International Multidisciplinary Research Journal
ISSN: 2424-7073
Available Online at https://imrjournal.info/
Volume:3; November 2025; Page No.13-25
DOI: https://doi.org/10.47722/imrj.2001.50

IMR JOURNAL CANADA

Research Article

EVALUATING THE QUALITY, USEFULNESS, AND SOUNDNESS OF THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD MODULE: BASIS FOR IMPROVEMENTS AND ENHANCEMENTS OF RESOURCE MATERIAL

Bernard V. Gerona[1]; Edwin C. Samis[2]

[1]Instructor III, Social Science Department, College of Arts and Sciences, West Visayas State University, Iloilo City, Philippines
[2]Associate Professor II, Social Science Department, College Liberal Arts, Sciences and Education, University of San Agustin, Iloilo City, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 15.08.2025
Accepted 15.10.2025
Published 20.11.2025

Keywords:

Modular Evaluation, Module, Quality, Usefulness, Soundness

ABSTRACT

Universities in the Philippines utilized the modules for remote learning as an adaptation to the lack of face-to-face classes due to COVID 19. Years have passed, and the improvement and enhancement of resource materials, particularly the module, is essential to achieving quality teaching and learning. This study evaluated the quality, usefulness, and soundness of the Contemporary World Module as the basis for the improvements and enhancements of resource materials. Descriptive research was utilized among the six hundred thirty-four (634) college students at one of the private universities in Western Visayas. The data gathered used as the basis to evaluate the quality, usefulness, and soundness of the module was developed from the researcher-made questionnaire validated by the experts and undergone a pilot test with a Cronbach Alpha of 0.98, which was interpreted as high internal consistency and highly reliable. Frequency count and mean were utilized for the descriptive data analysis, while Chi-Square, Kruskal-Wallis, and Kolgomorov-Smirnov were used to determine the significance difference and inferential data analysis. The result of the show in terms of quality, usefulness, and soundness of the module as perceived by the respondents when taken as a whole and when categorized according to sex, year level, and college ranges from good quality to very good quality, useful to very useful, and sound to very sound. The significant differences are according to quality, usefulness, and soundness, as well as according to sex and year level, while only that is shown as a significant difference in a college. With this result, the module will undergo improvements and enhancements that will suit the needed revisions.

I. Introduction

In June 2020 (Dela Cruz, 2020), schools in the Philippines, through the Commission of Higher Education (CHED) and Department of Education, which have mandates to oversee operations in higher education and basic education, respectively, obliged educational institutions to have an online class in compliance with the order of then President Duterte to put a halt to any form of face-to-face classes unless the vaccine for COVID-19 is readily

available. With the situation created by COVID 19, the school is forced to go online and utilize a module in all its courses as a response to ensure continuous education regardless of the situation. Years have passed, and the classes that were usually done through remote learning are moving towards blended and face-to-face classes (Magsambol, 2022). Through this change, it was realized that it is essential to evaluate the module, particularly in terms of its quality, usefulness, and soundness. Aside from the previously stated reason, the teaching-learning in the class, both for the teacher and the students, can be improved, particularly the enhancement of resource materials for the subject, which can be used as the basis of enhancement and improvement (Tety, 2016). This can be materialized through the evaluation of the students on the module, which is vital in ensuring a meaningful educational experience.

Previous studies about modular evaluation revolved around evaluation from a subject matter expert or from a third-party evaluator, and by involving the student, the result will show different shades of perspective, elucidating their view on what is an appropriate module to utilize. According to the Center for Academic Practice (n.d.), the student's view of the module is essential, and it is done through module evaluation through soliciting responses to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the module, particularly the things to improve. For this reason, the study was conducted to evaluate the quality, usefulness, and soundness of the Contemporary World Module as the basis for the improvements and enhancement of resource materials.

2. Module Evaluation

2.1 Module Evaluation and Quality

The CHED defines quality as the "alignment and consistency of the learning environment with the institution's vision, mission, and goals demonstrated by exceptional learning and service outcomes and the development of a culture of quality (CMO 46, 2012, p. 3). To achieve the goal of ensuring quality, this module was framed, and research was conducted to determine whether there were alignment and consistency with the teaching and learning embedded in the module.

