Acceptability and Effectiveness of Translated Self-Learning Instructional Materials in Bread and Pastry Production

Rosemarie L. Evardome, Merly P. Arjona, PhD[b]

[a] *rosemarie.evardome@deped.,gov.ph*
[a]*Department of Education, Brgy. Tongohin Infanta, Quezon 4336, Philippines*
[b]*Associate Professor V, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Siniloan Laguna, Philippines*

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the acceptability and validity level of translated self-learning instructional materials in Bread and Pastry Production and to investigate if there was a significant difference between the student's pretest and post-test scores before and after utilizing the translated self-learning instructional materials. Lastly, it sought to find out which of the translated self-learning instructional materials significantly predict students' performance in Bread and Pastry Production. The research design used was quantitative experimental design to determine whether changes in the independent variable cause changes in the dependent variable. A purposive sampling was done, and three sections from Grade 11-TVL-Home Economics track/strand with 38, 37, and 30 students, respectively, for the school year 2024-2025 were selected as respondents, one section as the control group, and the two sections as the experimental groups. Further, thirteen teachers, including TLE master teachers, language experts, and TLE teachers from the Infanta District, were selected as respondents in evaluating the translated modules' acceptability and validity. The results of this study revealed that, based on the evaluation of both the learners and the teachers, the translated self-learning instructional materials were acceptable and highly acceptable, with a mean of 3.80 and 4.63, respectively. When it comes to validity, as evaluated by both the learners and teachers, the translated self-learning instructional materials turned out to have a high and very high level of validity, with corresponding mean values of 3.80 and 4.65, respectively. The study's findings also disclosed no significant difference between the student's pretest scores before using the translated self-learning instructional materials. However, there was a substantial difference between the post-test scores of the control and experimental groups after utilizing the translated instructional materials. There were also significant differences between the pretest and post-test scores of the students before and after utilizing the translated self-learning instructional material. Based on Newmark's Translation Models, translated instructional materials using the semantic and communicative approach are recommended to increase students' Bread and Pastry Production performance.

Keywords: Acceptabilty, Effectiveness, Self-Learning Instructional Materials, Bread and Pastry Production

1. Introduction

Students typically have trouble learning English, especially in countries where English is not the primary language (Souriyavongsa et al., 2013). Hashemi (2011) found that students have trouble learning English because of differences in their social and cultural settings, especially when it comes to when they study their first, second, or foreign language. Akowuah et al. (2018) say that even though English is the language of teaching in Ghana, pupils' scores on the West African Senior High School Examination are still a big worry. The leading cause of this problem is the impact of the mother tongue. The results showed a significant link between a student's native language and their success in English. Liman et al. (2017) look at how the mother tongue affects the ability of media professionals in Kano State, Nigeria, to communicate. They find that the mother tongue is important for kids learning second languages. This finding backs up Oluwole's (2008) study, which says that a child's first language significantly affects how well they learn a second language (Collier, 1995; Cummins, 2001). The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development includes education as a UNESCO target (UNESCO, 2017). UNESCO vowed to alleviate poverty, protect the earth, and leave no one behind in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. One of the 17 SDGs is decent education. All individuals in need will have access to superior education, and anyone can achieve this through lifelong learning. By 2030, all students will possess the skills and knowledge required to advance sustainable development, as stated by UNESCO. Culturally-driven sustainable development enhances educational accessibility and the relevance of textbooks, curriculum, and pedagogical approaches.

Strengthening national education systems by providing inclusive, high-quality, and lifelong education contributes to developing inclusive and sustainable cities (Melegrito, 2022). The K–12 curriculum, which was implemented to close the gap, consists of Kindergarten and 12 years of basic education. According to DepEd (2012b), the aforementioned programs can help students master their knowledge and skills and prepare for college, employment, and self-reliance as entrepreneurs. Additionally, it provides Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education, which promotes teaching in the mother tongue of the area instead of English and Filipino. Bridging the gap and improving subject comprehension can be achieved by starting instruction in the native tongue. Native language instruction is the most efficient way for students to learn (DepEd, 2012a). The bilingual education policy designated English and Filipino as instructional languages in particular subject areas and was very close to the bill. Additionally, teaching both languages and using them as educational resources at all levels is how English is taught. The efficacy of using the mother tongue as a teaching method has been shown in numerous studies. Brillantes et al. (2019) contend that the TVL course is a fundamental element of the Senior High School curriculum, equipping students with essential values, competencies, and abilities for their future employment. Students receive academic knowledge, technical vocational training, and skills essential for fulfilling global workplace and community standards supported by highly trained and experienced teachers (Ramos, 2021).

1.1. Statement of the Problem

This study aims to determine the acceptability and effectiveness of translated self-learning instructional materials in Bread and Pastry Production that could help enhance learners' skills and academic performance. This research study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What is the 1acceptability level of the translated self-learning instructional materials in Bread and Pastry Production as evaluated by the language experts, TLE experts, and students in terms of the following?
   1.1. Accuracy of Translation;
   1.2. Clarity and Readability;
   1.3. Cultural Appropriateness;
   1.4. Stylistic Consistency;
   1.5. Functional Effectiveness;
   1.6. Technical Quality;
   1.7. Contextualization;
   1.8. Gender Sensitivity; and
   1.9. General Acceptability?

2. What is the validity level of the translated self-learning instructional materials as evaluated by the language experts, TLE experts, and students in terms of the following?
   2.1. Contextual Integrity;
   2.2. Usability;
   2.3. Completeness;
   2.4. Quality Assurance; and
   2.5. Professional Standards

3. What is the pretest score of the students in Bread and Pastry production before the utilization of translated self-learning instructional materials?
4. What is the post-test score of the students in Bread and Pastry production after using translated self-learning instructional materials?
5. Is there a significant difference between the students' pretest scores before using translated self-learning instructional materials?
6. Is there a significant difference between the students' post-test scores after using translated self-learning instructional materials?

7. Is there a significant difference between the students' pretest and post-test scores before and after using translated self-learning instructional materials?

8. Based on Newmark's Translation Models, which among the translated self-learning instructional materials is the most recommendable in increasing students' performance in Bread and Pastry Production?

1.2. Scope and Limitations

This study attempts to determine the acceptability and effectiveness of translated self-learning instructional materials in Bread and Pastry Production. The respondents include three sections from the Grade 11-TVL-Home Economics strand, with 38, 37, and 30 students, respectively, for the school year 2024-2025. Further, ten senior high school teachers, a head teacher, a master teacher, and a Filipino language expert from the junior high school department in Infanta District participated in the study as respondents. They were from Infanta National High School, Binulasan Integrated School, Langgas National High School, and Tongohin National High School. One of the challenges, which the researcher believes limited and affected the development of the study, was the availability of language experts to accommodate the technical assistance needed, primarily during the translation process. Hence, the most challenging part of the study is based on the researcher's experience. Limited language experts are present and do not have time to entertain such time-consuming and technical mentorship since most of them are master teachers from DepEd and have a so much workload. Another consideration is that the acceptability and validity of the translated modules were evaluated using a single checklist for both. This gives a generalized evaluation result for both the translated modules using the semantic and communicative approaches. The number of class cancellations and suspensions due to high heat indexes, adverse shear lines, tropical depressions, and typhoon signal warnings limited the maximum utilization of the translated modules. Some of the latter portion of the modules was improperly utilized when students were under modular distance learning.

