Available on: https://jmrr.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3588, P-ISSN: 3051-357X

Journal of Management Research and Review

Volume: 02 Issue: 06 June-2026

Strategic Instructional Materials and Students' Academic Performance in MAPEH: A Study in Potungan District, Schools Division of Dapitan City

Anelyn Teves-Cimafranca, MAEM
Teacher, Department of Education, Dapitan City, Philippines

Leo C. Naparota, PhD
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences and school of Criminal Justice Education, Andres Bonifacio College, Inc., Dipolog City, Philippines

Published Date: June 06, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jmrr/V2E6/2026-02**

ABSTRACT: This study aimed to determine the relationship between the perceived quality of strategic instructional materials and students' academic performance in MAPEH in Potungan District, Schools Division of Dapitan City, during School Year 2025-2026. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design involving 257 junior high school students. Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire that assessed strategic instructional materials in terms of content, mechanics, organization, and overall package, while academic performance was measured through students' final grades in MAPEH. Weighted mean, standard deviation, and Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient were used to analyze the data. Results showed that the overall quality of strategic instructional materials was very high (M = 4.01), with mechanics obtaining the highest rating, followed by overall package, organization, and content. Students' academic performance was outstanding (M = 4.31), with most respondents classified as very satisfactory or outstanding. However, the relationship between the quality of strategic instructional materials and academic performance was not significant (Spearman rho, $p > .05$). The findings indicate that although the materials were highly rated and students performed well, academic achievement may be influenced by other factors such as teaching style, motivation, home support, prior knowledge, and classroom engagement. It is recommended that DepEd officials, school heads, and MAPEH teachers continue validating and contextualizing strategic instructional materials, while future researchers examine additional variables that may explain MAPEH achievement.

KEYWORDS: Strategic instructional materials Students' academic performance MAPEH Dapitan City Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Strategic instructional materials (SIM) are increasingly viewed as vital supports for MAPEH learning because they translate curriculum competencies into clear, engaging, and performance-based activities that match the subject's skills- and practice-oriented nature. In the K to 12 curriculum, MAPEH, including Physical Education, emphasizes progressive skill development and competency-based learning, which requires well-aligned learning resources to help learners master expected outcomes (Department of Education, 2016). Beyond improving classroom engagement, SIM also play an important role in students' academic performance because effective instructional materials help learners understand lessons more clearly, practice targeted competencies, and strengthen mastery of concepts and skills assessed in class. Recent evidence in MAPEH classrooms likewise indicates that the use of strategic instructional materials, especially those designed with multimedia features and validated content, can produce measurable gains in students' MAPEH achievement compared with traditional instruction (Lucas & Morbo, 2025). Thus, SIM are not only valuable tools for facilitating instruction but also significant supports in improving learners' academic performance in MAPEH.

Academic performance of learners, in the context of basic education, refers to the observable and measurable outcomes of students' learning efforts, typically expressed through numerical grades, rubric-based scores, or competency-based ratings that reflect the extent to which learners have achieved the intended learning competencies (Department of Education, 2015). Within the K to 12 MAPEH curriculum, academic performance is not limited to written examinations; rather, it encompasses a holistic assessment framework that includes written work, performance tasks, and quarterly assessments that collectively measure both conceptual understanding and practical skill application (Department of Education, 2015, DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015). In Physical Education specifically, academic performance is demonstrated through learners' ability to execute movement patterns, apply fitness concepts, participate actively in individual and team activities, and reflect on personal health behaviors-all of which are assessed using rubrics and observation checklists (Department of Education, 2016; SHAPE America, 2014). A key feature of MAPEH assessment is its skill- and performance-based nature, meaning that learners do not simply recall facts but must demonstrate, perform, or produce evidence of learning (Andrade & Heritage, 2018). Consequently, academic performance in MAPEH is a multidimensional construct: it includes cognitive knowledge, psychomotor skills, and affective behaviors (Bloom et al., 1956; Airasian & Miranda, 2002). Because these dimensions require repeated practice, timely feedback, and appropriate learning scaffolds, the quality of instructional materials-such as SIM-directly influences how well learners can engage in meaningful practice and ultimately perform on graded tasks (Clark & Mayer, 2016). Thus, when this study

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

examines the relationship between SIM quality and academic performance, it refers specifically to learners' summative scores and performance-task ratings in MAPEH that reflect their mastery of curriculum-aligned competencies.