Enhancing a module through evaluation in terms of its quality serves several purposes, such as giving an opportunity to the teachers to correct the error in the module, which can be done by accepting feedback as a chance to improve and recognizing the learning preferences of the students to ensure the development of the information and approaches stipulated in the module, which are viewed as good modular practice (Academic Practice Department, 2019).

Modules with learning activities give students a chance to have learning exercises, and their results and feedback on the said exercises can be utilized to recalibrate the educational approach in revising the module, which is vital in the realization of the objective of the module in ensuring that process and guide were followed in order to accommodate assistance and manage educational challenges and hurdles in schools (Cramer et. al., 2018).

2.2 Module Evaluation and Usefulness

Usefulness is significant in module evaluation because it can be used as an instruction by the educator to provide content with or without the educator's presence, but it takes time to achieve its purpose. According to Cramer, et al. al. (2018), usefulness takes place in the

perceived inspiration, preferences, and efficacy of the module. In this study, it is done through a comparison of students', as respondents, examination' scores, specifically their midterm and exam scores. The same study shows that higher academic performance was manifested when educational modules were enthusiastically and joyfully completed by the students. From this, it can be inferred that, in the context of module evaluation, usefulness can be defined as a degree of benefit that a student can attain consistent with the learning outcomes.

2.3 Module Evaluation and Soundness

Shindler (2002) explains that soundness has a framework showing the four dimensions, and these are (1) efficiency, (2) reliability, (3) validity, and (4) effects on the students. His work revolves around assessment, but as a modification to fit with the soundness of the module as part of the student. In this context, soundness refers to the ability of the module to attain the learning outcomes through its contents, activities, and assessment using an approach that leads the learners to fulfill a task that is feasible and can be performed as part of teaching and learning.

2.4 Quality, Usefulness and Soundness and Sex, Year Level, and College

A procedure to navigate the responses of the evaluators as a basis for the module's significance, usefulness, and proficiency can be deemed a module evaluation. In line with this, it is also important to navigate the link between module evaluation and the socio-demographic profile of the respondents. In this study, it is through sex (male and female), year level (1st year, 2nd year, and higher year), and college (College of Liberal Arts, Sciences, and Education or CLASE, College of Nursing & Nutrition Dietitics or CNND, College of Commerce or COC, College of Technology or COT, College of Pharmacy and Medical Technology or CPMT).

Cramer, et. al. (2018) conducted a study about the evaluation of the module of a student who is taking a psychology course, which is in line with the courses offered in the CLASE and based on their results in terms of sex, both students, regardless of sex, show improvement in their academic performance, but the same study shows that there are significant differences shown in relation to the educational module. It shows that sex is not a determinant in the improvement of their studies or the enhancement of their academic performance in a module.

Several studies argued the difference in cognition that males and females manifest differences in ways of thinking, particularly the societal expectation towards them, where the approach of females to the module was leaning towards holistic, including collaborative and interactive learning, and contextual, including self-guided or independent learning, while that of males was more of compartmentalization and analysis, which mold their differences in educational perceptions (Choi and Peters, 2007; Nosek and Smyth, 2011; Valentine, 1998).

Lastly, differences in interest and career path of the students can also be reasonable grounds for the varying view towards the module, where Eccles (2009) argued that males and females have opposite interests and aspirations in relation to their studies and future professions.

The various views in the quality and soundness of the Module among students in the different grade levels can be attributed to various influences such as stages in cognitive development, educational knowledge, and individual differences that are backed by various

scientific explanations among students in varying year levels, and the rule of thumb is that as the students' progress to the higher year level, their growth also takes place, especially in terms of intellect, which changes in view and expectation towards a module. One of the influences that answer the aforementioned variation in perception is cognitive development, and the known person that we can infer is the world of John Piaget on the cognitive development theory. Piaget (1952) explained that as people progress, their rationality and cognition change. As an inference, higher-year-level students had reached a higher level of cognitive development, which gives them the ability to tackle difficult topics in the contemporary world, whereas, in comparison, this is less likely to be observed among 1st year and 2nd year students. The educational knowledge of the students is vital in this matter, which can be attributed to the perceived difference in the quality and soundness of the module. Vygotsky (1978) explained that, somehow similar to Piaget but focusing on educational knowledge, as the students' progress to a higher level, they acquire knowledge and skills that allow them to evaluate the module critically and interact with less difficult topics in the Module. Added, the topics and manner of presentation in the Module are encompassing to all year levels, where difficult topics require higher educational knowledge and skills. In this, Bloom (1956) asserted that there is a level of cognitive abilities among students where students in the higher level are assumed to possess higher order thinking skills such as evaluation, synthesis, and analysis, which is more likely not the same for 1st and 2nd year students. In other words, higher-level students are well-equipped as compared to 1st and 2nd year students in the evaluation of the module's content, activities, and assessment, resulting in differences in the quality and soundness of the module. Lastly, the individual differences among students can be a factor in the varying perceptions among grade levels. The interplay of the significance and usefulness of the module plays a vital role in it, where Eccles and Wigfield (2002) argue that differences among students influence their view of the module.