2. Methodology

The researcher uses a quantitative-experimental design in this study. Experiments and surveys are the principal research designs in quantitative research (Watson, 2015). Quantitative experimental design is a research approach that uses numerical data and statistical analysis to investigate cause-and-effect relationships between variables.

Purposive sampling technique is used by the researcher in selecting the respondents for this study. The respondents of the study were the one hundred five (105) grade eleven-TVL-Cookery students of Infanta National High School this School Year 2024-2025, who were assigned this study to be Control Group E (the control group to use the English module) and the two (2) experimental sections/groups – Experimental Group – S (the class using the module in semantic translation) and Experimental Group – C (the class using the module in communicative translation). Also, thirteen (13) teachers from the Infanta District, including master teachers, head teachers, language experts, and TLE teachers, participated in this study to measure the acceptability and validity level of the translated self-learning instructional materials. Participating schools included Binulasan Integrated School, Infanta National High School, Langgas National High School, and Tongohin National High School.

The researcher also prepared a self-made pretest and post-test based on the module. The tests were crafted in English and were translated into Filipino using also semantic and communicative approaches, just like the modules. Other instruments from related studies were also adopted by the researcher, such as the checklist on the development, acceptability, and validation of the effectiveness and acceptability of the translated self-learning instructional materials in Bread and Pastry Production NC II in gathering other important data (Salavaria et al., 2014).

The statistical tools used in the distribution of respondents are frequency and percentage. In order to determine the level of acceptability and validity of the translated self-learning instructional materials, the researcher used weighted mean and verbal interpretation. Mean, MPS, and verbal interpretation were the

statistical tools used to determine students' pretest and post-test scores before and after utilizing the translated self-instructional materials. In determining the significant difference between the student's pretest scores before utilizing the translated self-learning instructional materials, mean, MPS, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and verbal interpretation were used as statistical tools. The same statistical tools were used to determine the significant difference between the post-test scores of the students before utilizing the translated self-learning instructional materials. However, to determine which paired group has a significant difference, the researcher used the LSD and absolute mean difference. To determine the significant difference between the students' pretest and post-test scores before and after using translated self-learning instructional materials, mean, MPS, Paired T-Test, and verbal interpretation were used as a statistical data treatment. Lastly, to determine which translated self-learning materials are most recommended for increasing students' Bread and Pastry Production performance, the researcher used mean, MPS, ANOVA, LSD, absolute mean difference, and verbal interpretation.

3. Results and Discussions

Table 1.
Learners' and Teachers' Evaluation of the Acceptability of translated self-learning instructional materials

A. Accuracy of Translation	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Semantic Fidelity	3.95	MA	4.62	HA
2. Terminology Consistency	3.93	MA	4.69	HA
3. Nuance Preservation	3.77	MA	4.62	HA
4. Faithfulness to Source Text	3.93	MA	4.77	HA
5. Grammatical and Syntactical Accuracy	3.84	MA	4.77	HA
AWM	**3.89**	**MA**	**4.69**	**HA**
B. Clarity and Readability	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Linguistic Clarity	3.74	MA	4.85	HA
2. Grammatical Correctness	3.75	MA	4.62	HA
3. Sentence Construction	3.87	MA	4.77	HA
4. Vocabulary	3.79	MA	4.69	HA
5. Visual Layout and Formatting	3.69	MA	4.69	HA
AWM	**3.77**	**MA**	**4.72**	**HA**
C. Cultural Appropriateness	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Cultural Relevance	4.23	HA	4.85	HA
2. Local Adaptations	3.93	MA	4.69	HA
3. Adaptation of Local Customs	3.59	MA	4.69	HA
4. Sensitivity to Cultural Norms	3.92	MA	4.69	HA
5. Sensitivity to audience	3.97	MA	4.69	HA
AWMp	**3.93**	**MA**	**4.72**	**HA**
D. Stylistic Consistency	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**

Table 1 continued…

1. Voice and Tone	3.85	MA	4.46	HA
2. Formatting and structure	3.66	MA	4.69	HA
3. Adherence to Genre Conventions	3.79	MA	4.62	HA
4. Consistent Voice and Persona	3.69	MA	4.31	HA
5. Harmonized language register	4.21	HA	4.15	MA
AWM	**3.84**	**MA**	**4.45**	**HA**
E. Functional Effectiveness	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Content Comprehension	3.93	MA	4.54	HA
2. Purpose Fulfillment	3.77	MA	4.62	HA
3. Audience Response	3.85	MA	4.62	HA
4. Suitability for the target audience	3.79	MA	4.62	HA
5. Functional usability	3.85	MA	4.62	HA
AWM	**3.84**	**MA**	**4.6**	**HA**
F. Technical Quality	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Error Rate	3.52	MA	4.31	HA
2. Consistency in Terminology	3.72	MA	4.38	HA
3. Semantic Adequacy	3.75	MA	4.54	HA
4. Terminological Adequacy	3.52	MA	4.62	HA
5. Grammatical Adequacy	3.8	MA	4.38	HA
AWM	**3.68**	**MA**	**4.45**	**HA**
G, Contextualization	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Cultural Relevance	4.18	MA	4.69	HA
2. Situational Adaptation	3.84	MA	4.69	HA
3. Appropriateness of Tone.	3.89	MA	4.62	HA
4. Relevance to Target Audience	3.69	MA	4.77	HA
5. Effectiveness of Contextual Information	3.52	MA	4.62	HA
AWM	**3.82**	**MA**	**4.68**	**HA**
H. Gender and Sensitivity	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Inclusive Language Use	3.75	MA	4.62	HA
2. Representation of Gender Roles	3.56	MA	4.62	HA
3. Pronoun Precision	3.72	MA	4.62	HA
4. Avoidance of Gender Stereotypes	3.67	MA	4.54	HA
5. Cultural Context Consideration	3.87	MA	4.62	HA
AWM	**3.71**	**MA**	**4.6**	**HA**
I. General Acceptability	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**

1. Reception at the Target Audience Level	3.69	MA	4.77	HA
2. Cultural Sensitivity	3.72	MA	4.92	HA
3. Coherence of the Text	3.77	MA	4.69	HA
4. Emotional Resonance	3.74	MA	4.69	HA
5. Professional Presentation	3.75	MA	4.69	HA
AWM	**3.74**	**MA**	**4.75**	**HA**
AWM	**3.80**	**MA**	**4.63**	**HA**

Based on the table, the acceptability level of the translated self-learning instructional materials based on the evaluation of the learners and teachers. Generally, based on the evaluation of the learners, all the criteria fall under the moderately acceptable category based on their average weighted mean of 3.80. Regarding Cultural Appropriateness, particularly the Cultural Relevance indicator, it has gained the highest mean of 4.23, which can be verbally interpreted as highly acceptable. Under the criteria of Stylistic Consistency, the indicator Harmonized Language Register has a weighted mean of 4.21, which is also highly acceptable when verbally interpreted. On the other hand, teachers' evaluation of the acceptability level of the translated self-learning instructional materials revealed that it is highly acceptable, with an average weighted mean of 4.63. The indicator Cultural Sensitivity under the General Acceptability criterion attained the highest mean of 4.92, giving the criteria an average weighted mean of 4.75. It is followed by Clarity, Readability, and Cultural Appropriateness, with an average weighted mean of 4.72. The translation goes beyond just converting words from one language to another; it also involves bridging two distinct cultures according to Shri Ninganna T. (2021). A good translator must be multilingual and culturally aware, navigating various cultural nuances to ensure effective communication. Culture is made up of shared ideas, beliefs, customs, and social habits that are passed down through generations. It encompasses everything from traditions and moral values to clothing styles, food, and political viewpoints. These cultural specifics can pose challenges during translation, as they often carry deep meanings and significance that may not have direct equivalents in the target language. Therefore, understanding these cultural elements is essential for a translator to overcome potential barriers and convey messages accurately and respectfully.

