

Development and Validation of Learning Modules on Teaching Strategies for Preservice Teachers Specializing in Filipino

Ethel S. Doria¹, Roque A. Bongcac²

^{1,2}College of Education,
Holy Name University, Tagbilaran City, Philippines.

Corresponding Author: Ethel S. Doria

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20260630>

ABSTRACT

The study addressed the limited availability of instructional materials in the Filipino specialization, particularly in the course on teaching strategies. It sought to develop and validate learning modules that respond to the teaching needs of instructors and the learning needs of preservice teachers specializing in Filipino. Specifically, it determined the difference in their perceptions of these needs, assessed the modules in terms of usefulness and validity by experts, and evaluated readability as rated by student-users and instructors. The effectiveness of the modules was tested through pretest and posttest scores. Findings revealed a significant difference between instructors' and students' perceived needs in relation to the teaching of strategies in the Filipino subject. The modules were rated useful and comprehensive, with students and instructors affirming their readability, though a significant difference was noted in their ratings. Posttest scores were significantly higher than pretest scores, confirming the modules' effectiveness. Overall, the modules were found useful, valid, readable, and effective, and are recommended for use in preparing preservice teachers in the Filipino specialization.

Keywords: Learning Modules, Feedback-Based Readability, Teaching Filipino

INTRODUCTION

A meaningful insight that inspired this research is the enduring question: "Why is there a need to teach Filipino?" For many educators who have long dedicated themselves to the subject, this is more than rhetorical. Filipino is not merely a subject; it is a deeply rooted symbol of national identity, conveyed through language and culture. Thus, its teaching deserves greater emphasis, particularly in basic education where cultural formation begins.

Yet one persistent challenge in higher education is the lack of instructional materials—especially in the training of future teachers specializing in Filipino. Many preservice teachers find themselves using outdated, English-based references, with few Filipino-language modules tailored to their specialization courses. This material gap undermines the quality of teacher preparation, especially in subjects that require both cultural sensitivity and linguistic relevance.

Almario (2005) has long pointed out the indifference of some institutions toward the development of Filipino in academia, highlighting the need for instructional resources written in the national language (Montemayor, 2018). Similarly, Hidalgo, as

cited by Astorga and Vertucio (2016), underscores the teacher's role in producing learning materials that promote collaboration and active engagement.

In light of these needs, this study presents the development and validation of a module for the course *Pagtuturo ng Filipino* (Teaching Filipino), focusing on teaching strategies. Such a resource aims to assist both preservice teachers and current instructors by offering culturally responsive content in Filipino. Despite the passage of time, the scarcity of such materials remains—a concern this study seeks to address meaningfully.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between the teaching needs of instructors handling the Filipino specialization course and the learning needs of students specializing in Filipino in subjects dealing with teaching strategies in Filipino?
2. What are the assessments of the learning modules in terms of
 - 2.1 instructional validity, as reflected in the presence of pedagogical components, as rated by experts?
 - 2.2 readability as evaluated by the student-users and instructors?
3. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the learning modules by the student-users and instructors in terms of readability?
4. How effective are the modules in enhancing students' knowledge on teaching strategies in Filipino as reflected in the differences between the pretest and posttest scores of the students?

The following hypotheses are tested in the study:

- a. There is no significant difference between the teaching needs of instructors handling the Filipino specialization course and the learning needs of students specializing in Filipino in subjects dealing with teaching strategies in Filipino.
- b. There is no significant mean gain in the pretest and post-test scores of the students who used the learning modules.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study anchored on Operant Conditioning or Operant Learning Theory, believes that learning is behavior and that it is modified through reinforcement of appropriate responses given the proper motivation. According to principles of operant conditioning, behaviors maintained through fixed-interval schedules tend to increase in frequency as the anticipated reinforcement approaches. This pattern may help explain why students in modular learning environments become more active in completing requirements as deadlines draw near or when feedback is expected (Lim, 2024). Sejpal (2013) acknowledges the use of modular teaching in language classrooms saying that aside from being self-contained and organized logically, responses also receive instantaneous feedback.

