Validity of Learning Materials in Araling Panlipunan 2

Claire De Mesa Moral

claire.moral@deped.gov.ph
Elementary Teacher, Silangan Elementary School., Santa Cruz 4009 Laguna, Philippines

Ma. Victoria A. Cabigan

mavictoriacabigan@lspu.edu.ph
College Professor, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz 4009 Laguna, Philippines

Abstract

This study was conducted to determine the validity of the Araling Panlipunan 2 instructional materials.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following statements (1) Determine the level of validity of learning materials in terms of their components as to (1.1) Learning Objectives, (1.2) Content, (1.3) Enhancement Activities, and (1.4) Application (2) Determine the level of validity of learning materials in terms of its characteristics as to (2.1) Creativeness, (2.2) Accuracy and (2.3) Usefulness. (3) Determine the significant difference in the level of its components and characteristics as rated by the teacher and master teachers.

Descriptive design was utilized to analyze the data systematically. A survey and a research- made questionnaire on a 5-point Likert scale were used in the study. Weighted mean and standard deviation were used for the descriptive questions, while a two-sample T-test was used for the inferential questions.

In accordance with the findings, the conclusions were made. The study revealed that the level of learning materials in terms of its components gathered a learning objective, contents, enhancement activities, and application were very high. This means that the components of learning material in Araling Panlipunan 2 were evident. And as to the level of learning materials in terms of its characteristics as to creativeness, accuracy, usefulness was very high. This means that the characteristics of learning material in Araling Panlipunan 2 were evident.

On the other hand, the learning objectives, content, and application, the association among these variables revealed a not significant analysis of difference, which means that the master teacher and teachers' perception of the learning materials. However, when it comes to enhancement activities, it gathered a p-value which showcase a significant analysis that indicates a significant difference in the master teacher and teacher evaluation of the learning material.

Therefore, the hypothesis is partially accepted, stating that there is no significant difference in the level of validity of learning materials in terms of learning objectives, content and application. On the other hand, the enhancement activities show significant difference as evaluated by the master teachers and teachers in Araling Panlipunan.

This recommends teachers to continue creating and developing learning materials that would manifest good learning objectives, quality content, engaging enhancement activities, and meaningful application.

Keywords: Validity, Learning Materials, Araling Panlipunan, Accuracy, Application, Content, Creativeness, Usefulness

1. Main Text

Introduction

Since that continued obstacles in education are encountered due to the pandemic, the Department of Education (DepEd) addresses learning and education through various learning modalities, one of which is the modular method.

The modular approach is one of the variety of strategies, methods, and instructional styles that helps augment the scarcity of online instructional approaches that help in influencing pupils' abilities or knowledge.

Manual instruction is one of the approaches or tactics employed by educators nowadays which fall under the Learning Material category. Learning Material is a new teaching technique that has become popular in the 21st century. It includes activities as well as lessons. Teachers utilize Learning Materials as a new method to improve the knowledge imparted to students. It is a

type of educational material that offers information and instructs pupils on how to learn. Material development can make learning easier for students despite Individual differences. Hence, each child learns uniquely.

The least mastered competencies or expertise were determined prior to the creation and validation of a learning resource to address the learning issues and circumstances brought by the pandemic as well as to encourage the students to improve their capacity.

In line with this, the study determined to validate the learning material in Araling Panlipunan 2. The new material can be used in the teaching and learning process; thus, help learners and educators adopt the system in the new normal.

Background of the Study

Teachers sometimes use an instructional strategy known as "spoon-feeding." The students listen, while the teacher is the only one discussing. In a way, students also learn in this manner. However, students have already learned how to deal with the different instructional skills and procedures in the new situation.

Education's goal today is to teach students how to live independently by developing their minds and preparing them for a bright future. Students must be taught to think, comprehend, integrate, and demonstrate. The most important aspect of the knowledge gained is the ability to learn more about oneself. But some teachers are fearful of change, particularly in changing strategies or methods and the advancement of technology. They don't want to try a new method or make modifications Concerning change, the Department of Education has imposed the use of Learning Module (LM) and made them available as part of the K-12 curriculum's teaching methodologies.

Since that teacher are facilitators of learning, the learning material can be used as a strategy for teachers in the classroom community. This strategy is used nowadays by teachers in the 21st century, especially in this new normal setup of education brought about by the pandemic.

In this study, the researcher developed and validated a learning material in Araling Panlipunan for Grade 2 learners to provide a new material for use in the teaching and learning process.

Theoretical Framework

ADDIE is the classic instructional design model used for developing educational and training programs and instructional materials. ADDIE stands for Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation, the five steps in the design process.

Analysis: Identify the performance gap

The analysis phase involves identifying and clarifying the instructional problem or, from a training standpoint, identifying the performance gap and desired outcomes. This phase includes identifying participant characteristics (for example, current knowledge and skills, level of experience, language proficiency, and motivation), learning resources and budget and time constraints, defining the learning environment, and establishing instructional goals and objectives.

Design: Identify the learning objectives

The design phase broadly involves subject matter design, including defining specific learning objectives and instructional strategies and structuring content and assessments. The design should reflect a logical flow. Assessments should provide feedback on the learner's progress in achieving the learning objectives.