Table 2.
Learners' and Teachers' Evaluation of the Validity of Translated Self-Learning Instructional Materials

A. Contextual Integrity	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Cultural Appropriateness	4.35	VH	4.69	VH
2. Intent and Purpose	3.95	H	4.77	VH
3. Audience Appropriateness	3.88	H	4.69	VH
4. Contextual Consistency	4.02	H	4.69	VH
5. Ethics	3.73	H	4.77	VH
AWM	**3.99**	**H**	**4.72**	**VH**
B. Usability	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Clarity and Comprehensibility	3.67	H	4.77	VH
2. Consistency	3.87	H	4.54	VH
3. Navigability	3.87	H	4.62	VH
4. Accessibility	3.72	H	4.69	VH
5. Relevance to User Needs	3.58	H	4.69	VH
AWM	**3.74**	**H**	**4.66**	**VH**

C. Completeness	Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean	VI	Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean	VI
1. Adequate Content Retention	3.9	H	4.62	VH
2. Adherence to Structural Parts	3.98	H	4.54	VH
3. Inclusion of Footnotes and References	3.77	H	4.54	VH
4. Consistent with Source Purpose	3.88	H	4.62	VH
5. Equivalence of Form and Style	3.73	H	4.54	VH
AWM	**3.85**	**H**	**4.57**	**VH**
D. Quality Assurance	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Multiple review and edit cycles	3.77	H	4.62	VH
2. Consistency Tests	3.75	H	4.54	VH
3. Testing and Validation	3.48	H	4.69	VH
4. Change Control	3.47	H	4.77	VH
5. Quality Metrics and Reporting	3.68	H	4.54	VH
AWM	**3.63**	**H**	**4.63**	**VH**
E. Professional Standards	**Learners' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**	**Teachers' Evaluation Weighted Mean**	**VI**
1. Use acceptable translation techniques	3.82	H	4.62	VH
2. Peer review	3.57	H	4.77	VH
3. Protocols for feedback and revision	3.9	H	4.69	VH
4. Collaboration with the client and seeking his or her feedback	3.8	H	4.62	VH
5. Qualified Translators	3.8	H	4.62	VH
AWM	**3.78**	**H**	**4.66**	**VH**

Table 2 shows the learners' and teachers' evaluation of the validity of the translated self-learning instructional materials. Based on the learners' evaluation results, all the criteria fall under the high validity category, with an average weighted mean of 3.80. Remarkably, the Cultural Appropriateness indicator under the criterion Contextual Integrity got the highest weighted mean of 4.35, which is verbally interpreted as very high validity. On the other hand, teachers evaluated the translated module to have very high validity based on its average weighted mean of 4.65. It can be noted that teachers also gave high regard to the criteria Contextual Integrity, particularly the indicators of Intent and Purpose and Ethics, which both have a weighted mean of 4.77, giving the mentioned criteria an average weighted mean of 4.72. Teacher-respondents' tendency to provide favorable evaluation results in academic research can be attributed to response biases, which denote a systematic deviation in the reported responses. Bogner and Landrock (2016) define Social Desirable Responding, or social desirability bias, as the inclination of respondents to align their answers with the interviewer's or other participants' perceived expectations. Teachers may respond to questions in a manner they consider socially acceptable or that enhances their positive image among colleagues. This response bias is defined by a propensity to provide favorable self-descriptions (Paulhus, 2002; p. 47), as referenced by Wetzel et al. (2016). This behavior in responding to research questionnaires can be characterized as courtesy bias, as individuals may hesitate to provide negative feedback directed at their peers.

Table 3.
Pretest scores of G11-TVL-Home Economics learners per competency

RN	Comp A (25)			Comp B (16)			Comp C (9)			Total Score (50)		
	E	S	C	E	S	C	E	S	C	E	S	C
1	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
2	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
3	FS	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	FS
4	O	DNME	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	FS	VS	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME
5	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
6	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
7	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	S	DNME	FS	VS	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME
8	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
9	VS	DNME	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	O	FS	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME
10	DNME	FS	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME
11	S	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
12	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
13	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
14	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
15	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
16	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME
17	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	S	DNME	FS	O	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME
18	S	VS	S	FS	S	DNME	DNME	O	FS	FS	VS	DNME
19	FS	VS	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	VS	VS	DNME	S	S	DNME
20	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	S
21	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
22	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
23	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
24	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
25	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
26	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	FS	DNME
27	DNME	VS	FS	DNME	VS	DNME	FS	VS	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME
28	S	S	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	FS	FS	DNME	DNME
29	FS	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	O	DNME	DNME	DNME
30	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME
31	DNME	FS		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME	
32	DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	VS		DNME	DNME	
33	FS	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME	
34	DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME	
35	DNME	DNME		DNME	FS		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME	

36	FS	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	FS		FS	DNME	
37	S	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME	
38	DNME			DNME			DNME			DNME		
MS	**13.08**	**13.43**	**12.17**	**7.11**	**7.19**	**5.43**	**4.50**	**4.68**	**4.30**	**24.68**	**25.30**	**21.90**
PS	**52.32**	**53.73**	**48.67**	**44.41**	**44.93**	**33.96**	**50.00**	**51.95**	**47.78**	**49.37**	**50.59**	**43.80**
Trans	**73.00**	**73.00**	**72.00**	**71.00**	**71.00**	**68.00**	**72.00**	**72.00**	**71.00**	**72.00**	**72.00**	**70.00**
VI	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**

DNME-Did not meet expectation; FS-Fairly Satisfactory; S-Satisfactory; VS-Very Satisfactory; O-Outstanding

Table 3 presents the pretest scores of G11 TVL-Home Economics learners according to competencies. Based on the result, Control Group E (the class using the English module) has an average weighted mean of 49.37 with a transmuted grade of 72, while Experimental Group S (the class using the translated module in semantic approach) has an average weighted mean of 50.59, also with a transmuted grade of 72 and Experimental Group C (the class using the translated module in communicative approach) has 43.80 equivalent to a transmuted grade of 70. All these results can be verbally interpreted as Did Not Meet Expectations (DNME). Learners have higher scores in Competency A (E-13.08-73; S-13.43-73; and C-12.17-72) while they have the lowest scores in Competency B (E-7.11-71; S-7.19-71; and C-5.43-68). This may be so because competency A is easy, and competency B is difficult.