The varying views on the quality of the module among students in the different colleges in the university can be attributed to several reasons, such as differences in discipline and expertise, instructional methods, and topics included, which is explained by Blomeke, Gustafsson, & Shavelson (2015), who explain that this difference can be attributed to differences in discipline and expertise, particularly their academic background and goals.

The encompassing instructional methods and pedagogy in the module, regardless of college, can be a factor in the varying views in terms of quality. Achieving good quality or ensuring students are motivated can be realized through the organization of the module and opportunities for interactive learning (Diaz, 2002), with incorporation of their expectation will scaffold and aid them towards competencies needed in their field (Arum & Roksa, 2011).

2.5 Participants

The respondents of the study were the 634 students in a private university in Western Visayas, taken from a list given by the Social Science Academic Supervisor after the approval by the University President, drawn as a sample from the population where the Module is under. The lists are divided into sections under the subject teachers.

The respondents were selected based on their chosen characteristics needed in the study, which are (1) a college student and (2) enrolled in The Contemporary World. The sampling

method employed in the study was done with the assistance of the subject teachers by sending the Google Form link to the students under them. The respondents are presented in Table 1

Table 1 – Profile of the Respondents

Category		F	%
A. Entire Group		634	100
B. Sex:	Female	390	61.5
	Male	244	38.5
C. Year Level:	First Year	577	91.0
	Second Year	53	8.35
	Higher Years	4	0.65
D. College	CLASE	11	17.5
	CNND	22	3.47
	COC	6	0.95
	COT	224	35.34
	CPMT	271	42.74

Source: The demographic profile of the six hundred thirty-four (634) students covered in this study is presented in Table 1.

3. Methodology

This study employed a descriptive research design using a survey questionnaire. According to Sanchez (1986), descriptive research determines the predominant conditions, particularly the facts that prevail in the group chosen to study. This method is a technique for a quantitative description of the general characteristics of the group. This approach to problem solving seeks to answer questions, that is, to determine the quality, usefulness, and soundness of the Module as perceived by the respondents.

3.1 Research Instrumentation

The research instrument utilized is the researcher's made survey questions to evaluate the quality, usefulness, and soundness of Module. The questionnaire was presented to three validators for face and content validation and reliability testing. Added, the survey questions underwent internal consistency through Cronbach's alpha as shown below.

Table 1A – Reliability Test of the Contemporary World Module Survey Question

Student Responses	Frequency	Cronbach's Alpha	Description	Interpretation
	165	0.980	High Internal Consistency	Highly Reliable

Source: Reliability Test of The Contemporary World Module Survey Question in Table 1A.

The instrument has two (2) parts: part 1 is the respondent's profile, and part 2 is the main questionnaire. The respondent's profile data includes sex, year level, and college. The second part is an item on the perceptions of the respondents as an evaluation of the quality, usefulness, and soundness of the Module.

This instrument utilized Google Forms and was facilitated by their subject teacher through the link sent and the results were downloaded from the said forms. After the administration of the instruments, the data gathered was tallied, tabulated, computer-processed, analyzed, and interpreted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

The frequency, mean, standard deviation, and Kruskal-Wallis score was computed in order to determine the quality, usefulness, and soundness of the Module.