Development: Develop a performance solution

As the title indicates, the development phase involves creating/curating, and assembling the content specified in the design phase. This phase also involves stakeholder review and validation and any required revisions. This phase may involve the integration of technology and related testing.

Implementation: Deliver the performance solution

Implementation involves the development of the training framework, including course curriculum, learning outcomes, and the learning space. The process should also include confirming the availability of required materials and associated applications or websites and preparing learners to use any required tools or technology. The final step, of course, is participant engagement.

Evaluation: Evaluate the results relative to the performance objectives.

Although evaluation is listed last, it is included in every aspect of the process in practice. The overall design process is meant to be iterative, with elements fine-tuned along the way. Interim evaluations, referred to as formative evaluations, are conducted before implementation to confirm that the learning resources meet the specifications established in the design phase. After implementation, a summative evaluation would be conducted to determine training effectiveness: participant satisfaction, participant learning, and participant performance.

This study is anchored also on Bruner's Constructivism Theory. As cited by Fosnot (2015), constructivism emphasizes the learner's active role in building understanding and making sense of the information. Constructivist teaching is learner-centered, where students are actively involved in knowledge construction rather than passive learners.

A significant theme in the theoretical framework of Bruner is that learning is an active process in which learners construct new ideas or concepts based on their current and previous knowledge. The learner selects and transforms information, constructs hypotheses, makes decisions, and relies on their understanding. Cognitive structure (schema) provides meaning and organization to experiences and allows the individual to go beyond the information given.

To put it another way, the teacher should encourage students to discover principles within their own. The learner should be able to process new ideas that they acquire from some instructional material. They can then rely on their understanding and problem-solving ability.

On the other hand, Carl Roger's facilitation model also found application in the use of modules in teaching. This learning theory is based on the need to facilitate knowledge rather than teach it in the traditional sense. In modular instruction, students are given complete freedom to learn when and how they want to learn, and the personal relationship between the teacher and the learner is motivating.

The present study is also anchored on the Carl Roger's facilitation modl since manual instruction is applicable in the students' teaching and learning process.

Another theory is Brigg's theory of individualization, where the classroom teacher needs to learn how to develop instructional materials.

The development of instructional materials is essential for both the teachers and students in the teaching and learning processes. Learners are expected to learn quickly because of the development and improvements.

As Race (1989) mentioned, self-instructional materials are anchored on specifically developed teaching and learning theories.

Instructional material theories assume that there is a direct link between the materials that the teachers use and the students' learning outcomes. These outcomes include higher learning abilities, quality strategies to learn, perform classroom activities, and possessing a positive attitude towards learning. Further, these theories assume that instructional materials can develop the students highest order of intellectual skills as they illustrate clearly, step by step, how to follow the rules/principles and elaborate on the concepts, all of which have a positive impact on solving new problems by analyzing the situation and formulating a plan (Gagné et al., 2005). Instructional material can develop higher learning abilities in the learners through self-teaching or guided learning. This implies that the instructional materials mainly comprise eliciting performance, providing feedback on performance correctness, and providing guidance for guided discovery learning.

Instructional materials or technology in education stretch students' imagination and encourage them to solve problems in their lives. Similar ideas are held by Lev Vygotsky, a Russian psychologist. He held a view that tools and signs, which are in the form of instructional materials, can develop students' higher level of thinking, which is essential in problem-solving activities. However, since they are domain-specific, the ways instructional materials can start cognitive development are yet to be studied with respect to classroom teaching.

It is relevant to the current study since these focuses on developing and validating learning materials to enhance teaching and learning strategies so that students are motivated to learn, and teachers are aware of the improvements. The theories also suggest that learning materials are important in a school context's teaching and learning process. It also claims that instructional materials can improve each learner's capacities and knowledge, which is critical in the classroom. The exercises included in the learning materials are one method of assisting students in comprehending the contents or lessons.

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to know the validity of learning materials in Araling Panlipunan 2.

1. Determine the level of validity of learning materials in terms of their components as to:
      1.1. Learning Objectives;
      1.2. Content;
      1.3. Enhancement Activities; and
      1.4. Application

2. Determine the level of validity of learning materials in terms of their characteristics as to:
      2.1. Creativeness;
      2.2. Accuracy; and
      2.3. Usefulness

3. Determine the significant difference in the level of its components and characteristics as rated by the teacher and master teachers.

Research Methodology

This research explores the validity of learning material in Araling Panlipunan 2. However, specifically, it addressed the significant difference in the level of its components and characteristics as rated by the teachers and master teachers.

Research Design

The researcher used the descriptive methods of research to analyze the data systematically. The descriptive research method helped the researcher plan and carry out descriptive details about the learning material that was validated.

According to Calmorin (2007), descriptive research includes presenting facts or current conditions concerning the nature or persons, several subjects or classes of events, classification, classification, or measurement. Descriptive research is characterized as fact-finding with adequate interpretations.

Population and Sampling Technique

The study aims to test the validity of the Araling Panlipunan learning material in the form of a booklet. The study utilized the 50 Araling Panlipunan teachers and 36 Master teachers of Santa Cruz District, with 86 respondents.

