

Position Paper

The Citation Recency Bias: Rethinking Temporal Standards in Literature Review Practices

Mhel Cedric D. Bendo

College of Business Administration, Polytechnic University of the Philippines–
Maragondon Campus, Philippines
cedricbends@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0004-6873-3910

Date received: April 4, 2026

Date received in revised form: June 11, 2026; July 1, 2026

Date accepted: July 12, 2026

Recommended citation:

Bendo, M. C. D. (2026). The citation recency bias: Rethinking temporal standards in literature review practices. *Puissant*, 7, 3435-3447.

Abstract

This position paper critiques the widespread assumption that literature reviews should prioritize recent sources, often operationalized as a “5-year rule” in academic writing. While recency is valuable for capturing current developments, this practice may inadvertently exclude foundational theories and methodological principles that remain conceptually relevant. To address this issue, the paper introduces Citation Recency Bias, defined as the tendency to privilege newer sources based primarily on temporal proximity rather than functional relevance. Drawing on enduring contributions in research methodology and educational psychology, including measurement theory (Stevens, 1946), reliability estimation through Cronbach’s coefficient alpha (1951), statistical frameworks developed by Fisher (1925) and Cohen (1988), and foundational theories proposed by Bandura (1977) and Vygotsky (1978), the paper argues that many core elements of contemporary scholarship continue to rely on earlier works. Citation Recency Bias is therefore conceptualized as a methodological distortion that may weaken theoretical grounding and conceptual coherence when the publication date is treated as an indicator of scholarly value.

Keywords – citation recency bias, literature review practices, methodological rigor, research methodology, conceptual relevance



INTRODUCTION

In academic research, literature reviews are expected to demonstrate both conceptual grounding and engagement with current scholarship. In many instructional and evaluative contexts, this expectation is operationalized through an explicit or implicit emphasis on citation recency, often expressed as a “5-year rule” that prioritizes recently published sources. Although intended to ensure currency, this practice may encourage the assumption that newer sources are inherently more appropriate than older ones, regardless of their conceptual or methodological relevance. Consequently, literature review risks becoming a procedural exercise guided by publication date rather than a critical synthesis of the most appropriate evidence.

This concern is particularly significant because many foundational contributions continue to underpin contemporary research. Measurement theory (Stevens, 1946), reliability estimation (Cronbach, 1951), statistical reasoning (Fisher, 1925; Cohen, 1988), and influential theoretical frameworks such as Bandura’s (1977) social cognitive theory and Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory remain widely applied despite their age. Likewise, ongoing methodological debates regarding reliability, validity, and statistical interpretation (Taber, 2018; Sijtsma, 2009; Cohen, 1994; DeVellis, 2016; Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Haynes et al., 1995) emphasize that research quality depends on conceptual clarity and appropriate methodological justification rather than mechanical adherence to simplified rules. Together, these perspectives suggest that scholarly value is determined by functional contribution rather than chronological proximity.

Against this background, the present paper introduces Citation Recency Bias, defined as the tendency to equate temporal proximity with scholarly relevance in literature review practices. Rather than rejecting the importance of current scholarship, the paper argues that citation decisions should be guided by functional relevance, including a source’s role in establishing theoretical foundations, supporting methodological choices, and contextualizing empirical findings. By advancing a relevance-based framework for citation, the paper contributes to ongoing discussions of research quality and methodological rigor while promoting a more balanced integration of foundational and contemporary literature.

CONCEPTUAL APPROACH

Purpose and Position of the Paper

This study is framed as a position paper advancing a methodological argument on citation practices in academic writing. Rather than conducting an empirical investigation, the paper adopts a conceptual-analytic approach to examine how temporal criteria shape literature review practices and their implications for research quality. Position papers critically examine methodological issues through structured argumentation supported by scholarly literature (Swales & Feak, 2012; Hart, 2018). In this context, the present study does

not aim to generate new empirical findings but to interrogate an established academic convention—the prioritization of citation recency—and evaluate its methodological soundness.

The paper adopts an interpretive orientation, examining recency-based citation practices in relation to established principles of research design and knowledge construction. This approach is aligned with methodological scholarship emphasizing that research decisions should be guided by conceptual relevance and theoretical alignment rather than procedural conventions (Ravitch & Carl, 2016; Tracy, 2020). Accordingly, the analysis focuses on how citation practices function within the broader architecture of scholarly inquiry, rather than attempting to quantify their empirical effects.