Table 4.
Pretest scores of students from different groups before using translated self-learning instructional materials.

Source of Variation	***SS***	***Df***	***MS***	***F***	***P-value***	***F crit***
Between Groups	211.2074	2	105.6036815	2.558179958	**0.082407**	3.085465
Within Groups	4210.64	102	41.28078682			
Total	4421.848	104				

Table four (4) shows the difference in pretest scores between groups. Based on the computed P-value of 0.0824, which is greater than the alpha level of significance, which is 0.05, there is no significant difference between the pretest scores of the students from the different groups.

Table 5.
Pretest scores of students from different groups per competency before utilization of translated self-learning instructional materials.

Source of Variation	***SS***	***Df***	***MS***	***F***	***P-value***	***F crit***
Between Groups	4037.054	2	2018.527	260.718	<0.001	3.024681
Within Groups	2415.562	312	7.742186			
Total	6452.616	314				

Table 5, on the other hand, shows significant differences between the students' pretest scores per competency before the utilization of translated self-learning instructional materials based on the computed P-value of <0.001, which is much less than the alpha level of significance 0.05.

Table 6.
Significant difference of pretest scores of students per competency

Pairing	Mean Difference	Absolute Mean Difference	LSD	Interpretation
Comp A-Comp B	6.29	6.29	0.76	Significant
Comp A-Comp C	8.44	8.44	0.76	Significant
Comp B-Comp C	2.15	2.15	0.76	Significant

Table 6 shows the least significant difference among pairs of groups. Students' pretest scores show significant differences between Competencies A and B, with an Absolute Mean Difference of 6.29, between Competencies A and C, with an Absolute Mean Difference of 8.44, and between Competencies B and C, with an Absolute Mean Difference of 2.15. The Absolute Mean Difference between the three competency groups is greater than the Least Significant Difference, 0.76.

Table 7.
Post-test scores of G11 TVL-Home Economics learners per competency

RN	Comp A (25)			Comp B (16)			Comp C (9)			Total Score (50)		
	E	S	C	E	S	C	E	S	C	E	S	C
1	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	DNME
2	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
3	VS	FS	VS	S	DNME	S	DNME	O	O	S	S	VS
4	S	FS	DNME	DNME	S	DNME	VS	VS	DNME	S	FS	DNME
5	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	S	DNME
6	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	DNME
7	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	S	DNME
8	FS	FS	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	VS	FS	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME
9	VS	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	DNME	VS	VS	DNME	S	DNME	DNME
10	DNME	S	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME
11	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME
12	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
13	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME
14	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	S	FS	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	FS
15	DNME	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS
16	FS	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	O	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME

17	S	S	S	S	FS	FS	O	FS	DNME	S	FS	FS
18	S	S	FS	DNME	FS	S	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	S	FS
19	FS	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME
20	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	S	DNME	FS	O	DNME	DNME	VS
21	DNME	DNME	S	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
22	DNME	FS	S	DNME	DNME	FS	VS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS
23	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME
24	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME
25	DNME	FS	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	FS
26	DNME	FS	VS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	VS	DNME	DNME	FS
27	DNME	S	FS	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME
28	DNME	FS	VS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	FS	VS	DNME	DNME	S
29	DNME	S	S	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	VS	DNME	DNME	S
30	DNME	DNME	FS	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	DNME	O	DNME	DNME	DNME
31	FS	S		DNME	DNME		DNME	FS		DNME	DNME	
32	S	FS		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME	
33	DNME	FS		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME	
34	DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME		DNME	FS		DNME	DNME	
35	DNME	DNME		DNME	FS		DNME	DNME		DNME	DNME	
36	S	DNME		FS	S		FS	FS		FS	FS	
37	VS	FS		DNME	DNME		O	DNME		S	DNME	
38	DNME			DNME			DNME			DNME		
MS	**12.68**	**14.51**	**15.27**	**6.79**	**7.76**	**7.63**	**4.24**	**5.62**	**5.10**	**23.71**	**27.89**	**28.00**
PS	**50.74**	**58.05**	**61.07**	**42.43**	**48.48**	**47.71**	**47.08**	**62.46**	**56.67**	**47.42**	**55.78**	**56.00**
Trans	**72.00**	**74**	**75**	**70.00**	**72.00**	**71.00**	**71.00**	**76.00**	**74.00**	**71.00**	**73.00**	**74.00**
VI	**DNME**	**DNME**	**FS**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**FS**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**	**DNME**

DNME-Did not meet expectation; FS-Fairly Satisfactory; S-Satisfactory; VS-Very Satisfactory; O-Outstanding

Table 7 shows the post-test scores of the G11-TVL-HE learners per competency. As can be seen in the table, there is an increase in scores in experimental groups S and C after utilizing the translated module. For experimental group S, an average weighted mean of 27.89 with a percentage score of 55.78, equivalent to a transmuted grade of 73, was achieved; experimental group C has an average weighted mean of 28.00 with a percentage score of 56, having an equivalent transmuted grade of 74. However, these results remain verbally interpreted as Did Not Meet Expectations (DNME). Looking at the competencies, experimental group C scored 15.27 in competency A, equivalent to a percentage score of 61.07 with a transmuted grade of 75 and verbally interpreted as Fairly Satisfactory (FS). Control group S, on the other hand, scored 5.62 in competency C, with a percentage score of 62.46 and a transmuted grade of 76 verbally interpreted as Fairly Satisfactory (FS).

Using the communicative approach, students do not ponder too much on the grammar of the translation results, but students can concentrate on conveying the meaning of the source language (Mannahali et al., 2020). In addition, the translation results are very readable, easier, and not structural. Further, the results of his research highlight that when students are more inclined to prioritize the meaning of the source language than the structural element, the communicative approach is the correct option to use rather than other forms of

translation methods (Fazal et al., 2017).

Table 8
Post-test scores of students from different groups after utilization of the translated self-learning instructional materials.

Source of Variation	*SS*	*Df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	434.01	2	217.00	6.39	0.0024269	3.085465033
Within Groups	3463.38	102	33.95			
Total	3897.39	104				

Table 8 reveals the difference in posttest scores between groups after using translated self-learning instructional materials. Results show a significant difference between the post-test scores of the students from the different groups based on the computed P-value of 0.0024, which is less than the alpha level of significance 0.05.

Table 9
Significant difference in post-test scores of students after the utilization of the translated self-learning instructional materials

Pairing	**Mean Difference**	**Absolute Mean Difference**	**LSD**	**Interpretation**
Control E - Experimental S	-4.18	4.18	2.67	Significant
Control E - Experimental C	-4.29	4.29	2.67	Significant
Experimental S - Experimental C	-0.11	0.11	2.67	Not Significant

Table 9 further presents the notable difference in posttest scores of students between Control Group E and Experimental Group S and between Control Group E and Experimental Group C based on the computed Absolute Mean Difference of 4.18 and 4.29, respectively, which is greater than the LSD value of 2.67. It was noted that there is no significant difference in post-test scores of students between Experimental Group S and Experimental Group C since the computed absolute mean difference, equivalent to 0.11, is less than the LSD, which is 2.67.