To interpret the respondent's mean, the scales and their interpretations was employed:

Scale	Verbal Description	Quality	Useful	Sound
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very Good Quality	Very Useful	Very Sound
3.41-4.20	Agree	Good Quality	Useful	Sound
2.61-3.40	Undecided	Ambivalent	Ambivalent	Ambivalent
1.81-2.60	Disagree	Poor Quality	Not Useful	Not Sound
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Poor Quality	Very Not Useful	Very Not Sound

4. Results and Discussion

This data describes the perceptions (mean and standard deviations) of the respondents

Table 2A - Quality of the Module when taken as whole and according to sex

Student Evaluation	Standard Deviation	Mean	Description	Interpretation
Male	0.68927	4.0258	Agree	Good Quality
Female	0.63418	4.1631	Agree	Good Quality
Total	0.65879	4.1103	Agree	Good Quality

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 2B - Quality of the Module when taken as whole and according to year level

Student Evaluation	Standard Deviation	Mean	Description	Interpretation
1st Year	0.64443	4.1348	Agree	Good Quality
2nd Year	0.76041	3.8283	Agree	Good Quality
Higher Years	0.74605	3.8528	Agree	Good Quality
Total	0.65879	4.1103	Agree	Good Quality

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 2C - Quality of the Module when taken as whole and according to college

Student Evaluation	Standard Deviation	Mean	Description	Interpretation
CLASE	0.62574	4.0171	Agree	Good Quality
CNND	0.51893	4.2318	Agree	Good Quality
COC	0.38166	4.400	Strongly Agree	Good Quality
COT	0.72339	3.992	Agree	Good Quality
CPMT	0.56429	4.2299	Agree	Good Quality
Total	0.65879	4.1103	Agree	Good Quality

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 2D - Usefulness of the Module when taken as whole and according to sex

Student Evaluation	Standard Deviation	Mean	Description	Interpretation
Male	0.65263	3.9832	Agree	Useful
Female	0.62898	4.0905	Agree	Useful
Total	0.63981	4.0492	Agree	Useful

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 2E - Usefulness of the Module when taken as whole and according to year level

Student Evaluation	Standard Deviation	Mean	Description	Interpretation
1st Year	0.62689	4.0657	Agree	Useful
2nd Year	0.75462	3.8547	Agree	Useful
Higher Years	0.74170	3.8712	Agree	Useful
Total	0.63981	4.0492	Agree	Useful

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 2F - Usefulness of the Module when taken as whole and according to college

Student Evaluation	Standard Deviation	Mean	Description	Interpretation
CLASE	0.62574	4.0009	Agree	Useful
CNND	0.51893	4.150	Agree	Useful
COC	0.38166	4.3167	Strongly Agree	Very Useful
COT	0.72339	3.9304	Agree	Useful
CPMT	0.56429	4.1531	Agree	Useful
Total	0.63981	4.0492	Agree	Useful

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 2G - Soundness of the Module when taken as whole and according to sex

Student Evaluation	Standard Deviation	Mean	Description	Interpretation
Male	0.65824	4.0225	Agree	Sound
Female	0.63079	4.1303	Agree	Sound
Total	0.64312	4.0888	Agree	Sound

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 2H - Soundness of the Module when taken as whole and according to college

Student Evaluation	Standard Deviation	Mean	Description	Interpretation
CLASE	0.66789	4.0027	Agree	Sound
CNND	0.5271	4.1455	Agree	Sound
COC	0.44907	4.3167	Strongly Agree	Very Sound
COT	0.72188	3.9821	Agree	Sound
CPMT	0.55213	4.2011	Agree	Sound
Total	**0.64312**	**4.0888**	Agree	Sound

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 2I - Soundness of the Module when taken as whole and according to year level

Student Evaluation	Standard Deviation	Mean	Description	Interpretation
1st Year	0.62762	4.1107	Agree	Sound
2nd Year	0.76021	3.8528	Agree	Sound
Higher Years	0.74471	3.8747	Agree	Sound
Total	0.64312	4.0888	Agree	Sound

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 3A - Significant Difference according to quality, usefulness, and soundness and sex

Student Evaluation	p-value	Interpretation
Quality	0.017	Significant Difference
Usefulness	0.016	Significant Difference
Soundness	0.008	Significant Difference

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 3B - Significant Difference according to quality, usefulness, and soundness and college

Student Evaluation	p-value	Interpretation
Quality	0.001	Significant Difference
Usefulness	0.053	No Significant Difference
Soundness	0.085	No Significant Difference

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Table 3C - Significant Difference according to quality, usefulness, soundness and year level

Student Evaluation	p-value	Interpretation
Quality	0.022	Significant Difference
Usefulness	0.113	No Significant Difference
Soundness	0.036	Significant Difference

Source: Survey Result on the Quality of the Contemporary World Module

Quality as the "alignment and consistency of the learning environment with the institution's vision, mission, and goals demonstrated by exceptional learning and service outcomes and the development of a culture of quality (CMO 46, 2012, p. 3) in which this module was realized based on the finding as perceived by the students shows, regardless of sex, year level, and college, the result of the Module has a good quality to very good quality.