Scholarly Basis of the Argument

The study employs purposive and criterion-based selection of sources that represent both foundational and contemporary contributions to research methodology, measurement, and theory development. Foundational works were selected based on their sustained influence on current research practices, including measurement theory (Stevens, 1946), reliability estimation (Cronbach, 1951), statistical reasoning (Fisher, 1925; Cohen, 1988), and major theoretical frameworks in education and psychology (Bandura, 1977; Vygotsky, 1978). These sources are treated as exemplars of enduring scholarly contributions that continue to inform contemporary research.

To complement these foundational works, recent methodological literature was incorporated to reflect current standards and debates in research practice, particularly in relation to validity, research design, and statistical interpretation (American Psychological Association [APA], 2020; Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Taber, 2018). Integrating foundational and contemporary sources supports a balanced examination of evolving knowledge while preserving conceptual continuity. This strategy is consistent with integrative review approaches that emphasize the synthesis of historical and current literature to achieve a comprehensive understanding (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005).

Conceptual Analysis Strategy

The primary analytic strategy involves conceptual and comparative analysis of citation practices, focusing on the relationship between temporal recency and scholarly relevance. Sources were examined in terms of their functional roles within research, including their contributions to theoretical framing, methodological justification, and interpretive clarity. This approach allows for the identification of patterns in how knowledge is maintained and applied across time, particularly in cases where older sources continue to provide essential conceptual or methodological guidance.

Comparative analysis was used to evaluate whether publication recency reliably reflects scholarly value by contrasting foundational and recent works while emphasizing functional relevance over temporal proximity. This analytical approach aligns with qualitative research traditions that emphasize meaning, context, and applicability over temporal proximity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The objective is not to privilege one category of sources over another, but to clarify their respective roles within the structure of academic inquiry.

CONCEPTUAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTING CITATION RECENCY BIAS

Evidence from Methodological Literature

Existing methodological literature provides indirect but meaningful support for the concerns underlying Citation Recency Bias by demonstrating that scholarly quality depends on the appropriate integration of both foundational and contemporary sources rather than on publication date alone. Contemporary research and academic writing guidelines consistently encourage engagement with current scholarship to reflect recent developments and situate studies within ongoing discourse (American Psychological Association [APA], 2020; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). However, these sources do not advocate replacing seminal literature solely because of its age. Instead, they emphasize selecting references according to their conceptual, theoretical, and methodological relevance to the research problem.

Methodological scholarship likewise underscores that many core research principles remain valid across decades and continue to provide the intellectual foundations of contemporary inquiry. Measurement theory proposed by Stevens (1946), internal consistency reliability introduced by Cronbach (1951), statistical reasoning derived from Fisher (1925), and effect size interpretation advanced by Cohen (1988) remain widely cited because they define enduring concepts rather than transient empirical findings. Similarly, theoretical frameworks such as Bandura's (1977) social cognitive theory and Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory continue to guide current research and educational practice despite their historical origins. Their continued use demonstrates that scholarly relevance depends on functional contribution rather than publication date. Furthermore, methodological discussions concerning validity, reliability, and research design consistently emphasize conceptual appropriateness over mechanical compliance with simplified procedural rules (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; DeVellis, 2016; Haynes et al., 1995; Taber, 2018). This broader perspective suggests that literature selection should likewise be governed by the role a source plays in establishing theoretical foundations, supporting methodological decisions, or interpreting findings, rather than by publication year alone.

Collectively, this scholarship questions rigid recency-oriented citation expectations. While maintaining awareness of recent developments remains an important component of rigorous scholarship, the methodological literature indicates that excluding or minimizing

foundational works solely because they are older may weaken conceptual coherence and theoretical precision. These considerations provide the scholarly basis for the present paper's formulation of Citation Recency Bias as a methodological concern arising when temporal recency is implicitly elevated above functional relevance in literature review practices.

Analytical Indicators of Citation Recency Bias

Existing methodological discussions and academic practices suggest that citation decisions may at times be influenced by publication recency in addition to conceptual relevance. In many educational and research contexts, literature reviews are evaluated partly on the perceived currency of their references, creating incentives to prioritize recently published sources. Although maintaining engagement with current scholarship is important, an excessive emphasis on recency may inadvertently reduce direct engagement with foundational theories, methodological works, or seminal publications that continue to provide essential conceptual guidance. From this perspective, publication date may function as an implicit heuristic in source selection, potentially encouraging researchers to privilege temporal proximity over functional relevance within the research framework.