Research Procedure

The research study started during the first semester of 2021-2022. The pre-oral defense was done to approve the title, paradigm, and statement of the problem. The procedure followed for the conduct of the research was preparing the requirements needed. The research adviser and the Dean of the College of Teacher Education signed and noted a written request to secure permission to conduct this study.

The next step was gathering data needed for the related literature and related studies done primarily by reading books and journals (online and offline), browsing the internet, and sample thesis are other resources the researcher uses to gain the needed information for this study. Finally, the researcher administered a survey during the first semester of the academic year 2021-2022.

The respondents evaluated the validity of Araling Panlipunan Learning material. The proponent created a self-made questionnaire via Google Form.

The self-made questionnaire was checked and validated by Mrs. Analiza T. Madelar, Master Teacher I in Silangan Elementary School, and the panelist with a letter of request for validation and approval of the questionnaire.

The researcher asked and discussed the study and the respondents' participation prior to the validation of the questionnaire. After the validation, the researcher asked permission from the Division Superintendent of the Department of Education to conduct her research through a google form. The learning material was shown to the master teachers for their evaluation.

Finally, the researcher interpreted the data collected to determine the validity of the learning material in Araling Panlipunan.

Research Instrument

The checklist questionnaire was used to validate the Learning Material in Araling Panlipunan to measure its validity. The rating scale was presented using the Likert scale:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	High
3	2.60-3.39	Average
2	1.80-2.59	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Very Low

Statistical Treatment of Data

Statistical treatment of data of the present study is shown in the table below.

Statement of the Problem	Statistical Tool

To determine the level of acceptability and validity of the learning material in its components.	Weighted mean and Standard Deviation
To identify the significant difference in the level of validity of the learning material in Araling Panlipunan.	T-test

Results and Discussion

Level of Validity of Learning Materials in terms of its Components

Instructional materials or learning materials serve as teachers' resources in the teaching and learning process to attain the desired outcomes. In this study, the components of the learning materials were learning objectives, enhancement activities, content, and application which were determined by the weighted mean and standard deviation.

Table 1. As to Learning Objectives

STATEMENT	Master Teacher			Teacher		
	Mean	SD	Remarks	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. The objectives are measurable.	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree	4.81	0.40	Strongly Agree
2. The objectives are clearly stated.	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree	4.81	0.40	Strongly Agree
3. The objectives are aligned with the activities and content.	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree	4.86	0.35	Strongly Agree
4. The objectives consist of MELCS.	4.83	0.38	Strongly Agree	4.83	0.38	Strongly Agree
5. The objectives were achieved in the end.	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree	4.81	0.40	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.79		Strongly Agree	4.82		Strongly Agree
Interpretation	Very High			Very High		

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	High
3	2.60-3.39	Average
2	1.80-2.59	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Very Low

The results above show that as to learning objectives, the master teachers perceived that the components of the learning materials are *very high* supported by the grand mean of (M=4.79). This means that the respondents' manifest the learning objectives in the learning materials as evident. The respondents also manifest that the learning objectives are measurable and aligned to the activities and content.

The table presents that master teachers *strongly agree* that *the objectives consist of MELCS* with the highest obtained mean of (M=4.83, SD=0.38)*. On the same note, they also *strongly agree* that *the objectives are clearly stated though* it bears the lowest mean of (M=4.78, SD=0.42). This result signifies that the respondents perceived that the objectives in the learning materials appeared helpful to learners.

Similarly, teachers viewed that the components of the learning materials in terms of learning objectives were *very high*, denoted by the grand mean of (M=4.82). This means that the respondents recognized the learning objectives as reflected the learning materials.

Table 1 reveals that the teachers *strongly agree* that objectives were *aligned to the activities and content,* with the highest obtained mean of (M=4.86, SD=0.35)*. They also *strongly agree* that *the objectives are measurable, and that the learning material* both support the objectives with a mean of (M=4.81, SD=0.40). These results imply that the respondents perceived that the learning objectives in the learning materials were achieved.

Megan Barnard supports the findings of this study; hence, Emma Whitt & Stephanie McDonald (2021) state that despite their best intentions, both groups still interpret traditional examinations as a test of memory, and students respond by using surface and strategic learning approaches. Students use learning objectives in strategic and surface-level assessment preparations, whereas academics employ learning objectives to frame teaching. The matching experiment revealed that a large percentage of learning objective verbs might be used for both surface and deep learning. As a result, it has been suggested that students can use learning

objectives to construct strategic approaches to learning and assessment preparation, resulting in a mismatch between the academic's planned learning method and the student's actual learning approach.

The result below shows that as to contents, the master teachers perceived that the components of the learning materials were *very high* supported by the grand mean of (M=4.66). This means that the respondents manifest those contents in the learning materials are evident.

It was presented that master teachers *strongly agree* that *the contents are parallel to its objectives* with the obtained highest mean of (M=4.81, SD=0.40)*.* On the same note, they also *strongly agree* that *the content increases the learners' understanding,* although it bears the lowest mean of (M=4.56, SD=0.50). This means that the respondents perceived those contents in the learning materials appeared helpful to learners.

Similarly, teachers viewed that the components of the learning materials in terms of contents were *very high*, denoted by the grand mean of (M=4.82). This means that the respondents recognized the contents of the learning materials.