The good quality in the result was derived from the enhancement of the module in the past years by correcting the errors in the module due feedback and use as a basis in the incorporation of additional information and various approaches in the module which view by Academic Practices Department (2019), as good modular practice. Specifically, it was implemented by providing consistency between outcomes and activities, maintaining coherence between outcomes and assessment, integrating connection between learning activities and prior knowledge, ensuring appropriateness of learning activities in addressing knowledge gaps, establishing link between learning activities and topics, scaffolding aptness of learning activities in highlighting current situations, assuring relation between assessment and lessons, developing effectiveness in developing skills and knowledge, delivering adequacy in terms of contents, activities, and assessments, and incorporating recentness of the module content with the contemporary socio-economic-politico-environmental. On the other hand, the COC students who perceived it with very good quality was due to their programs that is consistent and aligned with the goals expected in their outcomes and culture of quality education (CMO 46, 2012, p. 3)

Generally, regardless of sex, year level, and college, the result of the study show that the Module is useful except that COC students, as a college, perceived it as very useful. This is result was attributed in the observed motivation, integration of preferences in the module with ensuring the efficacy of it (Cramer, et al. 2018) where it is manifested in the benefit that a student can gain in the consistency of the modules with the learning outcomes which was done through motivating the students to read or arouse their interest, assuring clarity in the sentences, establishing corrective measures activity, ensures learning of lessons, developing student-friendly features and layout, safeguarding correct symbols, figures, pictures, incorporating consistency in the assessments, lessons, and activities, allocating sufficient coverage in a semester, easy understanding of the lessons, activities, and assessment while ensuring challenge, and maintaining enjoyment and interesting reading. On the other hand, the COC who perceived with very useful was integration of student preferences with high regard

in the module and establishing various approaches making sure that module is highly interesting and enjoyable (Academic Practices Department, 2019).

Lastly, regardless of sex, year level, and college, the result of the study show that the Module is sound, except that COC students, as a college, perceived it as very sound. It's very sound result was because of efficiency, reliability, validity, and effectiveness of the module to the students. (Shindler, 2002). In other words, it is due to the feasibility of the task integrated in the module from its contents to its activities and assessment ensuring that teaching and learning took place in the scenario. Specifically, it was done through providing content with measurable learning outcomes and systematically presented, appropriating right assessment tools, ensuring lessons and activities that are presented clearly and gradually, constantly prepares the student for assessment and activities, allowing conversation and participation, covering a variety of subjects and multiple academic disciplines, utilizing simple language, illustration, and symbols, is free from errors, and contains correct sentences and punctuation.

Overall, in terms of sex, there is a significant difference in the quality, usefulness, and quality of the Module as perceived by the students, while a significant difference is shown in the quality and soundness of the Module as perceived by the students in terms of year level. Lastly, there is a significant difference in the quality of the Module as perceived by the students in terms of college.

There are various factors that lead to the significant difference between males and females in the quality, usefulness, and soundness of the Module. Below are the explanations for the distinctive differences in the perception of modules in terms of sex. Cramer, et. al. (2018) argued that the significant difference in the module was due to their academic performance. On the other hand, Silverman, Choi, & Peters (2007) argued that it is in the difference of cognition that male and female manifest differences in ways of thinking, where the approach of female to the module was leaning towards holistic and contextual while that of male was more of compartmentalization and analysis. This difference in cognition or mental processes can be attributed to how sexes, male and female, view the previously mentioned educational materials. Added, the Module includes male and female personalities or topics, either directly or indirectly. The relation between the traditional roles of being male and female would lead to a significant difference in their perception, especially the connection of socialization in the upbringing of the students that influences their view of the module. In support of this argument, Nosek and Smyth (2011) explain how expectations in society for males and females lead to differences in perceptions of educational materials, especially in the formation of their beliefs in relation to the topics in the module.