A conceptual observation developed in this paper is the disproportionate representation of contemporary sources in literature reviews, even in areas where foundational theories and methodological principles remain unchanged. In these cases, foundational contributions may be minimized or indirectly cited through secondary sources, reducing their visibility. This pattern suggests that citation decisions may be guided more by temporal expectations than by conceptual necessity.

Illustrative Patterns of Conceptual Underrepresentation

Conceptual examination suggests that Citation Recency Bias may result in the underrepresentation of core conceptual and methodological foundations. Foundational works that define measurement scales, statistical procedures, and theoretical constructs often remain central to research practice, yet may be omitted or replaced by more recent citations that do not fully capture their original conceptual intent. This substitution can lead to a dilution of conceptual precision, particularly when secondary interpretations are cited in place of primary sources.

For example, methodological principles that are widely applied in contemporary research—such as reliability estimation, measurement scaling, and statistical inference—are frequently derived from earlier foundational works. Excluding these sources may weaken methodological justification by limiting engagement with their original foundations.

Functional Misalignment in Source Selection

A recurring concern discussed in methodological scholarship is the misalignment between source selection and functional contribution. In several cases, sources appear to be included based on their publication date rather than their relevance to the conceptual or methodological requirements of the study. This misalignment results in literature reviews that are temporally current but functionally uneven, with some aspects of the research framework being overrepresented while others are insufficiently supported.

This imbalance is particularly evident in studies where recent empirical findings are emphasized without corresponding integration of the theoretical or methodological foundations upon which those findings are based. As a result, literature reviews may emphasize current developments without adequately situating them within their broader conceptual foundations.

Summary of the Conceptual Argument

Taken together, these considerations support the argument that citation practices may, in some contexts, exhibit a tendency to privilege recency over conceptual relevance. Citation Recency Bias is therefore proposed as a broader conceptual pattern that may emerge in literature review practices when temporal recency is implicitly prioritized over functional relevance. The arguments advanced in this paper suggest that without explicit consideration of functional relevance, citation practices may inadvertently introduce conceptual gaps, methodological inconsistencies, and interpretive limitations within research.

DEVELOPING THE CONCEPT OF CITATION RECENCY BIAS

This position paper does not seek to reject the use of recent literature, nor to prescribe fixed temporal distributions for citation practices. Rather, it advances a methodological argument concerning how relevance is determined in literature review, specifically addressing the tendency to equate recency with scholarly value. Within this framework, Citation Recency Bias is defined as a distortion in citation practice wherein temporal proximity is implicitly treated as a proxy for conceptual, methodological, or theoretical relevance.

The present paper argues that recency, while informative in capturing ongoing developments, does not function as a sufficient criterion for source selection. Foundational contributions in measurement, statistical reasoning, and theory development continue to structure contemporary research (Borsboom, 2005; Shadish et al., 2002), indicating that scholarly relevance operates independently of publication date. When recency is elevated to a primary evaluative standard, literature review may shift from a process of conceptual

integration to one of temporal filtering. This shift transforms citation from a mechanism of knowledge alignment into a procedural response to external expectations.

The consequences of this shift can be understood across multiple dimensions of research practice. Conceptually, Citation Recency Bias may result in the omission of foundational theories necessary for constructing coherent research frameworks. Methodologically, it may weaken the justification of research design decisions when established principles are underrepresented or excluded (Maxwell, 2012; Messick, 1995). Interpretively, it may produce literature reviews that are current in appearance but limited in depth, reducing the researcher's ability to situate findings within the cumulative development of the field. In this sense, Citation Recency Bias introduces a structural imbalance in knowledge representation, privileging visibility over functional relevance.

To address this issue, the present paper advances a guiding principle for citation practice:

Relevance-Based Citation Principle

The selection of sources should be governed by their functional contribution to the research, including their role in establishing conceptual definitions, supporting methodological decisions, and framing the interpretation of findings. Publication date, while informative, should not operate as a primary criterion independent of these considerations.