Table 10

Post-test scores of students per competency after utilization of translated self-learning instructional materials

Source of Variation	*SS*	*Df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	4665.83	2	2332.92	333.89	<0.001	3.02
Within Groups	2179.96	312	6.99			
Total	6845.80	314.00				

Table 10, on the other hand, shows the significant differences between the students' pretest scores per competency after utilizing the translated self-learning instructional materials based on the computed P-value of <0.001, much less than the alpha level of significance of 0.05.

Table 11

Significant difference in post-test scores of students per competency after the utilization of the translated self-learning instructional materials.

Pairing	Mean Difference	Absolute Mean Difference	LSD	Interpretation
Comp A-Comp B	6.70	6.70	0.72	Significant
Comp A-Comp C	9.10	9.10	0.72	Significant
Comp B-Comp C	2.40	2.40	0.72	Significant

Table 11 shows the significant difference among pairs of groups. It can be seen that there are significant differences in students' post-test scores between Competencies A and B, with a computed Absolute Mean Difference of 6.70, between Competencies A and C, having an Absolute Mean Difference of 9.10, and between Competencies B and C, with an Absolute Mean Difference of 2.40. The Absolute Mean Difference of all pairs is greater than the Least Significant Difference Value of 0.72, hence a significant difference. According to Field (2024), there is strong evidence regarding the efficacy of contextualized validated materials. Rogayan and Dollete (2019) and Espiritu and Ogerio (2020) have also developed an effective method for improving academic achievement, thus verifying the standing related to content validity. Tolentino et al. (2023) expressed that efficient instructional materials enhance self-efficacy among students and their learning results and experiences.

Table 12

Pretest-Posttest scores of G11 TVL-Home Economics learners

Test	Mean2			SD			T-value			P-Value		
	E	S	C	E	S	C	E	S	C	E	S	C
Pre	24.68	25.30	21.90	5.98	7.08	6.11	0.70	-2.80	-7.77	0.49	0.0082	<0.001
Post	23.71	27.89	28.00	6.85	4.89	5.46						
Diff	-0.97	2.59	6.10									

Table 12 shows the pretest and post-test scores of G11 TVL-Home Economics learners from different groups. From the result, it can be seen that there is no significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores of students in experimental group E based on the computed P-value of 0.49041, which is greater than the alpha level of significance 0.05. The pretest and post-test scores of experimental groups S and C have significant differences before and after utilizing translated self-learning instructional materials based on computed P-values of 0.0082 and <0.001, less than the alpha significance level (0.05). A study conducted by Field (2024) also revealed that the pretest and post-test mean scores of learners were significantly different, indicating that the learners' performance level was affected. The results have shown that the learners' performance improved after using the developed localized supplementary instructional materials, as reflected in the differences in their pretest and post-test scores.

Table 13

Post-test scores of Experimental Group- S and Experimental Group- C after the utilization of the translated self-learning instructional materials

Source of Variation	*SS*	*Df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.19	1	0.19	0.007285	0.93	3.99
Within Groups	1727.57	65	26.58			
Total	1727.7612	66				

Table 13 shows no significant difference between the post-test scores of experimental groups S and C. Though the average weighted mean result of the posttest scores of students who used the translated module in the communicative approach is higher than the post-test scores of the students who used the translated module in the semantic method, it can be seen in the table that the computed P-value of 0.93 is more than the alpha level of significance of 0.05; hence the difference is not significant. This supports that the translated self-learning instructional materials using semantic and communicative approaches are recommended to increase students' Bread and Pastry Production performance. Considering the above data on the difference between pretest-post-test scores of the students before and after the utilization of the translated self-learning instructional materials, this study supports Newmark's view of translation that semantic and communicative translation are complementary; optimal translation requires employing both, not choosing one over the other (Fengling, 2017). This is also supported by Zu and Dong, 2015, who stated that the best translation technique is the mixture and adaptable application of both semantic and communicative approaches. "There is no one communicative or one semantic method of translating a text—these are, in fact, widely overlapping bands of methods," Newmark stated in A Textbook of Translation. A given piece or sentence may be regarded more communicatively or less semantically, and a translation may be more or less communicative.

4. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it was found that the translated self-learning instructional materials were highly acceptable and valid, with experts providing very high evaluations of their quality and effectiveness. Results revealed that all student groups initially performed below expectations in Bread and Pastry Production during the pretest, indicating similar levels of low proficiency before the intervention. However, post-test findings showed that the experimental groups who used the translated instructional materials significantly improved their performance, while the control group showed little to no improvement. Statistical analysis confirmed no significant differences in pretest scores among groups, but significant differences were observed in post-test results, highlighting the positive impact of the instructional interventions. Furthermore, both translation models used in the experimental groups—Newmark's semantic and communicative approaches—were found to be equally effective in enhancing students' learning outcomes and performance in Bread and Pastry Production.

5. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, it is recommended that.

1. While the materials are functional, there may still be areas for improvement to enhance learner engagement and comprehension. The gap between the learners' and experts' evaluation ratings indicates the need for learner feedback and expert assessment to improve the acceptability of the translated instructional materials. Addressing learners' concerns is essential to bridge the gap between their views and the experts' perceptions.
2. Although indicating generally high validity, the difference between the validation results of students and experts deserves to be further explored in finding out the particular aspects where learner perception and expert judgment deviate. The research should explore potential reasons for the discrepancy and inform revisions to the materials to enhance their usability and effectiveness for learners.
3. Effective instructional strategies, such as the translated self-learning materials, are necessary to enhance students' understanding and performance in Bread and Pastry Production. Before introducing the translated self-learning instructional materials, a foundational skills assessment should be implemented to identify specific learning gaps within the curriculum. Developing instructional materials should address the identified weaknesses and ensure students possess the necessary prerequisite knowledge before engaging with the primary instructional materials.
4. It is recommended that the translated self-learning instructional materials be integrated into the regular Bread and Pastry Production curriculum and used by learners from informal educational settings like the ALS and Open High School. Further research should also explore the long-term impact of these materials on student learning and retention and assess their effectiveness across

diverse learner populations.

5. Future studies utilizing similar experimental designs should incorporate a larger sample size to increase statistical power and reveal subtle differences in pretest scores that may not have been detected in this study. This will allow for a more robust analysis of the effectiveness of the translated self-learning instructional materials.
6. Future research is recommended to explore the specific components of the translated self-learning instructional materials that contributed most significantly to the improved posttest scores in the experimental groups to develop an even more impactful instructional resource. Further research is also recommended to investigate the factors contributing to the ineffectiveness of the English module. This could involve qualitative studies exploring student perceptions of the module's content, language, and pedagogical approach to inform the development of more effective English-language instructional materials for this specific learner population.
7. It is recommended that educational institutions consider the potential benefits of developing and implementing the utilization of translated learning materials for students whose first language is not English to meet the needs of diverse learners better and ultimately improve educational outcomes.
8. Other research enthusiasts are encouraged to conduct a similar study with a broader scope to validate the present study's results and findings. Likewise, they are encouraged to investigate the acceptability and effectiveness of other translation approaches better suited to TVL students' learning styles.