The study is important because improving SIM quality is a practical, school-based way to strengthen teaching effectiveness, learner engagement, and mastery especially when teachers face limited time and uneven access to ready-to-use materials. Research-based guidance on multimedia and instructional design highlights that well-designed learning materials can reduce confusion, support understanding, and improve learning by presenting content in ways that match how students process information (Clark & Mayer, 2016). In the same way, instructional design literature underscores that systematic development and evaluation of materials (e.g., alignment, usability, and learner fit) are essential to ensuring learning resources actually support performance outcomes rather than simply adding content (Reiser & Dempsey, 2021).

The literature supports the expectation of a positive correlation between the quality of strategic instructional materials (SIM) and students' academic performance in MAPEH: higher-quality materials tend to provide clearer explanations, better sequencing, and more meaningful practice, which can translate into stronger results. Multimedia learning research explains that students learn more effectively when words and visuals are organized and aligned with cognitive principles, strengthening comprehension and retention (Mayer, 2020). Empirical findings on instructional quality further show that classrooms characterized by stronger instructional clarity and support are associated with higher student achievement, reinforcing the assumption that better-quality instructional inputs are linked with better outcomes (Teig & Nilsen, 2022).

Despite the growing use of strategic instructional materials (SIM) to support competency-based teaching in MAPEH, a clear research gap remains in terms of context-specific evidence on how the quality of SIM (relates to students' academic performance at the school level. While national curriculum directions emphasize performance-based learning in MAPEH that requires well-aligned instructional resources, and recent studies report that SIM use can be associated with improved MAPEH outcomes, there is still limited empirical documentation focusing on Potungan National High School, Potungan District, Schools Division of Dapitan City. Specifically, prior work rarely measures SIM quality using explicit indicators and links these quality dimensions to learners' actual MAPEH grades or performance tasks within this local setting, making it difficult for teachers and school leaders to identify which aspects of strategic instructional materials (SIM) quality most strongly predict achievement and what targeted improvements should be prioritized hence the need for the present study.

METHODS

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to determine the relationship between the perceived quality of strategic instructional materials and students' academic performance in MAPEH in Potungan District, Schools Division of Dapitan City, during School Year 2025-2026. The respondents were 257 junior high school students who participated in the study. The descriptive component was used to determine the level of quality of the strategic instructional materials and the level of academic performance, while the correlational component was used to test whether the perceived quality of the materials was significantly related to students' academic performance.

Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire-checklist that measured the perceived quality of strategic instructional materials in terms of content, mechanics, organization, and overall package. Students' academic performance was measured using their MAPEH grades, categorized according to the DepEd grading descriptors. The instrument was administered with proper permission from school authorities and with due consideration for respondents' participation. The responses were encoded, checked, and analyzed using appropriate statistical procedures.

Frequency count and percentage were used to describe the academic performance categories of the respondents. Weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the perceived level of quality of strategic instructional materials across the identified dimensions. Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient was used to test the relationship between the perceived quality of strategic instructional materials and academic performance in MAPEH at the 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Quality of Strategic Instructional Materials

Table 1. Respondents' perceived level of quality of strategic instructional materials in terms of content

Descriptors	AWV	SD	Description	Interpretation
All the instructions in the modules correspond with activities.	4.04	0.802	Agree	Very High
Learning activities satisfy the stated objectives in enhancing the least mastered skills of learners in MAPEH.	4.15	0.772	Agree	Very High
The module provides independent activities suited to the needs of its target users.	3.80	0.827	Agree	Very High
Graphical and pictorial images are evident that encourage interactive participation among learners.	3.99	0.795	Agree	Very High
Concepts are presented logically based on the needs and least-mastered competencies of learners in MAPEH.	3.93	0.851	Agree	Very High
Overall	**3.97**	**0.565**	**Agree**	**Very High**

AWV = Average Weighted Value; SD = Standard Deviation.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Table 1 shows that the respondents perceived the quality of strategic instructional materials in terms of content as very high, with an overall mean/AWV of 3.97 and a standard deviation of 0.565. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item was "Learning activities satisfy the stated objectives in enhancing the least mastered skills of learners in MAPEH" with an AWV of 4.15 and SD of 0.772, interpreted as Very High. This was followed by "All the instructions in the modules correspond with activities" with an AWV of 4.04 and SD of 0.802, and "Graphical and pictorial images are evident that encourage interactive participation among learners" with an AWV of 3.99 and SD of 0.795, both also interpreted as Very High. On the other hand, the lowest-rated indicator was "The module provides independent activities suited to the needs of its target users" with an AWV of 3.80 and SD of 0.827, although it still fall within the Very High interpretation. Overall, the results indicate that all content indicators were positively assessed by the respondents.