The Instructional Theory is used as basis in the study because it stands on the belief that teaching should be geared towards improvement of learning. For this to happen, it contends that learning should be easier and lighter by decreasing the time spent and the effort of learning. It also considers learning as being appealing, fun and motivating. Textbook-making in this perspective takes into account special formatting techniques that aids in individualized instruction that “meet the needs of students with different cognitive styles”. A basic contention is that textbooks should be written by a team, at least one expert in instruction and one in instructional design (Sari & Reigeluth, 1982). Specifically, Orbe (2019) discusses Gagné's Theory of Instruction, which outlines different conditions that guide the design of learning to achieve specific outcomes. These are articulated as nine events of instruction: gaining attention, informing the learner of the objectives, stimulating recall of prior learning, presenting the stimulus, providing learning guidance, eliciting performance, providing feedback, assessing performance, and enhancing retention and transfer.

One of the innovations in the education of the new generation which is self-paced and student-centered is the teaching-learning module. Henson (1995) as cited by Sarmiento (2005) believes that the learning module is a pragmatic innovation in curriculum and instruction. The modality, which is called modular instruction, teaches students how to teach themselves.

Modular instruction is a teaching approach where one lesson is broken down into chunks of lessons contained in one module. Each topic in the module is taught and learned before proceeding to the next module. According to Sadiq (2014), each module incorporates elements recommended by UNESCO, including clearly defined objectives, structured learning activities, and criterion-based assessments. Individual differences and progression are being acknowledged. The modular instruction is geared towards learning that is dynamic yet student-centered.

Religioso as mentioned by Astorga & Vertucio (2016) enumerated the following factors in the development of instructional materials: instructional objectives; message to be transmitted; aesthetic quality; cost; production aids; durability; maintenance and storage; skill of the teachers and availability of equipment and facilities.

The trend of using learning modules as instructional materials is already extensive. Several studies prove that students perform better with the use of the learning modules. According to Sadiq (2014), modular teaching proves to be more effective than traditional methods, as it allows students to learn at their own pace, supports independent learning, and provides immediate feedback. This approach not only motivates learners but also promotes greater classroom participation by enabling them to accomplish tasks in ways that suit their individual learning styles.

According to Jenkins & Walker (1994), the modular approach is an instructional method that uses modules as the primary learning tool. The modules are designed to be self-

directed, self-paced, and to give students greater responsibility for their learning. In this approach, the curriculum is divided into small units of learning that are assessed upon completion, with the teacher acting as a facilitator and monitor of the learning process (Torrefranca, 2017).

In terms of the importance of instructional materials, Doria & Conui (2020) cited Brotonel's (2004) study, that the developed teaching materials are effective and beneficial in developing critical thinking skills as a component of English lessons. Conversely, Oni (1992) asserts that these resources can assist educators in elaborating on concepts they wish to draw attention to (Tety, 2016).

MATERIALS & METHODS

This study employed a combination of descriptive and quasi-experimental research designs. The descriptive design was used to analyze the results of the needs assessment survey, internal and face validation of the modules, and the readability feedback gathered both before and after the implementation. Meanwhile, the quasi-experimental design was employed to evaluate the effectiveness of the developed learning modules in enhancing preservice teachers' competence in teaching strategies for Filipino. This design was deemed appropriate, as random assignment was not feasible due to pre-existing classroom structures and institutional settings.

The study was conducted in several Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in the island province of Bohol, part of Region VII. These tertiary institutions offer Bachelor in Secondary Education programs with different fields of specialization, including Filipino. Among these institutions, five were selected based on their offering of Filipino specialization: Batuan Colleges, Bohol Institute of Technology in Tagbilaran City, Holy Name University, Mater Dei College in Tubigon, and the University of Bohol. These institutions provided the data for the needs assessment. Two private universities—Holy Name University and the

University of Bohol—were selected as pilot sites for module implementation due to the limited availability of instructional materials.