References

Abaidoo, A. (2018). Factors contributing to academic performance of students in a Junior High School. https://www.grin.com/document/450284

Abarro, J. O. (2016). Factors Affecting Career Track and Strand Choices of Grade 9 Students in the Division of Antipolo and Rizal, Philippines. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, *6*(6), 51. www.ijsrp.org

Acido, Josephine. V., & Caballes, D. G. (2024). Assessing educational progress: A comparative analysis of PISA results (2018 vs. 2022) and HDI correlation in the Philippines. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, *21*(1), 462–474. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.1.0020

Adil, M. (2020). Exploring the Role of Translation in Communicative Language Teaching or the Communicative Approach. *SAGE Open*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020924403

Agbunag, M. R. (2022). Contextualized and Localized Supplementary E-Learning Materials in Science 8 Physics. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, *3*(11), 2378–2396. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.11.22

Akowuah, J. A., Patnaik, S., & Kyei, E. (2018). Evidence-based learning of students' performance in english language in adu gyamfi senior high school in the sekyere south district of Ghana. *Cogent Social Sciences*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2018.1503577

Aksan, J. A. (2021). Effect Of Modular Distance Learning Approach To Academic Performance In Mathematics Of Students In Mindanao State University-Sulu Senior High School Amidst Covid-19 Pandemic. *Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*(2), 407–430. https://doi.org/10.37275/oaijss.v4i2.64

AlAli, R., & Wardat, Y. (2024). Low PISA Performance Students: Factors, Perceptions, and Improvement Strategies. *International Journal of Religion*, *5*(9), 334–348. https://doi.org/10.61707/nve8gj33

Al-Amri, W. B., & Abdul-Raof, H. (2016). Translation in teaching and learning a foreign language: A methodological approach. In *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies (IJHCS* (Vol. 1, Issue 2). https://www.academia.edu/download/34637204/Al_Amri_and_Abdul_Raof_article.pdf

Alegado, E. S., Navarro, E. M. A., Roxas, P. J., & Monteza, A. M. M. (2023). SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING AMONG SECONDARY EDUCATION STUDENTS SPECIALIZING IN ENGLISH AT UM DIGOS COLLEGE, PHILIPPINES. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *10*(8). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v10i8.4908

Alferez, R. C., & Palmes, N. D. (2012). Implementation of Strengthened Technical Vocational Education Program - Competency Based Curriculum, Northern Mindanao, Philippines. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, *7*(1), 186–200. https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v7i1.161

Amant, K. S. (2002). When cultures and computers collide: Rethinking computer-mediated communication according to international and intercultural communication expectations. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, *16*(2), 196–214. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651902016002003

Anderson, L., Gavioli, L., & Zanettin, F. (2018). *TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING FOR LANGUAGE LEARNERS (TAIL) Lessons in honour ofGuy Aston, Anna Ciliberti, Daniela Zorzi*. https://iris.unimore.it/handle/11380/1169056

Andrade, A., Pereira, S., Tolo, A., Superior Cristal, I., & -TimorLeste anacletoandrade, D. (2018). TEACHING SPEAKING BY USING COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH TO SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF LOWER SECONDARY SCHOOL OECUSSE. In *ISCE Journal of Innovative Studies on Character* (Vol. 2, Issue 1).

Angeles, J. A. P. R., Manaig, K. A., Sapin, S. B., Yazon, A. D., & Tesoro, J. F. B. (2022). Effectiveness of Localized Reading Activity Sheets in Enhancing the Reading Skills of Grade 1 Learners A Quasi-Experimental Research Design. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, *4*(2), 125–136. https://doi.org/10.31098/ijtaese.v4i2.1087

Arante, R. B. (2018). Design and Assembly of an Improvised Logic Gates Simulator. *World Journal of Engineering and Technology*, *06*(04), 839–853. https://doi.org/10.4236/wjet.2018.64056

Arante, R. B., Sacay, M. R., Bocboc, V., & Baisa, D. B. (2020). Design, development and evaluation of contextualised learning materials in consumer electronics. *International Journal of Learning*, *12*(3), 153–165. https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v12i3.4956

Arroyo, G. M. (2003). *EO 210 Establishing the Policy to Strengthen the Use of the English Language as a Medium of Instruction in the Educational System*. https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocsfriendly/5/5198

Astrid, R. V., Isabel, B.-A., & Alfonso, L.-V. (2018). Challenges of the English Teacher in the Engineering Faculty. *English Language Teaching*, *11*(2), 149. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n2p149

Barrera, J. D., Megallon, S. R. R., & Patadlas, A. B. (2024). Managing Modular Instruction and Students' Learning Outcomes. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, *4*(1), 110–121. https://doi.org/10.35877/454ri.eduline1883

Batova, T., & Clark, D. (2015). The Complexities of Globalized Content Management. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, *29*(2), 221–235. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651914562472

Bogner, K., & Landrock, U. (2016). *Response Biases in Standardised Surveys (Version 2.0)*. https://doi.org/10.15465/gesis-sg_en_016

Brillantes, K., Dominique, B. ;, Orbeta, A. C. ;, Francisco-Abrigo, K. A. ;, Capones, E. M. ;, Jovellanos, J., & Beatrice, B. (2019). *Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen*. https://www.pids.gov.ph

Bullard, E. (2024). *Purposive sampling*. https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/social-sciences-and-humanities/purposive-sampling

Butzkamm, Wolfgang., & Caldwell, J. A. W. . (2009). *The bilingual reform : a paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Narr.

Cabigon, M. (2015). *State of English in PH: Should we be concerned?* https://opinion.inquirer.net/90293/state-of-english-in-ph-should-we-be-concerned

Calamlam, J. M. M. (2021). The Development of 21st-Century e-Learning Module Assessment Tool. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *49*(3), 289–309. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520953792

Castro, B. A. (2024). *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH AND INNOVATION IN SOCIAL SCIENCE (IJRISS) Enhancing Handicraft Education Through Interactive Instructional Materials: An Evaluation of Learning Effectiveness*. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. https://www.academia.edu/download/53272946/j._c._catford-a_linguistic_theory_of_translation-oxford_univ._press_1965.pdf

Chitera, N., Kasoka, D., & Thomo, E. (2016). *There is more to the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics than the use of Local Languages: Mathematics Teacher Practices*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v10i4.4959

Creus, B. (2019). *The Effectiveness of Using Localized Instructional Materials in the Performance of Grade Seven Food Technology Students in Amaya School of Home Industries*. https://ojs.aaresearchindex.com/index.php/AAJMRA/article/view/4268

Dagdag, J. D., & Calimag, N. A. (2023). Scale development and investigation of self-directed learning readiness in Mathematics among Filipino college students. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, *13*(1), 61–75. https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol13.1.5.2023

De Ocampo, N. D. (2023). Perceptions, Challenges and Effectiveness of Modular Distance Learning Approach to The Academic Performance of Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) Students of Botolan National High School. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, *4*(6), 1833–1848. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.06.09