This shows that the strategic instructional materials were viewed as highly acceptable and effective in terms of content quality. This additionally shows that the materials were generally perceived as aligned with learning objectives, responsive to learners' least-mastered competencies, clear in instructional directions, and supportive of learner participation. The consistently high ratings across all indicators suggest that the content components of the materials were appropriate for classroom use and were seen as educationally relevant by the respondents.

This points to the conclusion that well-developed instructional content can support better learning engagement and improve the usefulness of strategic instructional materials in addressing learners' academic needs. This further points to the conclusion that alignment between activities and objectives, logical presentation of concepts, and the inclusion of supportive visual elements strengthen the instructional value of learning materials. At the same time, the relatively lower mean for activities suited to target users offers the insight that there remains room to further improve the differentiation and learner-centeredness of the materials so they can better respond to varying student needs and levels of readiness.

This finding is in agreement with Penuel et al. (2024), who emphasized that standards-aligned instructional materials are most effective when they rigorously address learning goals while also engaging diverse learner interests and needs. It is also in agreement with UNESCO (2024), which stressed that ensuring quality educational content, including teaching and learning materials, helps support learners and teachers and improves the delivery of inclusive and meaningful education. These studies affirm that instructional materials become more effective when their content is clear, relevant, aligned with objectives, and responsive to learners' characteristics and needs.

Table 2. Respondents' perceived level of quality of strategic instructional materials in terms of mechanics

Descriptors	AWV	SD	Description	Interpretation
The module contains relevant activities aligned with the lessons.	4.04	0.863	Agree	Very High
All activities in the module provide practical and useful work in enhancing the least-mastered competencies of learners in MAPEH.	4.00	0.873	Agree	Very High
All assigned tasks in the module develop creativity and resourcefulness among learners, especially in the preservation of their local knowledge in MAPEH.	4.10	0.858	Agree	Very High
All lessons and activities provide relevant information for a better understanding of the identified least-mastered competencies in MAPEH.	4.06	0.827	Agree	Very High
All activities conform to the concepts of teaching MAPEH.	4.05	0.823	Agree	Very High
Overall	4.04	0.598	Agree	Very High

AWV = Average Weighted Value; SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 2 reveals that the respondents perceived the quality of strategic instructional materials in terms of mechanics as very high, with an overall mean/AWV of 4.04 and a standard deviation of 0.598. The highest-rated item was "All assigned tasks in the module develop creativity and resourcefulness among learners, especially in the preservation of their local knowledge in MAPEH" with an AWV of 4.10 and SD of 0.858, interpreted as Very High. This was followed by "All lessons and activities provide relevant information for a better understanding of the identified least-mastered competencies in MAPEH" with an AWV of 4.06 and SD of 0.827, and "All activities conform to the concepts of teaching MAPEH" with an AWV of 4.05 and SD of 0.823, both likewise interpreted as Very High. The lowest-rated indicator was "All activities in the module provide practical and useful work in enhancing the least-mastered competencies of learners in MAPEH" with an AWV of 4.00 and SD of 0.873, though it still fall within the Very High interpretation. Overall, all indicators obtained consistently high ratings, showing strong respondent approval of the mechanics of the materials.

This demonstrates that the strategic instructional materials were perceived as highly sound in terms of mechanics. This additionally demonstrates that the lessons, activities, and assigned tasks were seen as relevant, practical, aligned with MAPEH concepts, and capable of promoting learner creativity and resourcefulness. The consistently very high ratings suggest that the mechanical features of the materials contributed positively to their usability and instructional effectiveness.

This conveys that well-constructed mechanics in instructional materials can strengthen classroom implementation because activities that are relevant, practical, and aligned with lesson goals are more likely to support learner understanding and participation. This further conveys that the

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

materials may help teachers address least-mastered competencies more effectively while also encouraging creativity and contextualized learning among students. At the same time, the slightly lower rating for practical and useful work highlights that further enhancement may still be made to ensure that all activities are even more responsive to learners' actual classroom needs.