Before developing the modules, a needs analysis was conducted to determine the relevant topics. Students and professors specializing in Filipino from the participating institutions responded to a checklist-questionnaire identifying key topics for inclusion. Their responses were statistically analyzed; only topics with significant correlation between students' and teachers' perceptions were included in the modules, while those without significant relationship were excluded. This process aligns with the recommendation of Nardo & Hufana (2014), who emphasized the importance of needs assessment in the development of instructional materials.

Following the identification of topics, the modules were developed and subjected to internal validation by five professors teaching Filipino courses in one of the TEIs. In addition, four other professors conducted the face validation of the pretest-posttest instruments and reviewed the table of specifications. For the item analysis, nineteen students from another university—who did not participate in the module implementation—answered the test to determine the quality of the items.

The quasi-experimental phase involved 34 preservice teachers enrolled in the course on teaching strategies in Filipino—11 from Holy Name University and 23 from the University of Bohol. Two professors teaching the course also participated in the study. These participants were purposively selected based on their enrollment and willingness to take part in the module field try-out.

These students were enrolled in the course Teaching Filipino, and the modules were used as supplementary materials for instruction.

Throughout the try-out, students engaged with the modules while attending their regular classes. There were three sessions held with the researcher acting as the facilitator: start to give instructions; middle to verify some issues raised or questions regarding instructions; last for the prefinal instructions and clarifications. After completing each module, their outputs were collected and checked. Constructive feedback was provided, and answer keys to the self-tests were distributed after all module activities were accomplished. This process ensured that learning was reinforced and that students had the opportunity to reflect on their performance.

The participants rated the modules using a Feedback-Based Readability Rating Scale after the implementation phase. Instruments and modules were revised twice: first, after the initial validation, and again after the field implementation, based on feedback and suggestions from both students and professors who used the modules.

A pretest was conducted to assess the students' prior knowledge, and a posttest was administered after the module use. The pretest and posttest results were correlated to determine the effectiveness of the instructional materials.

Statistical Analysis

The study used descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) to summarize responses. To compare the mean scores of students and instructors on the readability of the learning modules, an independent samples *t*-test was applied. For the pretest and post test scores of students, a paired *t*-test was used to determine significant changes over time. All tests were evaluated at the 0.05 level of significance.

RESULT

Table 1. t-Test Results on the Difference Between Instructors’ Teaching Needs and Students’ Learning Needs in Filipino Teaching Strategies

MAIN TOPICS	Perception of Students			Perception of Instructors			D. O. F.	Computed t-value	Critical t-value	Decision	Conclusion
	N1	Mean1	Sd1	N2	Mean2	Sd2					
1. <i>L.B.P</i> *	440	3.39	0.66	71	3.59	0.57	509	2.745	1.96	Reject	Significant
2. <i>T.I.P.</i> *	1456	3.31	0.66	232	3.27	0.67	1686	0.843	1.96	Accept	Not Signif.
3. <i>P.I.P.</i> *	2263	3.13	0.70	352	3.49	0.54	2613	11.137	1.96	Reject	Significant
4. <i>P.P.</i> *	883	3.23	0.67	138	3.36	0.70	1019	2.035	1.96	Reject	Significant
5. <i>PAF</i> *	2062	3.31	0.65	305	3.34	0.73	2365	0.539	1.96	Accept	Not Signif.
OVERALL PERCEPTION	5042	3.25	0.68	793	3.39	0.66	5833	5.694	1.96	Reject	Significant

*L.B.P – Legal na Batayan sa Pagtuturo at Paggamit ng wikang Filipino (Legal Bases)

