-writing/> [Accessed 12 Jul. 2018].