Table 2 shows that the teachers *strongly agree* that contents were *parallel to its objectives* with the highest obtained mean of (M=4.974, SD=0.23). They also *strongly agree* that *the content is organized and substantial;* with a mean of (M=4.83, SD=0.38). These results imply that the respondents perceived the contents of the learning materials to follow the aligned objectives.

Table 2. As to Contents

STATEMENT	Master Teacher			Teacher		
	Mean	**SD**	**Remarks**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Remarks**
1. The content is parallel to its objective.	4.81	0.40	Strongly Agree	4.94	0.23	Strongly Agree
2. The content is organized and substantial.	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree	4.83	0.38	Strongly Agree
3. The content helps answer activities.	4.61	0.49	Strongly Agree	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree
4. The content was up to date.	4.64	0.49	Strongly Agree	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree
5. The content helped increase the understanding of the learners.	4.56	0.50	Strongly Agree	4.83	0.45	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**4.66**		**Strongly Agree**	**4.82**		**Strongly Agree**
Interpretation	**Very High**			**Very High**		

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	High
3	2.60-3.39	Average
2	1.80-2.59	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Very Low

The findings above are supported by Horne (2015) stating that activating students' preexisting knowledge of the subject issue is the first step in successfully encouraging them to learn about the subject content. Photos are a fantastic method to do this, as they pique learners' interest and get them chatting. After that, introduce a new subject terminology and concepts. An excellent method to achieve this is to show some related videos with explanations that illustrate the new content in context.

The result below shows that as to enhancement activities, the master teachers perceived that the components of the learning materials were *very high* supported by the grand mean of (M=4.74). This means that the respondents manifest that the enhancement activities outcome in the learning materials is evident.

Table 3. As to Enhancement Activities

STATEMENT	Master Teacher			Teacher		
	Mean	**SD**	**Remarks**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Remarks**
1. The outcome of the enhancement activities is measured objectively.	4.75	0.44	Strongly Agree	4.92	0.28	Strongly Agree
2. The activity is aligned to the content and objectives.	4.64	0.49	Strongly Agree	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree

3. The enhancement activities are organized.	4.72	0.45	Strongly Agree	4.89	0.32	Strongly Agree
4. The enhancement activities helped increase the understanding of the topic.	4.75	0.44	Strongly Agree	4.86	0.35	Strongly Agree
5. The enhancement activities prepared the students for the next lesson.	4.83	0.38	Strongly Agree	4.92	0.28	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**4.74**		**Strongly Agree**	**4.87**		**Strongly Agree**
Interpretation	**Very High**			**Very High**		

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	High
3	2.60-3.39	Average
2	1.80-2.59	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Very Low

It was presented that master teachers *strongly agree* that *the enhancement activities prepare the students for the next lesson* with the obtained highest mean of (M=4.83, SD=0.38). On the same note, they also *strongly agree* that *the enhancement activities are aligned to the content and objectives though* it bears the lowest mean of (M=4.64, SD=0.49). These results mean that the respondents perceived the enhancement activities in the learning materials which appeared helpful to learners.

Similarly, teachers viewed that the components of the learning materials in terms of learning objectives were *very high*, denoted by the grand mean of (M=4.87). This means that the respondents recognized the enhancement activities in the learning materials.

Table 3 shows that the teachers *strongly agree* that enhancement activities were *measured objectively* with the highest obtained mean of (M=4.92, SD=0.28). They also *strongly agree* that *the enhancement activities clarified the topic, and they accepted that the learning material* both supported the mean of (M=4.86, SD=0.35). These results imply that the respondents perceived the enhancement activities in the learning materials are in accordance with the aligned content and objectives.

The findings of this study are supported by Danielson (2017) that all elements of an instructional plan, the most critical, is the design of instructional activities. The critical question is: 'What could students do to learn X?' There are many choices, of course. They could listen to a presentation or work--either alone or in groups--to solve a problem or engage in a project. Given the importance of student's active intellectual engagement in learning, skilled teachers, in their design of activities, favor those that challenge students to be cognitively active, they offer students the opportunity to select an activity from among several options, and permit students the opportunity to develop their understanding.

The result below shows that as to application, the master teachers perceived that the components of the learning materials were *very high* supported by the grand mean of (M=4.72). This means that the respondents manifest that the application in the learning materials is evident.

Table 4. As to Application

STATEMENT	Master Teacher			Teacher		
	Mean	**SD**	**Remarks**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Remarks**
1. The outcome of the application is measured objectively.	4.75	0.44	Strongly Agree	4.92	0.28	Strongly Agree
2. The application activities are organized.	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree	4.86	0.35	Strongly Agree
3. The application activities were able to show the acquired knowledge of the learners.	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree	4.92	0.28	Strongly Agree
4. The helpful in increasing the understanding of the topic. Is aligned to the content and objectives.	4.67	0.48	Strongly Agree	4.86	0.35	Strongly Agree
5. The application prepared the students for the next lesson.	4.72	0.45	Strongly Agree	4.92	0.28	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**4.72**		**Strongly Agree**	**4.89**		**Strongly Agree**
Interpretation	**Very High**			**Very High**		

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	High
3	2.60-3.39	Average
2	1.80-2.59	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Very Low

It was presented that master teachers *strongly agree* that *enhancement activities showed the acquired knowledge of the learners* with the highest mean of (M=4.78, SD=0.42). On the same note, they also *strongly agree* that *application was helpful in increasing the understanding of the topic and aligned to the content and objectives though* it bears the lowest mean of (M=4.67, SD=0.48). These results mean that the respondents perceived the application in the learning materials as helpful to learners.