DepEd. (1987). *DO_s1987_52 The 1987 Policy of Bilingual Education*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/1987/05/DO_s1987_52.pdf

DepEd. (2012a). *DO_16_s2012 Guidelines on the Implementation of the Mother Tongue-Based-Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2012/02/17/do-16-s-2012-guidelines-on-the-implementation-of-the-mother-tongue-based-multilingual-education-mtb-mle/

DepEd. (2012b). *DO_31_s2012 Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of Grades 1 to 10 of the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) Effective School Year 2012-2013*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/DO_s2012_31.pdf

DepEd. (2015). *DO_08_S 2015 Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/DO_s2015_08.pdf

DepEd. (2019). *DO 021, s2019 Policy Guidelines on the K to 12 Basic Education Program*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2019/08/22/august-22-2019-do-021-s-2019-policy-guidelines-on-the-k-to-12-basic-education-program/

DepEd. (2021). *DO_001, S. Guidelines on the Evaluation of Self-Learning Modules for Quarters 3 and 4 for School Year 2020-2021*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/DO_s2021_001-.pdf

Dimacali, K. B. E. (2018). *Localization/Localized Materials.* https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/sunstar-pampanga/20180712/281698320512761?srsltid=AfmBOorBcutv68SWmH3DFH4dJRCQ2LvwFxcvlkRbTA0QKU-xIBC547mW

Enarsao, C. M. S. (2022). Teachers' Lived Experiences in Blended Learning during the Covid-19 Pandemic in Selected Schools in Tagaytay City, Philippines. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v3i1.75

Espiritu, J. A., & Ogerio, L. F. (2020). *RESOURCES, PRACTICES AND THE ACCEPTABILITY OF TEACHER-MADE LEARNING MATERIALS IN SOCIAL STUDIES 9 (ECONOMICS)*. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3634204

Estrada, L. (2021). *Are self-learning modules effective?* https://www.rappler.com/voices/imho/opinion-are-self-learning-modules-effective/

Fajar, M., Perdana, A., & Rochmah, N. (2024). The Impact of Google Translate on High School Students' Writing Ability. *Journal of English Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.30587/jetlal.v4i1

Farah, M., Samardali, S., Mohammad, A., & Ismael, H. (2017). Translation as a Tool for Teaching English as a Second Language. *An International Peer-Reviewed Journal*, *40*. www.iiste.org

Fazal, S., Ahmad, M., & Fazal Muhammad Iqbal Majoka Mustanir Ahmad, S. (2017). *Integration of Grammar Translation Method with Communicative Approach: A Research Synthesis*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322083426

Fengling, L. (2017). A Comparative Study of Nida and Newmark's Translation Theories. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science*, *5*(8), 31–39.

Field, J. T. (2024). TAGLE (Transformation Acquired from Good Learning Environment): THE DEVELOPED LOCALIZED SUPPLEMENTARY INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR ARALING PANLIPUNAN 9 LEARNERS IN LOS BAÑOS NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL-POBLACION. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, *2*(11). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14232819

Fu, L. (2017). *On Semantic Equivalence in English-Chinese Translation*. https://doi.org/10.2991/icoss-17.2017.30

Garin, R. M., Reyes, R., Domantay, G. F., & Rosals, J. (2017). Contextualized and Localized Teaching as a Technique in Teaching Basic Statistics. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, *4*(1), 62–67. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350108440_Contextualized_and_Localized_Teaching_as_a_Technique_in_Teaching_Basic_Statistics

Glover-Tay, S. (2024). *Exploring The Efficacy of Twi-Language Interfaced ChatGPT as A Self-Learning Support tool for Junior High School Students in Rural*.

Gonzales, L. (2018). Translation as a Multimodal Practice. *Sites of Translation*, 39–54. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv65sx95.7

Gueta, M. F., & Janer, S. S. (2021). *Distance Learning Challenges on the Use of Self-Learning Module*. https://uijrt.com/articles/v2/i7/UIJRTV2I70010.pdf

Hashemi, M. (2011). Language stress and anxiety among the English language learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *30*, 1811–1816. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.349

Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203181522

Husain, K., Ahmat, N., Mohd Tajudin, N., & Yerizon, Y. (2021). Development of Integration Self Learning (InSeL) Module for Matriculation Students. *Journal of Science and Mathematics Letters*, *9*(Special), 80–90. https://doi.org/10.37134/jsml.vol9.sp.10.2021

Ike, E., & Okechukwu, I. B. (2015). Effective Learning Systems through Blended Teaching Modules in Adult Secondary Education Systems in Developing Nations: Need for Partnership. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, *21*(1), 18–30. https://doi.org/10.7227/jace.21.1.3

Joy, S., & Namanya, C. (2017). *The Effects of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education* (Vol. 20, Issue 2). https://journals.aiias.edu/info/article/view/70/61

Ka, C., Juhari, M. I., Azid, N., Andika Bagus, N. R. P., Rizky, E. W., Purwantono, P., & Zainuddin, N. A. (2023). Development of Task-Based Instructional E-Module for Data Processing Unit of Information Technology Courses. *Journal of Technology and Humanities*, *4*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.53797/jthkkss.v4i1.1.2023

Lenske, G., & Helmke, A. (2015). Child respondents—Do they really answer what scientific questionnaires ask for?. *Multidisciplinary research on teaching and learning*, 146-166.

Limon, M. R., & Castillo Vallente, J. P. (2016). Module Development in Home and Family Living for College Students of a State University in the Philippines. *Global Journal of Educational Studies*, *2*(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.5296/gjes.v2i1.9539

Louise, D., Bacallo, D. L., Bie, P. E. G., Yshin, R., Tulabut, C., Jireh, A., Pineda, M., Vicente, A. P., De Vera, A. R., Jmiel, E., Sawal, F., Louise, J., Marcaida, M., & Dizon, R. C. (2024). DIGITAL LEARNING REVOLUTION: IDENTIFYING THE INFLUENCE OF DEPENDENCY ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS TOWARDS THE KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION OF STUDENTS. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, *2*(8). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13359360

Macià, E. A., Isohella, S., Maylath, B., Schell, T., Verzella, M., Minacori, P., Mousten, B., Musacchio, M. T., Palumbo, G., Vandepitte, S., & Palumbo, G. (2014). Enhancing students' skills in technical writing and LSP translation through tele-collaboration projects: teaching students in seven nations to manage complexity in multilateral international collaboration. *19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Purposes, Proceedings*, *July 2013*, 8–10.