This result aligns with the Department of Education (2023), which states in its learning resource materials quality standards that instructional materials should be appropriate to delivery methods, contribute to the achievement of learning objectives, be aligned with objectives and standards, be appropriate to the proficiency level of target learners, and be logically sequenced. These standards are consistent with the table results showing that the materials were viewed as relevant, practical, and aligned with MAPEH instruction. This result is also in line with UNESCO (2024), which emphasized that quality educational content, including digital and analogue teaching materials, supports learners and teachers, and that participatory and collaborative pedagogies stimulate learning and creativity. This supports the high rating given to activities that develop creativity, resourcefulness, and better understanding of competencies.

Table 3. Respondents' perceived level of quality of strategic instructional materials in terms of organization

Descriptors	AWV	SD	Description	Interpretation
The module is designed based on the needs, and contexts of the learners.	3.96	0.924	Agree	Very High
It is based on the MAPEH Curriculum Guide learning competencies which have least-mastered by the learners.	3.95	0.846	Agree	Very High
The module provides necessary drills and activities that help its users enhance their skills in MAPEH.	4.13	0.794	Agree	Very High
It is arranged in the correct sequence based on the identified least-mastered competencies of learners in MAPEH.	3.96	0.838	Agree	Very High
It provides varied activities to sustain interest of its users as to learning MAPEH.	3.97	0.856	Agree	Very High
Overall	**3.98**	**0.633**	**Agree**	**Very High**

AWV = Average Weighted Value; SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 3 shows that the respondents perceived the quality of strategic instructional materials in terms of organization as very high, with an overall mean/AWV of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 0.633. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item was "The module provides necessary drills and activities that help its users enhance their skills in MAPEH" with an AWV of 4.13 and SD of 0.794, interpreted as Very High. This was followed by "It provides varied activities to sustain interest of its users as to learning MAPEH" with an AWV of 3.97 and SD of 0.856, and both "The module is designed based on the needs and contexts of the learners" and "It is arranged in the correct sequence based on the identified least-mastered competencies of learners in MAPEH" with an AWV of 3.96. The lowest-rated item was "It is based on the MAPEH Curriculum Guide learning competencies which have least-mastered by the learners" with an AWV of 3.95 and SD of 0.846, although it still fall under the Very High interpretation. These results indicate that all indicators of organization were favorably assessed by the respondents.

It means that the strategic instructional materials were perceived as highly organized and systematically arranged. It means further that the modules were seen as learner-centered, properly sequenced, curriculum-based, and enriched with drills and varied activities that support skill development and sustain learner interest. The consistently high ratings suggest that the organizational structure of the materials contributed positively to their clarity and usability.

It implies that well-organized instructional materials can make learning more meaningful because properly sequenced and learner-responsive content helps students follow lessons more clearly and engage more actively. It implies further that aligning modules with learner needs, context, and least-mastered competencies can strengthen the effectiveness of instruction in MAPEH. At the same time, the slightly lower rating for curriculum-guide alignment implies that continuous review may still be needed to ensure even stronger correspondence between module organization and prescribed learning competencies.

This interpretation is supported by the Department of Education (2020), which states that learning resources should be developed based on results of needs analysis, content review, and evaluation, showing that organized materials must respond to learner needs and curriculum requirements. It is further supported by UNESCO (2025), which explains that quality learning depends on how learners engage with and make sense of what they learn, suggesting that well-structured and relevant instructional materials help promote meaningful learning. This interpretation is also supported by the DepEd contextualized learning resource guidelines, which describe modules as resources that present course materials in a logical and sequential order, guiding learners through content and assessment.

Table 4. Respondents' perceived level of quality of strategic instructional materials in terms of overall package

Descriptors	AWV	SD	Description	Interpretation
The discussions and instructions are easy to understand as they are simplified based on the needs of the learners.	4.05	0.882	Agree	Very High

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Descriptors	AWV	SD	Description	Interpretation
Provides knowledge and skill in learning MAPEH specifically on the identified competencies.	4.09	0.841	Agree	Very High
Encourages creative and critical thinking towards understanding MAPEH.	4.04	0.920	Agree	Very High
Serves as an instructional tool to enhance the least mastered skills of the learners in MAPEH.	3.93	0.914	Agree	Very High
Helps facilitate lesson presentation, especially in learning MAPEH.	4.11	0.899	Agree	Very High
Overall	**4.03**	**0.689**	**Agree**	**Very High**