Similarly, teachers viewed that the components of the learning materials in terms of application were *very high*, denoted by the grand mean of (M=4.89). This means that the respondents recognized the application in the learning materials.

As shown in Table 4, the teachers *strongly agree* that *the outcome of the application is measured objectively* with the highest obtained mean of (M=4.92, SD=0.38). Just the same, they also *strongly agree* that *the acquired knowledge of the learners were able to test through these activities* with a mean of (M=4.92, SD=0.38). These results imply that the respondents perceived the application of the learning materials as in accordance with the achieved objectives.

The study's findings are supported by Sequeira (2021) stating that in a good learning activity, students should be able to apply what is learned and apply it in another context for another purpose. For example, students can directly apply the skills or knowledge they acquired to an assessment task on data handling using a bar and line graphs or to a new unit in science where they are plotting graphs to show which flowers attract specific pollinators in the unit. Furthermore, the teacher's fundamental task is to get students to engage in learning activities that are likely to achieve [the intended learning] outcomes.

Level of Validity of Learning Materials in Terms of Its Characteristics

Instructional materials or learning materials serve as teachers' resources in the teaching and learning process to attain the desired outcomes. In this study, the components of the learning materials were described as creativeness, accuracy, and usefulness, which was determined by the weighted mean and standard deviation.

The result below shows that as to creativeness, the master teachers perceived that the components of the learning materials were *very high* supported by the grand mean of (M=4.74). This means that the respondents manifest creativity in the learning materials.

Table 5. As to Creativeness

STATEMENT	Master Teacher			Teacher		
	Mean	**SD**	**Remarks**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Remarks**
1. The creativeness is evident.	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree
2. I am satisfied with the creativity.	4.75	0.44	Strongly Agree	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree
3. The creativeness helps in motivating the learner.	4.75	0.44	Strongly Agree	4.81	0.40	Strongly Agree
4. The design is aligned with the topic and content.	4.72	0.45	Strongly Agree	4.83	0.38	Strongly Agree
5. The design is not a distraction.	4.78	0.42	Strongly Agree	4.81	0.40	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**4.74**		**Strongly Agree**	**4.80**		**Strongly Agree**
Interpretation	**Very High**			**Very High**		

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	High
3	2.60-3.39	Average
2	1.80-2.59	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Very Low

It was presented that master teachers *strongly agree* that *the learning material design is not a distraction* with the obtained highest (M=4.78, SD=0.42). On the same note, they also *strongly agree* that *the creativeness is evident* though it bears the lowest

(M=4.69, SD=0.47). This means that the respondents perceived the creativeness in the learning materials, yet it does not appear distracting to learners.

Similarly, teachers viewed that the components of the learning materials in terms of creativeness was *very high*, denoted by the grand mean of (M=4.80). This means that the respondents recognized the creativity in the learning materials.

As shown in Table 5, the teachers *strongly agree* that *the design aligns with the topic and content* with the highest obtained mean of (M=4.83, SD=0.38). They also *strongly agree* that *the creativeness is evident, and they are satisfied with the creativity which* both supported the least mean of (M=4.78, SD=0.42). These results imply that the respondents perceived the creativeness in the learning materials and its design is in accordance with the topic and content.

Penfold (2019) supports the study's findings that the sensory and aesthetic characteristics of a substance can change as a child plays with it, allowing for more experimentation. Children can then extend and complicate their learning over time because of these modifications.

The result below shows that as to the accuracy, the master teachers perceived that the components of the learning materials were *very high*, supported by the grand mean of (M=4.69). This means that the respondents manifest the accuracy in the learning materials.

It was presented that master teachers *strongly agree* that *the accuracy of the learning material is accurate for learners' needs* with the highest obtained mean of (M=4.69, SD=0.47). On the same note, they also *strongly agree* that *the accuracy is evident* though it bears the lowest mean of (M=4.67, SD=0.48). These results mean that the respondents perceived the accuracy of the learning materials and appeared helpful to learners.

Similarly, teachers viewed that the components of the learning materials in terms of accuracy were *very high*, as denoted by the grand mean of (M=4.71). This means that the respondents recognized the accuracy of the learning materials.

As shown in Table 6, the teachers *strongly agree* that *the content is accurate for the learner's needs*, with the highest obtained mean of (M=4.72, SD=0.45). They also *strongly agree* that *the accuracy is evident, and they accept the learning material* both supported the least mean of (M=4.72, SD=0.45). These results imply that the respondents perceived the accuracy of the learning materials is in accordance with the needs of the learners.