*T.I.P. – Tradisyunal na Istratehya sa Pagtuturo (2) Traditional Strategies

*P.I. P- Pinaunlad na Istratehya sa Pagtuturo (3) Innovative Strategies

*P.P. - Pagbubuo ng Pagsusulit (4) Tests

*P.A.F. – Paksang-aralin sa Filipino (5) Subject Matter Coverage

Table 1 presents findings on five key issues related to teaching Filipino: (1) *Legal Bases*, (2) *Traditional Strategies*, (3) *Innovative Strategies*, (4) *Tests*, and (5) *Subject Matter Coverage*. It was

hypothesized that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of Filipino majors and instructors regarding these topics.

Table 2. Summary of Experts’ Evaluation of Pedagogical Components Contributing to the Usefulness of the Modules

MODULE NO.	Total	Mean	Sd	Categorical Rank of Mean
1	140	3.94	1.13	Useful
2	136	4.12	0.97	Useful
3	136	4.29	0.92	Very Useful
4	137	4.34	0.90	Very Useful
5	136	3.96	1.03	Useful
6	136	4.19	0.97	Useful
Overall Perception	821	4.14	1.00	Useful

Table 2 presents the expert evaluation results on the pedagogical features of the six developed modules, focusing on their usefulness in supporting classroom instruction. The overall mean rating of 4.14

places the modules in the “Useful” category, affirming that the instructional elements embedded in each unit contributed meaningfully to their perceived practical value.

Table 3. Summary of Experts' Validity Ratings of the Modules

Module No	Ratings					Total	Mean	Sd	Categorical Rank of Mean
	1	2	3	4	5				
1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.60	0.49	Very Comprehensive
2	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.40	0.80	Very Comprehensive
3	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.20	0.98	Comprehensive
4	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.40	0.49	Very Comprehensive
5	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.40	0.49	Very Comprehensive
6	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.20	0.98	Comprehensive
OVERALL PERCEPTION	0	0	4	11	15	30	4.37	0.70	Very Comprehensive

To establish content validity, the modules were evaluated by a panel of experts using comprehensiveness as the primary criterion. Following Siddiek's (2010) definition, comprehensiveness refers to the ability to "cover all aspects of the course content."

The overall mean rating of 4.37, with a standard deviation of 0.70, suggests that the experts perceived the modules to be very comprehensive, with a high level of agreement among them.

Table 4. Overall Mean of the Responses of Both Students and Instructors on the Readability of the Modules

Module No.	STUDENTS		INSTRUCTORS		Overall Mean
	N	Mean	N	Mean	
1	476	3.643	56	3.268	3.515
2	448	3.632	56	3.321	3.523
3	447	3.642	56	3.196	3.493
4	476	3.794	56	3.214	3.629
5	474	3.819	56	3.214	3.646
6	476	3.878	56	3.089	3.360
OVERALL RATING	2797	3.737	336	3.217	3.521

The overall mean of 3.521 with a standard deviation of 1.356 indicates a divergence in the respondents' perceptions.

Table 5. t-Test for the Significant Mean Differences between the Ratings of the Students and the Ratings of the Instructors on the Readability of the Six Modules

Module No.	Readability by Students	Readability by Instructors	D.O.F	Computed	Critical	Decision	Conclusion
	Mean 1	Mean 2					
1	3.64	3.27	530	1.717	1.96	Accept	Not significant
2	3.63	3.32	502	1.573	1.96	Accept	Not significant
3	3.64	3.20	501	2.116	1.96	Reject	Significant
4	3.79	3.21	530	2.748	1.96	Reject	Significant
5	3.82	3.21	528	2.884	1.96	Reject	Significant
6	3.88	3.09	530	3.549	1.96	Reject	Significant
Overall Readability Ratings	3.737	9.122	3131	6.010	1.96	Reject	Significant

A t-test was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences between students' and instructors' ratings on the readability of the six instructional modules. For Modules 1 and 2, the computed t-values

(1.717 and 1.573, respectively) were lower than the critical t-value of 1.96 at the 0.05 significance level. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating no significant difference in how students and instructors

perceived the readability of these two modules.