AWV = Average Weighted Value; SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 4 shows that the respondents perceived the quality of strategic instructional materials in terms of overall package as Very High, with an overall mean/AWV of 4.03 and a standard deviation of 0.689. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item was "Helps facilitate the lesson presentation, especially in learning MAPEH" with an AWV of 4.11 and SD of 0.899, followed by "Provides knowledge and skill in learning MAPEH specifically on the identified competencies" with an AWV of 4.09 and SD of 0.841. The indicators "The discussions and instructions are easy to understand as they are simplified based on the needs of the learners" and "Encourages creative and critical thinking towards understanding MAPEH" also received high ratings, with AWVs of 4.05 and 4.04, respectively. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated item was "Serves as an instructional tool to enhance the least mastered skills of the learners in MAPEH" with an AWV of 3.93 and SD of 0.914, although it still fall within the Very High interpretation. These results indicate that all indicators under the overall package were favorably evaluated by the respondents. It means that the strategic instructional materials were generally perceived as highly effective and acceptable in their overall package.

This additionally shows that the materials were viewed as understandable, competency-based, supportive of lesson presentation, and capable of promoting both knowledge acquisition and higher-order thinking. The consistently very high ratings suggest that the overall design and presentation of the materials made them useful and appropriate for MAPEH instruction.

This points to the idea that when instructional materials are clear, simplified, and aligned with learner needs and competencies, they become more useful in supporting classroom instruction and student learning. This also points to the idea that well-packaged materials can help teachers present lessons more effectively while also supporting learners' understanding, skill development, and creative and critical thinking. However, the slightly lower mean for enhancing least-mastered skills offers the insight that refinement may still be needed so that materials can respond even more strongly to specific learning gaps of students.

This result aligns with the Department of Education (2020), which states that learning resources should be learner-centered, inclusive, responsive, relevant, and contextualized, and that they serve as learning toolkits where procedures, instructions, and other details are provided to aid the learning process. This result is also consistent with UNESCO (2024), which emphasizes that educational materials provide structured content that supports teachers and learners in achieving educational goals and fostering critical thinking skills. These sources support the present result that the overall package of the strategic instructional materials was perceived as very high because the materials were seen as clear, facilitative of lessons, competency-focused, and supportive of thinking skills.

Table 5. Summary of the respondents' perceived level of quality of strategic instructional materials

Descriptors	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Content	3.97	0.565	Agree	Very High
Mechanics	4.04	0.598	Agree	Very High
Organization	3.98	0.633	Agree	Very High
Overall Package	4.03	0.689	Agree	Very High
Overall	**4.01**	**0.531**	**Agree**	**Very High**

SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 5 shows that the respondents perceived the overall quality of strategic instructional materials as very high, with an overall mean of 4.01 and a standard deviation of 0.531. Among the four dimensions, Mechanics obtained the highest mean of 4.04 with an SD of 0.598, followed closely by Overall Package with a mean of 4.03 and SD of 0.689. Organization ranked third with a mean of 3.98 and SD of 0.633, while Content registered the lowest mean of 3.97 and SD of 0.565. Despite slight differences in rank, all dimensions were described as Agree and interpreted as Very High, indicating consistently favorable evaluations across all aspects of the strategic instructional materials.

This establishes that the strategic instructional materials were generally perceived by the respondents as highly acceptable, well-prepared, and instructionally sound. This further establishes that the materials demonstrated strength in mechanics, overall presentation, organization, and content, suggesting that they were suitable for classroom use and responsive to the learning needs of students. The very high overall mean reflects a strong level of confidence among the respondents in the quality of the materials provided.

This conveys that high-quality strategic instructional materials can serve as effective supports for teaching and learning, especially when they are clear, organized, learner-centered, and instructionally relevant. This further conveys that the strong ratings across all dimensions may contribute to better lesson delivery, improved learner engagement, and more meaningful acquisition of knowledge and skills in MAPEH. At the same time,

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

the slightly lower mean for content serves as an indication that while the materials were already rated very high, there is still room to strengthen content enrichment and alignment to learners' specific needs and least-mastered competencies.