Table 6. As to Accuracy

STATEMENT	Master Teacher			Teacher		
	Mean	SD	Remarks	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. The components are accurate.	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree	4.67	0.48	Strongly Agree
2. The learning material is acceptable.	4.67	0.48	Strongly Agree	4.72	0.45	Strongly Agree
3. The accuracy is evident.	4.67	0.48	Strongly Agree	4.72	0.45	Strongly Agree
4. It enhances the knowledge of the learners.	4.72	0.45	Strongly Agree	4.72	0.45	Strongly Agree
5. The learning material's content is accurate for the learners.	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.69		Strongly Agree	4.71		Strongly Agree
Interpretation	Very High			Very High		

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	High
3	2.60-3.39	Average
2	1.80-2.59	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Very Low

Gullickson (2013) supported the study's findings that accuracy requirements ensure that a student evaluation provides accurate information about a student's learning and performance. Valid interpretations, reasonable conclusions, and suitable follow-up result from good data.

The results below show that as to the usefulness, the master teachers perceived that the components of the learning materials are *very high* supported by the grand (M=4.66). This result means that the respondents manifest the accuracy in the learning materials.

Table 7. As to Usefulness

STATEMENT	Master Teacher	Teacher

	Mean	SD	Remarks	Mean	SD	Remarks
1. It improves the learners' understanding.	4.81	0.40	Strongly Agree	4.83	0.38	Strongly Agree
2. It's easier to use and understand.	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree	4.81	0.40	Strongly Agree
3. it enables the learners to understand the lesson quickly.	4.61	0.49	Strongly Agree	4.72	0.45	Strongly Agree
4. It enhances the problem-solving skills of the learners.	4.64	0.49	Strongly Agree	4.75	0.44	Strongly Agree
5. It increases the productiveness of the learners.	4.56	0.50	Strongly Agree	4.69	0.47	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	**4.66**		**Strongly Agree**	**4.76**		**Strongly Agree**
Interpretation	**Very High**			**Very High**		

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	High
3	2.60-3.39	Average
2	1.80-2.59	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Very Low

It is presented that master teachers *strongly agree* that *the usefulness of the learning material improves the learners' understanding* with the obtained highest mean of (M=4.81, SD=0.40). On the same note, they also *strongly agree* that *the usefulness is evident* though it bears the lowest mean of (M=4.61, SD=0.49). These results mean that the respondents perceived the usefulness of the learning materials, yet it appeared helpful to learners.

Similarly, teachers viewed that the components of the learning materials in terms of usefulness were *very high*, as denoted by the grand mean of (M=4.76). This means that the respondents recognized the usefulness of the learning materials.

Table 7 shows that the teachers *strongly agree* that *the content is helpful to learners* with the highest obtained mean of (M=4.83, SD=0.38). They also *strongly agree* that *the usefulness is evident, and they accept the learning material which* both supported the least mean of (M=4.72, SD=0.45). These results imply that the respondents perceived the usefulness of the learning materials in accordance with the needs of the learners.

The findings of this study are supported by Almahasees et al., 2021 stating that research shows various perceptions of distance education usefulness. Many studies highlight the advantages of distance learning in learning flexibility, efficiency, outcomes, self-efficacy, and comfort.

Significant Difference in the Level of its Components and Characteristics as rated by the Teacher and Master Teachers

Minitab 14 was used to compute the data gathered and treat them statistically using the Two-Sample T-test. The computed p-values were compared to the significance level at 0.05 to determine the significant difference in the level of validity of learning materials as rated by the respondents. Presented in table 8 was the significant difference in the level of validity of learning materials as evaluated by the master teachers and teachers in Araling Panlipunan.

Table 8. Significant Difference in the Level of Validity of Learning materials as rated by the Respondents

Variable	Master Teacher Mean	Teacher Mean	t-value	p-value	Analysis
Learning Objectives	4.789	4.800	-0.14	0.892	Not Significant
Content	4.817	4.788	0.42	0.678	Not Significant
Enhancement Activities	4.739	4.888	-2.82	0.007	Significant
Application	4.722	4.844	-1.66	0.103	Not Significant

significant at a .05 level of significance

The obtained p-value (0.007), which was lower than the (0.05) level of significance, implied a *significant* difference in the level of validity of the learning materials in terms of enhancement activities as rated by the respondents. This further implies that the group respondents have a different evaluation of the validity of the enhancement activities present in the learning materials.

Besides, the p-value (0.892) on learning objectives, (0.678) on content, and (0.103) on the application, which was all higher than (0.05) level of significance, suggested a *not significant* analysis. This meant further that the groups of respondents have a similar judgment on the validity of the learning materials in terms of objectives, content, and application.

Summary of Findings

The study was conducted to determine the validity of the Araling Panlipunan 2 learning material.

Specifically, this research sought to provide relevant information based on the following research objectives (1) Determine the level of validity of learning materials in terms of its components as to (1.1) Learning Objectives, (1.2) Content, (1.3) Enhancement Activities, and (1.4) Application (2) Determine the level of acceptability of learning materials in terms of its characteristics as to (2.1) Creativeness, (2.2) Accuracy and (2.3) Usefulness (3) Determine the significant difference in the level of its components and characteristics as rated by the teacher and master teachers.

The descriptive design was utilized to analyze the data systematically. A survey and a research-made questionnaire in the form of a 5-point Likert scale were used. Weighted mean and standard deviation were used for the descriptive questions, while the Two-Sample T-test was used for the inferential questions.