From this perspective, citation is understood as a process of epistemic alignment, wherein sources are selected based on how they contribute to the internal coherence of the study. Foundational works may be necessary for defining constructs and establishing methodological legitimacy, while recent studies may be required to situate the research within current scholarly discourse. The relative weight of these sources is therefore context-dependent and should be determined by the structure of the research problem rather than by uniform temporal expectations.

The implications of this principle extend across research contexts. In fields characterized by rapid empirical change, recency may play a more prominent role in capturing emerging findings. However, even in such contexts, foundational theories and methodological principles often remain stable and continue to inform research practice. In disciplines with strong theoretical continuity, the exclusion of foundational literature may significantly weaken conceptual clarity and analytic precision. These variations indicate that citation practices must be responsive to the epistemic characteristics of the field rather than governed by generalized temporal norms.

Accordingly, Citation Recency Bias is best understood not as an error in individual judgment, but as a systemic tendency arising from the institutionalization of simplified citation standards (Merton, 1973; Latour, 1987). Addressing this bias requires a shift from

rule-based citation toward principle-based evaluation, where the inclusion of sources is justified in relation to their role within the research. By reframing citation as a methodological decision rather than a procedural requirement, this paper contributes to a more balanced and theoretically grounded approach to literature review, supporting research that is both current and conceptually coherent.

Diagnostic Conditions of Citation Recency Bias

To strengthen the operational clarity of Citation Recency Bias, the present paper proposes a set of indicative diagnostic conditions through which the presence of this bias may be identified in literature review practices. These conditions are not intended as rigid thresholds, but as evaluative signals that suggest potential misalignment between citation practices and conceptual relevance.

Citation Recency Bias may be inferred when one or more of the following conditions are observed:

- **Disproportionate Recency Concentration** – A substantial majority of cited sources (e.g., around 70% or more) fall within a narrowly defined recent time frame (such as the past five years), regardless of the conceptual or methodological requirements of the study.
- **Foundational Omission** – Foundational works that define key constructs, theories, or methodological principles are absent, indirectly cited, or replaced by secondary interpretations despite their continued relevance.
- **Indirect Theoretical Grounding** – Theoretical frameworks are supported primarily through contemporary summaries rather than direct engagement with original or seminal sources.
- **Functional Misalignment of Sources** – Sources are selected based on temporal proximity rather than their specific role in establishing conceptual definitions, methodological justification, or interpretive coherence.
- **Procedural Justification of Citation** – Citation choices appear driven by compliance with perceived temporal expectations (e.g., “recent sources required”) rather than by epistemic necessity.

The presence of these conditions does not automatically invalidate a literature review; however, their convergence may indicate that citation practices are being guided by temporal heuristics rather than by principled methodological judgment. In this sense, Citation Recency Bias can be understood as a diagnosable pattern within research design, rather than merely an abstract critique of scholarly behavior.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH PRACTICE

This paper advances a methodological argument that the prioritization of citation recency in literature review practices reflects a misalignment between temporal criteria and scholarly relevance. While the use of recent sources remains important for engaging with current developments, the analysis demonstrates that recency alone does not constitute a sufficient basis for determining the inclusion of literature. Foundational contributions in theory, measurement, and methodology continue to inform contemporary research, and their exclusion on the basis of publication date may result in incomplete or weakened conceptual frameworks.

To formalize this issue, the paper introduces the concept of Citation Recency Bias, referring to the tendency to equate temporal proximity with scholarly value in citation practices. This bias is not merely a stylistic preference but a methodological concern that affects how knowledge is structured, represented, and interpreted within research. When recency is treated as a primary selection criterion, literature reviews may become descriptively current but conceptually fragmented, limiting their capacity to support coherent theoretical integration and methodological justification.

The arguments advanced in this paper suggest that citation practices should be repositioned within the broader framework of research design. Rather than functioning as a procedural requirement guided by temporal expectations, citation should be understood as a process of epistemic alignment, wherein sources are selected based on their functional contribution to the study. This perspective is reflected in the Relevance-Based Citation Principle, which emphasizes that sources should be included according to their role in defining constructs, supporting methodological decisions, and framing the interpretation of findings.

The balance between foundational and contemporary literature is context-dependent. In rapidly evolving fields, recent studies are essential for capturing emerging developments. However, even in such contexts, foundational theories and methodological principles often remain essential for ensuring conceptual clarity and analytic precision. In disciplines with strong theoretical continuity, the exclusion of foundational literature may significantly weaken the structural integrity of research. Citation practices must therefore be responsive to the epistemic characteristics of the field rather than governed by uniform temporal thresholds.