Table 6. Paired Sample t-Test of the Pretest and Posttest Scores of Students Using the Proposed Instructional Modules

n	Df	Sum of Differences	Mean Difference	Standard Deviation of Differences	Computed t-value	Critical t-value	Decision	Interpretation
34	33	411	12.088	7.823	9.01	1.96	Reject Ho	Significant

A null hypothesis was formulated stating that there would be no significant change in the academic achievement of students from the two participating universities based on their pretest and posttest scores. However, the computed t-mean gain was 9.01, which is significantly greater than the critical t-value of 1.96 at the 0.05 level of significance. This result led the researcher to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the use of the developed modules resulted in a significant improvement in students' academic performance.

DISCUSSION

Difference Between Instructors' Teaching Needs and Students' Learning Needs in Filipino Teaching Strategies

For the Legal Bases, instructors rated the topic significantly higher than students. Their broader experience likely explains this, as familiarity with educational laws is essential for teachers. The researcher's own experiences affirm the importance of equipping teachers not only with pedagogical knowledge but also with legal foundations.

On Traditional Strategies, the computed *t*-value (0.843) is less than the critical value (1.96), indicating no significant difference. Both groups acknowledge the relevance of traditional methods as foundational in teaching.

In contrast, Innovative Strategies yielded a computed *t*-value of 11.137 (*df* = 2613), significantly exceeding the critical value. Instructors rated this topic more highly, likely due to their awareness of current trends like critical thinking and cooperative learning, despite limited access to related materials. Many students, unfamiliar with

such strategies, tended to focus on more basic and immediately applicable methods. For Tests, the computed *t*-value (2.035, *df* = 1019) also exceeded the critical value, showing significant differences. Instructors again rated this area higher, emphasizing its importance in assessing learning.

Regarding Subject Matter Coverage, the computed *t*-value (0.539) is below the critical value, suggesting agreement between students and instructors. Both groups recognize the importance of topics like grammar, literature, rhetoric, and composition.

Overall, the general *t*-value (5.694, *df* = 5833) exceeds the critical value, indicating a significant difference in perceptions between students and instructors. Instructors, with more field experience, tend to perceive a greater need for comprehensive content in teaching materials. Students, still in training, have limited exposure and may not fully recognize the complexities of their field.

Experts' Evaluation of Pedagogical Components Contributing to the Usefulness of the Modules

Although the evaluation framework included standard pedagogical dimensions—such as instructional content, delivery events, learning activities, strategies, and assessment, the experts' ratings ultimately reflect how useful each module is likely to be in actual teaching contexts. That usefulness is inferred from the presence and quality of these components, as they directly influence the modules' adaptability, relevance, and clarity when used in instruction.

Notably, Modules 3 and 4 stood out with mean scores of 4.29 and 4.34, respectively,

earning the rank “Very Useful.” This suggests that their instructional features—such as the clarity of objectives, the appropriateness of activities, and the alignment of assessments—contributed to a stronger sense of practical benefit and instructional support.

The remaining modules also received favorable evaluations, with mean scores ranging from 3.94 to 4.19, all falling within the “Useful” category. This indicates that although these modules may not have reached the highest perceived usefulness, they still possess substantial pedagogical merit and are expected to contribute positively to instruction.

The standard deviation values reflect moderate variability in expert opinion, possibly due to content complexity or individual evaluator perspectives. Nevertheless, the consistency of the ratings across modules reinforces the conclusion that the instructional design choices made during module development translated effectively into materials that experts find pedagogically useful.

These findings highlight that usefulness, as derived from sound pedagogical design, serves as a key indicator of module quality. More than just theoretical soundness, the modules demonstrated practical value, suggesting that their use in actual teaching scenarios will likely support effective learning experiences.