The salient points of the study presented found that the level of learning materials in terms of its components gathered a learning objective, contents, enhancement activities, and application were very high respectively. This means that the components of learning material in Araling Panlipunan 2 were evident.

The level of learning materials in terms of its characteristics as to creativeness, accuracy, usefulness which means very high, respectively. This means that the characteristics of learning material in Araling Panlipunan 2 were evident.

The learning objectives, content, and application, the association among these variables revealed a not significant analysis of difference, which means that the master teacher and teachers' perception of the learning materials. However, when it comes to enhancement activities, it gathered a p-value which showcase a significant analysis that indicates a significant difference in the master teacher and teacher evaluation of the learning material.

Conclusion

In accordance with the findings, the conclusions were made:

The respondents validated the learning material anchored through the data that shows the respondents strongly agree which means very high with all the statement provided that illustrates its positive impact on them. The research also reveals no significant difference between master teachers and teachers across all indicators under each parameter.

Therefore, the hypothesis is partially accepted, stating that there is no significant difference in the level of validity of learning materials in terms of learning objectives, content and application. On the other hand, the enhancement activities show significant difference as evaluated by the master teachers and teachers in Araling Panlipunan.s.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, the following recommendations are hereby endorsed.
1. Teachers may continue creating and developing learning materials that would manifest good learning objectives, quality content, engaging enhancement activities, and meaningful application.
2. The rated learning material may be used as reference or supplemental material in teaching and learning Araling Panlipunan 2.
3. The master teachers and teachers of Araling Panlipunan may develop a standard validating tool for learning materials in teaching and learning Araling Panlipunan that would manifest the characteristics such as creativeness, accuracy, and usefulness.
4. The study's rated learning material may be converted into digitalized learning material in teaching-learning Araling Panlipunan 2.
5. The following study may employ other indicators to gather more information about the validity of learning materials in Araling Panlipunan 2.
6. The future researchers may conduct a study about the validity of learning materials that can be used in the teaching-learning Araling Panlipunan.6. Future researchers may conduct studies about the faculty efficiency of the teachers in a different setting like work from home scheme.

References

Abdullah et.al. (2021). Learning Activities and their effects on learning and assessment preparation Education, 46:5, 673-684, DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2020.1822281

Almahasees et al. (2021). Faculty and students' perceptions of online learning during COVID-19. Frontiers in Education, 6, Article 638470. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.638470

Balderas (2016). Learning and Understanding: Improving Advanced Study of Mathematics and Science in U.S. High Schools Retrieved from: https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/10129/chapter/8

Barad, K (2007). Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning. Durham: Duke University Press.

Barad, K (2011). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. Signs, 28(3), p.801-831.

Barnard et.al. (2021) Learning objectives and their effects on learning and assessment preparation: insights from an undergraduate psychology course, Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46:5, 673-684, DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2020.1822281

Bennett, J (2004). The force of things: Steps toward an ecology of matter. Political Theory, 32(3), p.347-372.

Bennett, J (2010). Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things. Durham: Duke University Press.

Braidotti, R (2013). The posthuman. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Calmorin (2007). Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching (2nd ed.) (p. 57). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Central Data Catalog Retrieved from: Error! Hyperlink reference not valid. Thailand - Ordinary National Educational Test – Overview Department of Education. Retrieved from: https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/05/06/officialstatement2/#:~:text=Education%20can%20and%20must%20continue%20but%20only%20under,the%20DOH%20and%20the%20World%20Health%20Organization%20%28WHO%29

Cicha et al. (2021). COVID-19 and higher education: First-year students' expectations toward distance learning. Sustainability, 13, Article 1889. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041889

Dahan, M.A. Effects of the Availability and Use of Instructional Materials on Academic Performance of Students in Punjab (Pavaratan) in Euro Journal Publishing Lecture. Available online: http:www.eurojournals.com/MEFE.htm.FRC (accessed on 13 April 1999).

Danielson, C. (2017). Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching (2nd ed.) (p. 57). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Davrajoo et al. (2010) Enhancing Algebraic Conceptual Knowledge with Module Using Mastery Learning Approach. The University of Malaya. December 2010Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 8(3):362-369 Retrieved from: DOI:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.051

Edward et al. (2020). Motivating Factors of Teachers In Developing Supplementary Learning Materials (S.L.M.s). Schools Division of the City of Meycauayan, Department of Education, Philippines. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJA R01/10912

Faize et.al. (2011). Utilization of Instruction Materials as Tools for Effective Academic Performance of Students: Implications for Counselling. Retrieved from: https://www.mdpi.com/2504-3900/2/21/1395

Fahrurrozi et al. (2020). The usefulness of online learning on quality of education during Covid-19 pandemic: Evidence from the department of elementary school teacher education at Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia. International Journal for Quality Research, 15 (1), 107-124. https://doi.org/10.24874/IJQR15.01-06

Fosnot (2015). What Is Constructivism? Retrieved from: https://www.wgu.edu/blog/what-constructivism2005.html#close

Gagne et.al. (2012). Learning Theories. Retrieved from: https://edtechbooks.org/id/learning_theories

Gale (2022) Instructional Content & Curriculum Standards Retrieved from: https://www.gale.com/instructional-content