The approach in the module can also factor into the difference in perception. Valentine (1998) suggested that collaborative and interactive learning are preferred by females, while self-guided or independent learning is preferred by males. It means this difference was due to the manner or method in the module in relation to the student's navigation of the content, activities, and assessment, and if it suited the former more than the latter or the latter to the former, then a significant difference may have taken place.

Individual differences in interest and career path can also be reasonable grounds for the significant differences. Eccles (2009) argued that males and females have opposite interests

and aspirations in relation to their studies and future professions. The style of the formation of the module and the development of the same, where interest and aspiration chosen by male or female were highly emphasized, can be attributed to the aforementioned differences.

The significant differences in the quality and soundness of the Module among students in the different grade levels can be attributed to various influences such as stages in cognitive development, educational knowledge, and individual differences. Below are the explanations for the distinctive differences in the perception of modules in terms of year level.

There are various scientific explanations among students in varying year levels, and the rule of thumb is that as the students' progress to the higher year level, their growth also takes place, especially in terms of intellect, which changes in view and expectation towards a module. One of the influences that answer the aforementioned difference in perception is cognitive development, and the known person that we can infer is the world of John Piaget on the cognitive development theory. Piaget (1952) explained that as people progress, their rationality and cognition change. As an inference, higher-year-level students had reached a higher level of cognitive development, which gives them the ability to tackle difficult topics in the contemporary world, whereas, in comparison, this is not yet manifested among 1st- and 2nd-year students.

Another consideration is the educational knowledge of the students, which can be attributed to the perceived difference in the quality and soundness of the module. In support of this, Vygotsky (1978) explained that, somehow similar to Piaget but focusing on educational knowledge, as the students progress to a higher level, they acquire knowledge and skills that allow them to evaluate the module critically and interact with less difficult topics in the Module. Added, topics and manner of presenting in the Module are one size fits all to all year levels, where difficult topics require higher educational knowledge and skills. In this, Bloom (1956) asserted that there is a level of cognitive abilities among students where students in the higher level are assumed to possess higher order thinking skills such as evaluation, synthesis, and analysis, which is more likely not the same for 1st and 2nd year students. In other words, higher-level students are well-equipped as compared to 1st and 2nd year students in the evaluation of the module's content, activities, and assessment, resulting in differences in the quality and soundness of the module.

Individual differences among students can be a factor in the difference in perceptions among grade levels. The interplay of the significance and usefulness of the module plays a vital role in it, where Eccles and Wigfield (2002) argue that differences in aspiration and inspiration among students influence their view of the module, where such differences take place at varying year levels and their progress over time in the perceived quality and soundness of the Module.

The significant differences in the quality of the Module among students in the different colleges in the university can be attributed to several reasons, such as differences in discipline and expertise, instructional methods, and topics included. Their perception of quality varies due to the influence of the college to which the student belongs. One of the explanations for the aforementioned differences was due to the varying disciplines and expertise emphasized in their respective colleges, which influence how they evaluate the module. A comparative

example of this is the CLASE, which places a higher emphasis on pedagogy, artistry, scientific knowledge, social consciousness, and critical thinking, while other colleges prioritize management and profit orientation for the COC, practical medical applications for the CPMT and the CNND, and practical engineering and design applications for the COT. Blomeke, Gustafsson, & Shavelson (2015) explain that this difference can be attributed to differences in discipline and expertise, particularly their academic background and goals.

The encompassing instructional methods and pedagogy in the module, regardless of college, can be a factor in the significant difference in terms of quality. According to Diaz (2002), achieving good quality or ensuring students are motivated can be realized through the organization of the module and opportunities for interactive learning. Universality in the approach, with varying needs from different colleges in relation to the needed teaching and learning among students, has an influence on their view of the module. Added, the ability of the Module should be maintained or incorporated to connect with academic expectations from and of the students, and their expected outcomes vary in the various colleges, especially the relevance of the topic included in the module if it will scaffold them to their chosen profession and aid them towards competencies needed in their field or career in the near future (Arum & Roksa, 2011). In other words, the applications and relations of the module to the students' academic and professional development have an impact on their manner of evaluating the quality of the module. The difference in the academic background of the students and their respective colleges can influence their view of the module. It shows that the closer the students' background to the instruction integrated into the module, the more likely they are to manifest a good perception of its quality.