As emphasized by Nardo and Hufana (2014), expert evaluations serve not only to validate instructional content but also to enhance the applicability and usability of learning materials in actual classroom settings. The presence of clear learning objectives, engaging student tasks, and coherent assessments supports the instructional validity and overall quality of the modules.

Experts’ Validity Ratings of the Modules

As regards content validity, the six modules were developed from five core instructional areas identified through needs analysis. Among these, Module 1: Foundations of

Teaching Filipino (Sandigan sa Pagtuturo ng Filipino) received the highest rating. Experts commended its extensive coverage of foundational topics such as the history of the Filipino language, its legal bases, and orthographic guidelines. The module was recognized for addressing essential legal, historical, and linguistic questions that teachers encounter in the classroom.

Module 2: Instructional Materials (Mga Kagamitang Pampagtuturo) also received a very comprehensive rating. Experts noted its relevance to contemporary pedagogical needs, with clearly defined concepts and applications of student-centered approaches. The content was seen as timely and necessary, especially given the increasing shift toward more dynamic and participatory instructional methods.

Modules 4 and 5—Module 4: Innovative Methods of Teaching (Mga Inobatib na Pamamaraan ng Pagtuturo) and Module 5: Learning Assessment (Pagtataya ng Pagkatuto)—were consistently rated as very comprehensive, with low standard deviations indicating strong consensus among experts. These modules were praised for their logical structure, alignment with learning competencies, and practical application in classroom instruction.

In contrast, Module 3: Traditional Methods of Teaching (Mga Tradisyunal na Pamamaraan sa Pagtuturo) received more varied feedback. While some experts rated it very comprehensive, others were undecided due to insufficient procedural detail. Several comments suggested that the module could benefit from step-by-step demonstrations of specific traditional strategies to support better classroom implementation.

A similar concern was noted in Module 6: Coverage in Teaching Filipino (Saklaw sa Pagtuturo ng Filipino), which was rated comprehensive but with a slightly higher degree of response variation. Some experts recommended further elaboration on grammar-related subtopics and the logical sequencing of grammar and rhetoric. One expert pointed out that phonology, morphology, and syntax should be treated as

the "the peak in grammatical study grounded in linguistic principles" and suggested that rhetoric should follow grammar in presentation, as they are closely associated. This feedback was addressed during the final revision of the module.

In summary, both the numerical ratings and qualitative feedback demonstrate strong expert approval of the modules. Modules 1, 2, 4, and 5 were consistently rated as very comprehensive, with relatively low standard deviations indicating a high level of consensus among the evaluators. Meanwhile, Modules 3 and 6 were rated comprehensive, reflecting slightly more varied expert opinions. The comments suggest that these two modules would benefit from clearer procedural details and improved sequencing of topics—particularly in the treatment of grammar and rhetoric. Nevertheless, the overall ratings confirm that the modules meet the standards for content validity and are well-positioned to support the development of effective Filipino teaching strategies.

Responses of Both Students and Instructors on the Readability of the Modules

Concerning readability, while the average rating suggests that the modules are generally regarded as clear and readable, the wide standard deviation reflects a lack of consensus among the respondents. Several factors may account for this variation, as previously discussed. One key factor is the unequal number of raters from each group. Moreover, the differing perspectives of the two groups likely contributed to the disparity: students primarily focused on whether the modules were comprehensible and useful for mastering content in preparation for demonstration teaching, whereas instructors evaluated the materials more from a linguistic and textual standpoint.

Differences between the Ratings of the Students and the Ratings of the Instructors on the Readability of the Six Modules

Qualitative feedback aligned with these findings. For Module 1, both groups cited issues such as unclear instructions but also mentioned strengths in layout and structure. In Module 2, both students and instructors noted clerical errors and the need to clarify instructions and improve sequencing of activities. These shared observations suggest that the two groups arrived at similar judgments regarding how easily the texts could be understood and followed. This agreement may also reflect the fact that these modules were distributed earlier in the semester, giving both students and instructors more time to engage with the content. Additionally, the more focused content and manageable scope may have contributed to the consistency of their ratings.