García-Alberti et al. (2021). Challenges and experiences of online evaluation in courses of civil engineering during the lockdown learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Education Sciences, 11, 59. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11020059

Google Sites (2022) Accuracy - Information Ethics and Security Retrieved from:https://sites.google.com/site/iformationethicsandsecurity/ethics-of-information/accuracy

Gullickson, A. R. (2003). Accuracy standards. In The student evaluation standards (pp. 125-208). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412990097

Horne, A. (2015) The importance of teaching content to young learners. Retrieved from: https://www.cambridge.org/elt/blog/2015/07/02/ importance-teaching-content-young-learners/

Hussin et.al (2019) Online Learning Tools: Asynchronous Communication Tools https://www.angelo.edu/faculty-and-staff/instructional-design/online-teaching/section_31.php

Jimenez et al. (2020). Motivating Factors of Teachers In Developing Supplementary Learning Materials (S.L.M.s). Schools Division of the City of Meycauayan, Department of Education, Philippines. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJA R01/10912

Klasika (2014) Retrieved from: http://klasika.edu.lv/en/teaching-math-and-science-through-english-clil-in-stem

Kristina M. W. Mitchell & Whitney Ross Manzo (2018) The Purpose and Perception of Learning Objectives, Journal of Political Science Education, 14:4,456 472, DOI: 10.1080/15512169.2018.1433542

Learning Design (2022). Learning Materials. Retrieved from: https://learningdesign.hawaiipublicschools.org/school-design/learning- materials

Taguchi, et.al. (2011). Investigating learning, participation, and becoming in early childhood practices with a relational materialist approach. Global Studies of Childhood, 1(1).

Leonor Briones: (2021) Learning and education must continue: Covid Call To Humanity. Covid Call To Humanity | Evidence-Based Truth About The COVID Scamdemic Retrieved from: https://covidcalltohumanity.org/2020/07/31/leonor-briones-learning-and-education-must-continue/

Lumen Learning (n.d) The ADDIE Model Retrieved from: https://courses.lumenlearning.com/wmopenhumanresourcesmgmt/chapter/the-addie-model/

Manea, I. V., Macavei, T., & Pribeanu, C. (2021). Perceived benefits of online lectures during the pandemic: A case study in engineering education. Pro Edu International Journal of Educational Sciences, 3(1), 35-41. https://doi.org/10.26520/peijes.2021.4.5.65-41

Memorial (2022), Classroom Management Guide. Retrieved from: https://www.unco.edu/cebs/teacher-education/undergraduate-programs/classroom_management.aspx

Oyorzun (2022). Learning Theories: Design for Learning. Retrieved from: https://edtechbooks.org/id/learning_theories

Parker et al. (2020). Making learning stick. Learning Forward. Retrieved from: https://learningforward.org/journal/beyond-the-basics/making-learning-stick/

Penfold, L., (2019) Material Matters in Children's Creative Learning. https://jods.mitpress.mit.edu/pub/bwp6cysy/release/1critical factors of the perceived usefulness of a learning analytics dashboard for distance university students. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239- 021-00284-9

Profweb (2017). How to Integrate Creativity into an Instructional Design Strategy Retrieved from: https://www.profweb.ca/en/publications/ articles/how-to-integrate-creativity-into-an-instructional-design-strategy

Raw (2010). The Use of Textbooks in the Teaching-Learning Process – ResearchGate. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342641993_The_Use_of_Textbooks_in_the_TeachingLearning_Process

Reiser (2013). Assessing Prior Knowledge - Eberly Center - Carnegie Mellon University Retrieved from: https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/designteach/teach/priorknowledge.html

Rets, I., Herodotou, C., Bayer, V., Hlosta, M., & Rienties, B (2021). Exploring https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/83632862.pdf

Rizun, M., & Strzelecki, A. (2020). Students' acceptance of the COVID-19 impacts shifting higher education to distance learning in Poland. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(18), Article 6468. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17186468

Roberts, J., Kigotho, M., & Stagg, A. (2018). Expanding horizons in open and distance learning. Distance Education, 39(1), 1-3. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2018.1439367

Samonte (2008). Effectiveness of Modular approach In Teaching. Retrieved from: https://www.coursehero.com/file/72329465

Sendurur et.al. (2018) The design and development of creative instructional materials: the role of domain familiarity for creative solutions. International Journal of Technology and Design Education. DOI. 10.1007/s10798-016-9391-y

Sequeira c., (2021) How Teaching Should be Activity and Application-Based to Meet the Requirements of Diverse Learners Retrieved from: https://www.k12digest.com/how-teaching-should-be-activity-and- application-based-to-meet-the-requirements-of-diverse-learners/

Song, et.al. (2013) Meta-analysis of the effectiveness of digital learning resources. Chin Teleph Edu, (11):81-85.

Teaching & Learning - the University of Tasmania, Australia (2021). Retrieved from: https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/designteach/teach/priorknowledge

TechHQ. Technology and business. Retrieved from: https://asiancorrespondent. com/2012/02/thai-education-part1 ridiculous-o-net-questions/

Wiggins et.al. (2005). Understanding by Design. ASCD. National Students are ignoring Thailand (2021) O-NET exams. Retrieved from: http://www.nationmultimedia.com/news/national/aec/30202815