5. Conclusion

In view of the findings, the conclusions were drawn: Generally, the Module, as perceived by the students, has good quality, is useful, and is sound regardless of sex, year level, and college. While here is data that exceeds being good quality, useful, and sound, like in the case of COC, where results show that COC students viewed the Module as very good quality, very useful, and very sound. The former was due to the yearly enhancement of the module by the teacher teaching the module, incorporating correction and relevant information, accepting feedback, integrating students preferences, and ensuring alignment and consistency in the outcome, activities, assessment, content, and other related mechanisms, while the very good quality as perceived by the COC students was attributed to the alignment of their program with the overall aspects of the module. Overall, the significant difference in the quality, usefulness, and soundness of the Module as perceived by the students in terms of sex can be attributed to various factors such as cognition, socialization, pedagogy, and individual interests of the students, while the significant difference in the quality and soundness of the Module as perceived by the students in terms of year level was attributed to their cognitive development, educational knowledge, and individual differences. Lastly, the significant difference in the quality of the Module as perceived by the students in terms of college originated from differences in the discipline and expertise of the students, the instructional method, and the topics included in the module. Lastly, all results in this study are only applicable to the students in the chosen university and, thus, cannot be generalized to all students in the country.

References

Academic Practice Department (2019) Module Evaluation: A brief guide to good practice for module leaders. Birmingham City University

Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011). Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses. University of Chicago Press.

Blömeke, S., Gustafsson, J.-E., & Shavelson, R. J. (2015). Beyond dichotomies: Competence viewed as a continuum. Zeitschrift für Psychologie, 223(1), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000194

Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals (1st ed.). Longman Group.

Centre for Academic Practice (n.d.). How to evaluate your module to enhance the student experience. Queen Margaret University. Retrieved from dated October 13, 2023: https://www.sparqs.ac.uk/ch/Module%20Evaluation%20Leaflet%20FINAL.pdf

Commission on Higher Education. (2012). *CMO No. 46, series of 2012: Policy-standard to enhance quality assurance (QA) in Philippine higher education through an outcomes-based and typology-based QA* (Section 6, p. 3).

Cramer, K. M., Ross, C., Plant, L., & Pschibul, R. (2018). Efficacy of learning modules to enhance study skills. *IJTIE (International Journal of Technology and Inclusive Education)*, *7*(1), 1251-1259.

Dela Cruz, R. (2020). No face-to-face classes until Covid-19 vaccine is available. Philipppine News Agency. https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1105226

Diaz, D. P. (2002). Online drop rates revisited. The technology source, 3(3), 35-51.

Eccles, J. (2009). Who am I and what am I going to do with my life? Personal and collective identities as motivators of action. Educational psychologist, 44(2), 78-89.

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. Annual Review of Psychology, 53(1), 109–132. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153

Magsambol, B. (2022). After 2 years of distance learning, PH schools return to face-to-face classes. Rappler. https://www.rappler.com/nation/philippine-schools-return-in-person-classes-2022/

Nosek, B. A., & Smyth, F. L. (2011). Implicit social cognitions predict sex differences in math engagement and achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 48(5), 1125-1156.

Piaget, J. (1952). The origins of intelligence in children. (M. Cook, Trans.). W W Norton & Co. https://doi.org/10.1037/11494-000

Sanchez, C. A. (1986). *Methods and techniques of research*. Rex Book Store.

Shindler, J. V. (2002). Examining the Soundness of Two Collaborative Assessment Practices in Teacher Education Courses.

Silverman, I., Choi, J., & Peters, M. (2007). The hunter-gatherer theory of sex differences in spatial abilities: Data from 40 countries. Archives of sexual behavior, 36, 261-268.

Tety, J. L. (2016). Role of Instructional Materials in Academic Performance in Community Secondary Schools in Rombo District" (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania).

Valentine, E. F. (1998). Gender Differences in Learning and Achievement in Mathematics, Science, and Technology and Strategies for Equity: A Literature Review.

Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes. Harvard university press.

How to cite this article:
Gerona B.V and Samis E. C (2025) 'Evaluating the Quality, Usefulness, and Soundness of the Contemporary World Module: Basis for Improvements and Enhancements of Resource Material', *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, Volume:3; November 2025; Page 13-25.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.47722/imrj.2001.50