For Modules 3 to 6, significant differences in readability ratings emerged, with students generally providing higher scores than instructors. The computed t-values exceeded the critical value, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. These findings may reflect students' more favorable experiences and motivations when engaging with the modules. While the statistical data speaks to perceived readability, students' open-ended responses provide a more nuanced view. Their comments suggest that students found the content not only engaging and relevant but also accessible.

"Mabisa ang modyul na ito" [This module is effective],

"Malinaw at madaling maintindihan ang mga materyal" [The material is clear and easy to understand],

"Napakahalaga nito sa pagtuturo ng Filipino" [This is very important in teaching Filipino],

"Binabati ko ang pagkamalikhain ng guro" [I commend the teacher's creativity],

"Ngayon lang ako nakatanggap ng modyul na malaking tulong sa akin" [This is the first

time I received a module that really helped me],

While not all directly define readability in a technical sense, these statements support the idea that students perceived the modules as readable and valuable for their learning.

In contrast, instructors' lower ratings were likely shaped by their expertise in grammar, sentence structure, instructional clarity, and coherence—key components of readability. They may have identified issues with text complexity, inconsistent formatting, or vague instructions that students either overlooked or interpreted more favorably due to their enthusiasm.

Overall, the average readability rating from students ($M = 3.737$) was descriptively interpreted as "readable," while the instructors' average rating ($M = 3.217$) fell closer to a "neutral" or "uncertain" judgment. The significant difference between these mean scores points to a perceptual gap: students tended to find the modules more readable than instructors did.

This finding emphasizes the need to consider both end-user impressions and expert evaluations when refining instructional materials for clarity, accessibility, and pedagogical effectiveness.

Mean-Gain from the Pretest-Posttest Conducted to Students from the Two Universities in Tagbilaran City Using the Proposed Modules

To ensure the validity of the data gathered, a pretest-posttest instrument was developed and validated prior to its administration. The instrument consisted of test items aligned with the content and objectives of the proposed modules on teaching strategies in Filipino. Subject-matter experts examined the instrument to establish content validity, and it was administered to a group of students not included in the actual field try-out for item analysis. The validation process confirmed that the instrument was appropriate for measuring the students' knowledge and learning related to the topics presented in the modules. The results of the pretest and posttest were then used to

determine the effectiveness of the proposed modules. The modules themselves were internally validated by a panel of five experts, who rated them highly in terms of content, structure, and instructional relevance. Once validated, the modules were field-tested among 34 preservice teachers: 11 from Holy Name University and 23 from the University of Bohol.

Following the completion of all six modules, a posttest was administered. The results showed notable improvements in student performance. While the highest possible score was 79, several students demonstrated significant gains—for example, from 26 to 45, 29 to 44, 26 to 36, 39 to 59, 37 to 54, and 32 to 62. These score increases serve as evidence of the modules' effectiveness in enhancing student learning outcomes.

The results of this study align with the findings of earlier research on modular instruction. Ruguian (2008) reported that modularized instruction was effective in improving student achievement in kinematics, with both experimental and control groups showing significantly higher posttest scores.

Student feedback from the current study further supports the modules' effectiveness. Many students reported gaining additional knowledge from the modules that was not covered in the regular classroom instruction. They expressed appreciation for the opportunity to use the materials, describing the experience as both enriching and intellectually challenging. One instructor also noted that the modules provided valuable content that contributed to deeper learning.

In conclusion, both quantitative results and qualitative feedback affirm the instructional value of the modules. The significant improvement in student achievement, supported by expert validation and positive user experience, confirms that the developed learning modules are effective tools in enhancing the teaching and learning of Filipino teaching strategies.