Makumane, M., Mataka, T. W., Sengai, W., & Ngcobo, S. (2023). Neutralising the digital divide: is blended learning a viable solution? *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478)*, *12*(7), 511–522. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v12i7.2740

Malipot, M. H. (2021). *DepEd issues guidelines on evaluation of self-learning modules*. https://mb.com.ph/2021/01/06/deped-issues-guidelines-on-evaluation-of-self-learning-modules/

Mannahali, M., Rijal, S., & Yusri. (2020). *Communicative Translation Method in Increasing Students Performance in Translation Class .pdf*. https://eprints.unm.ac.id/35537/

Mannahali, M., & Suhaeb, L. A. (2023). TRANSLATION THEORY AS THE BASIS OF TRANSLATION LEARNING. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.26858/retorika.v15i2.47024

Melegrito, M. C. P. (2022). The Use of Filipino and English as Mediums of Instruction in the Teaching of Engineering Courses at the Tertiary Level. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, *11*(3), 668–678. http://www.european-science.com668

Misbah, N. H., Mohamad, M., Yunus, M. M., & Ya'acob, A. (2017). Identifying the Factors Contributing to Students' Difficulties in the English Language Learning. *Creative Education*, *08*(13), 1999–2008. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2017.813136

Nardo, Ma. T. B. (2017). Modular Instruction Enhances Learner Autonomy. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *5*(10), 1024–1034. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-5-10-3

Natividad, E. D. (2021). *PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF LEARNING MODULES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MODULAR DISTANCE LEARNING IN THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL*. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3889429

Newmark, Peter. (2009). *A textbook of translation*. Shang hai wai yu jiao yu chu ban she. http://ilts.ir/Content/ilts.ir/Page/142/ContentImage/A%20Textbook%20of%20Translation%20by%20Peter%20Newmark%20(1).pdf

Nkonde, E., Siluyele, N., Mweemba, M., Nkhata, L., Kaluba, G., & Zulu, C. (2018). Evaluating the Impact of Teaching and Learning of Mathematics and Science using Local Language (Language of Play) in Primary Schools in Muchinga Province, Zambia, a Case of Chinsali District. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(8), 1153–1163. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-6-8-14

Ocampo, M. R. P., & Del Rosario, A. L. P. (2022). Translation-Based Instructional Material in Mathematics and ProblemSolving Abilities of Grade 5 Pupils. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, *05*(03), 225–241. https://doi.org/10.37502/ijsmr.2022.5318

Pangket, W. F. (2019). Oral English Proficiency: Factors Affecting the Learners' Development. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*. www.ijsmsjournal.org

Pham, A. T., Nguyen, Y. N. N., Tran, L. T., Huynh, K. D., Le, N. T. K., & Huynh, P. T. (2022). University Students' Perceptions on the Use of Google Translate: Problems and Solutions. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, *17*(4), 79–94. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v17i04.28179

Precellas, L. B. C., & Napil, M. C. (2024). Constructivist Learning Environment, Critical Thinking Motivation, Self-Directed Learning Readiness, a Structural Equation Model on Students' Engagement. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, *18*(11), 124–141. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2024/v18i11781

Putra, S. J., Gusmita, R. H., Hulliyah, K., & Sukmana, H. T. (2016). A semantic-based question answering system for Indonesian translation of quran. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, 504–507. https://doi.org/10.1145/3011141.3011219

Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2018). A critical investigation of English language teaching in Bangladesh. *English Today*, *34*(3), 43–49. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607841700061X

Ramos, F. G. (2021). An Evaluation of the Technical Vocatioanal Livelihood Track in Public Senior High Schools in the Division of Batangas: Basis for an Enhancement Program. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *10*(2), 877–900. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v10-i2/10269

Roa, G. R. B., & Fajardo, M. T. M. (2025). Development of self-learning modules to foster the basic science process skills acquisition. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, *14*(4). https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2025.25836

Rogayan, D. V., & Dollete, L. F. (2019). Development and Validation of Physical Science Workbook for Senior High School. *Science Education International*, *30*(4), 284–290. https://doi.org/10.33828/sei.v30.i4.5

Roya, W., & Ngcobo, S. (2023). The role of information communication technologies on African indigenous knowledge systems: Folktales. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478)*, *12*(6), 46–55. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v12i6.2662

Rudianto, G., & Mubarak, Z. H. (2022). Translation Analysis of Translating Machine. *TONIL: Jurnal Kajian Sastra, Teater dan Sinema*, *19* (2), 82-89. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/551486709.pdf

Salavaria A. C., F., Galicia, D. C., Manaligod, R. P., Mariano, J. B., Escartin, M. N., & Flora Canare, E. D. (2014). *DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF WORKTEXT IN STATISTICS _____ Critic/Member External Critic*. https://www.academia.edu/download/40193369/FINAL_MANUSCRIPT.pdf

Savignon, S. J. (2017). Communicative Competence. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1–7). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0047

Semilla, J. R. B., Parmisana, V. R., Fajardo, L. L., Abucayon, R. L., Dinoro, A. P., & Tabudlong, J. M. (2023). Innovation in Early Reading Instruction: The Development of e-Learning Materials in Mother Tongue. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *22*(7), 411–433. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.7.22

Shri Ninganna T. (2021). *CULTURAL BARRIERS IN THE TRANSLATION OF SOURCE LANGUAGE INTO TARGETED LANGUAGE : AN OVERVIEW*. https://www.epitomejournals.com/VolumeArticles/FullTextPDF/553_Research_Paper.pdf

Smith. (2017). *ScholarWorks The Influence of Language on the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics*. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations

Souriyavongsa, T., Rany, S., Jafre Zainol Abidin, M., & Lai Mei, L. (2013). Factors Causes Students Low English Language Learning: A Case Study in the National University of Laos. *International Journal of English Language Education*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v1i1.3100

Surgawi, T., Joebagio, H., & . D. (2019). Development of Module on Communicative Translation Material in Translation Subject. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 373–378. https://doi.org/10.24331/ijere.573875

Tolentino, J. C. G., Danganan, C. G., David, A. A., & Peña, J. T. (2023). Development and Validation of a Booklet in Educational Research: A Supplementary Material for Filipino Teacher Education Students. *Multidisciplinary Journal for Education, Social and Technological Sciences*, *10*(2), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.4995/muse.2023.18678

Tolentino, J. C. G., Miranda, J. P. P., Maniago, V. G. M., & Sibug, V. B. (2020). Development and Evaluation of Localized Digital Learning Modules for Indigenous Peoples' Health Education in the Philippines. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(12), 6853–6862. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081251

UNESCO. (2007). *Advocacy kit for promoting multilingual education : Including the excluded, Overview of the kit*. UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000233259

UNESCO. (2011). *UNESCO World Data on Education VII Ed. 2010/11 (2011)*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000193188

UNSECO. (2017). *UNESCO Moving Forward The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2017). Available: https://unesdoc.unesco.org*.

Walton, R., Zraly, M., & Mugengana, J. P. (2015). Values and validity: Navigating messiness in a community-based research project in Rwanda. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *24*(1), 45-69. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2015.975962

Watson, R. (2015). *Quantitative Research Nursing Standard*. https://hull-repository.worktribe.com/374637/1/Article.pdf

Wetzel, E., Böhnke, J. R., & Brown, A. (2016). *Response biases*. https://kar.kent.ac.uk/49093/1/Response_biases_Final_accepted_version.pdf

Zheng, W. (2017). *Exploring Newmark's Communicative Translation and Text Typology*. https://doi.org/10.2991/ssehr-17.2018.137

Zu, M., & Dong, Y. (2015). *A Brief Analysis of Communicative Translation and Semantic Translation*. https://doi.org/10.2991/jisem-15.2015.55