Accordingly, researchers are encouraged to adopt a principle-based approach to citation decision-making. This approach entails evaluating sources in relation to their necessity within the research framework, rather than relying on recency as a default criterion. The inclusion of literature should be explicitly justified based on its conceptual, methodological, or interpretive function, thereby ensuring that citation practices contribute to the coherence and rigor of the study. This approach requires a

reconceptualization of citation as a methodological judgment rather than a procedural expectation.

More broadly, addressing Citation Recency Bias requires a reconsideration of instructional and evaluative norms that equate currency with quality. While recency remains a valuable dimension of scholarly engagement, its role should be calibrated in relation to relevance rather than treated as an independent standard. By reframing citation as a methodological decision grounded in the functional structure of research, this paper contributes to a more balanced and theoretically grounded approach to literature review. Ultimately, scholarly rigor is strengthened not by privileging recency, but by integrating sources in a manner that reflects the cumulative and structured nature of knowledge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author sincerely thanks the editors and anonymous reviewers of *Puissant* for their careful evaluation and constructive feedback, which contributed to strengthening the conceptual clarity and methodological positioning of this paper. The author also acknowledges the foundational scholars whose work in measurement theory, statistical methodology, and theoretical development informed the present analysis. Their enduring contributions provided the conceptual basis for examining citation practices and for articulating the methodological issues addressed in this study. The author further acknowledges the use of Grammarly for English language editing, including grammar, spelling, punctuation, and stylistic refinements. Grammarly was used solely to improve language quality and did not contribute to the conceptual development, analysis, interpretation, or scholarly content of the manuscript.

FUNDING

This study did not receive funding from any public, commercial, or non-profit institution.

DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Informed Consent

Not applicable. This study does not involve human participants or primary data collection.

Ethics Approval

Not applicable. This study is a conceptual and methodological analysis based on existing literature and does not involve human-subjects research.

REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Borsboom, D. (2005). *Measuring the mind: Conceptual issues in contemporary psychometrics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490026>
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(2), 81–105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046016>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
- Cohen, J. (1994). The earth is round ($p < .05$). *American Psychologist*, 49(12), 997–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.49.12.997>
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Fisher, R. A. (1925). *Statistical methods for research workers*. Oliver & Boyd.
- Hart, C. (2018). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the research imagination* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
- Haynes, S. N., Richard, D. C. S., & Kubany, E. S. (1995). Content validity in psychological assessment: A functional approach to concepts and methods. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 238–247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.238>
- Hunsley, J. (2003). Introduction to the special section on incremental validity and utility in clinical assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, 15(4), 443–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.15.4.443>
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). Guilford Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5(3), 213–236. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.2350050305>
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Harvard University Press.

- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment. *American Psychologist*, 50(9), 741–749. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.50.9.741>
- Merton, R. K. (1973). *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. University of Chicago Press.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539–569. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452>
- Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological*. SAGE.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Sijtsma, K. (2009). On the use, misuse, and very limited usefulness of Cronbach's alpha. *Psychometrika*, 74(1), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-008-9101-0>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Stevens, S. S. (1946). On the theory of scales of measurement. *Science*, 103(2684), 677–680. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.103.2684.677>
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha in science education research. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>
- Tracy, S. J. (2020). *Qualitative research methods* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Author's Biography

Mhel Cedric D. Bendo is a student researcher and academic writer pursuing a Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship at the Polytechnic University of the Philippines–Maragondon Campus. His research focuses on educational psychology, educational assessment, psychometrics, digital and mobile learning, artificial intelligence in education, and financial technology (FinTech). He has authored and co-authored studies published and forthcoming in international peer-reviewed and Scopus-indexed journals and serves on the editorial boards of several international scholarly journals. He previously served as a Technical Editor and currently serves as an invited peer reviewer for international journals, including the Online Learning Journal (OLJ), Cogent Education (Taylor & Francis), the

International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), the International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), and the Journal of Learning for Development (JL4D). Beyond academic research, he writes research-informed commentaries, essays and literary pieces on education, technology, media literacy, culture, and social development, with works published in regional and national Philippine publications, including SunStar Cebu, Manila Bulletin, and the Philippine Daily Inquirer.