CONCLUSION

The study highlights the pressing need for well-designed learning materials that support preservice teachers in mastering strategies for teaching the Filipino subject in basic education. The developed modules, grounded in both instructors' and students identified needs, address key areas such as the legal basis of teaching Filipino, innovative approaches, and test construction. Expert validation confirmed their usefulness and comprehensiveness, while readability was affirmed by both faculty and students. The significant increase in posttest scores provides strong evidence of the modules' effectiveness in enhancing preservice teachers' competence. This study affirms the importance of producing validated, research-based learning resources to strengthen the preparation of future educators in teaching the Filipino subject.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: No conflicts of interest declared.

REFERENCES

1. Astorga, E. R. & Vertucio, H. D. (2016, March 19-20). Instructional Materials in Filipino Rhetoric: A Source of Educational Excellence in Filipino Curriculum. 4th International Conference on Language, Education and Innovation (ICLEI). <https://tinyurl.com/4ad8dv84>
2. Doria, E. & Conui, F. (2020). Pagbuo ng Workbuk sa Kasanayan sa Kritikal na Pag-lisip ng mga Estudyante. CASS Langkit, 09, 19-41. <https://journals.msuiit.edu.ph/langkit/article/view/85/54>
3. Lim, A. G. Y. (2024, February 2). *Schedules of reinforcement in psychology (examples)*. Simply Psychology. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/schedules-of-reinforcement.html>
4. Montemayor, M. T. (2018, August 2). *Filipino must evolve into a language of knowledge: Almario*. Philippine News Agency. <https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1043532>
5. Nardo, Ma. T., & Hufana, E. (2014). Development and Evaluation of Modules in Technical Writing. [Review of Development and Evaluation of Modules in Technical Writing.]. *American Journal of Educational Research*. 2(6), 341-350. doi: 10.12691/education-2-6-2
6. Orbe, M. C. (2019, January 16). Module development for a social science course: An application of Gagne's Nine Events in Instruction. 8th MAAP Research Forum. <https://tinyurl.com/yjzhvfnv>
7. Ruguian, Victoria M. (2008, May). "Effectiveness of Modularized Instruction in Kinematics." www.mmsu.edu.ph/publication/files/modularize_dinstruction.pdf
8. Sari, F., & Reigeluth, C. M. (1982, January 1). Writing and evaluating textbooks: Contributions from instructional theory. <https://tinyurl.com/54w2k5px>
9. Sadiq, S. & Zamir, S. (2014). Effectiveness of Modular Approach in Teaching at University level. *Journal of Education and Practice*. 5(17), 103-109. <https://tinyurl.com/mpe2bcz5>
10. Sarmiento, A. (2005). "Learning Modules: A Self-Learning Kit in Criminology." *Frontiers for Innovative Criminology Education*. <http://www.rkmfiles.net/criminology-articles/Learning-Modules-Self-Learning-Kit-in-Criminology.html>
11. Sejpal, D. (2013). Modular Method of teaching. *International Journal for Research in Education*, 2(2), 169-171.
12. Siddiek, A. G. (2010). The Impact of Test Content Validity on Language Teaching and Learning. *Asian Social Science*, 6(12), 133-143. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED574721.pdf>
13. Tety, J L. (2016). Role of Instructional Materials in Academic Performance in Community Secondary Schools in Rombo District. *CORE*. Pp. 1-73. <https://tinyurl.com/ycx5eym6>
14. Torrefranca, E. C. (2017). View of Development and Validation of Instructional Modules on Rational Expressions and Variations. (2026). Pnuresearchportal.org. <https://www.po.pnuresearchportal.org/ejournal/index.php/normallights/article/view/375/235>

How to cite this article: Ethel S. Doria, Roque A. Bongcac. Development and validation of learning modules on teaching strategies for preservice teachers specializing in Filipino. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2026; 13(6): 298-308. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20260630>