This finding is corroborated by the Department of Education (2020), which emphasizes that learning resources in basic education should be learner-centered, inclusive, responsive, relevant, and contextualized, qualities that are consistent with the very high ratings obtained by the strategic instructional materials. This finding is further corroborated by UNESCO (2024), which states that ensuring quality educational content, including curricula and teaching and learning materials, supports learners and teachers and strengthens meaningful educational delivery. In addition, UNESCO explains that educational materials provide structured content that helps teachers and learners achieve educational goals and foster critical thinking, which aligns with the respondents' very high assessment of the materials' mechanics, organization, content, and overall package.

Respondents' Level of Academic Performance

Table 6. Respondents' level of academic performance

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Fairly Satisfactory	2	0.80			
Satisfactory	28	10.90			
Very Satisfactory	115	44.70			Outstanding
Outstanding	112	43.60	4.31	0.693	
Total	**257**	**100.00**			

Table 6 shows that among the 257 respondents, 115 or 44.70% were classified as Very Satisfactory, while 112 or 43.60% were classified as Outstanding. A smaller proportion, 28 or 10.90%, obtained a Satisfactory rating, and only 2 or 0.80% fall under Fairly Satisfactory. The table further shows an overall mean of 4.31 with a standard deviation of 0.693, interpreted as Outstanding. These findings indicate that the great majority of the respondents performed at the upper academic levels, with very few falling in the lower performance categories. The performance levels used in the table are also consistent with DepEd's K to 12 grading descriptors, where Outstanding = 90-100, Very Satisfactory = 85-89, Satisfactory = 80-84, and Fairly Satisfactory = 75-79.

This demonstrates that the respondents generally demonstrated high academic performance, as reflected in the overall mean interpreted as Outstanding. This further demonstrates that most of the learners were able to meet, and in many cases exceed, the expected academic standards, since nearly all respondents belonged to the Very Satisfactory and Outstanding categories. This suggests that the student group, as a whole, manifested a strong level of academic achievement.

This reflects that the respondents possessed a generally favorable academic standing, which may reflect effective learning engagement, adequate instructional support, and the capacity to perform well in school tasks. This further reflects that because the largest proportions were concentrated in the Very Satisfactory and Outstanding categories, the learners may have benefited from instructional conditions that supported achievement and mastery. At the same time, the small number of respondents in the Satisfactory and Fairly Satisfactory groups indicates that some students may still require targeted academic assistance to help them move toward higher performance levels. UNESCO's 2023 GEM Report also notes that when educational tools and learning supports are appropriately used, they can contribute to stronger learning gains and improved student progress.

This outcome is in line with UNESCO (2023), which reported that appropriate educational tools and personalized learning supports can improve some types of learning and generate measurable learning gains for students. This outcome is also in line with Irambona (2023), who found that instructional materials affect learners' achievement, indicating that effective teaching resources are linked with better academic outcomes. These studies support the present result that the respondents' academic performance was generally high, as most of them were classified as Very Satisfactory and Outstanding.

Relationship between the Quality of Strategic Instructional Materials and Academic Performance in MAPEH

Table 7. Test of the relationship between the perceived level of the quality of strategic instructional materials and level of academic performance in MAPEH

Variables	Variables	Academic Performance
Content	Correlation Coefficient	-0.073
Content	Sig.(2-tailed)	0.241
Content	N	257
Mechanics	Correlation Coefficient	-0.024
Mechanics	Sig.(2-tailed)	0.704
Mechanics	N	257
Organization	Correlation Coefficient	-0.065
Organization	Sig.(2-tailed)	0.303
Organization	N	257
Overall Package	Correlation Coefficient	-0.063
Overall Package	Sig.(2-tailed)	0.311
Overall Package	N	257

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Variables	Variables	Academic Performance
Quality of Strategic Instructional Materials	Correlation Coefficient	-0.079
Quality of Strategic Instructional Materials	Sig.(2-tailed)	0.206
Quality of Strategic Instructional Materials	N	257

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 7 shows that the relationship between the respondents' perceived quality of strategic instructional materials and academic performance in MAPEH was not significant across all dimensions. In terms of content, the correlation coefficient was -0.073 with a p-value of 0.241; for mechanics, the correlation coefficient was -0.024 with a p-value of 0.704; for organization, the correlation coefficient was -0.065 with a p-value of 0.303; and for overall package, the correlation coefficient was -0.063 with a p-value of 0.311. Likewise, the overall relationship between the quality of strategic instructional materials and academic performance yielded a correlation coefficient of -0.079 with a p-value of 0.206, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance. These findings indicate that although the correlations were slightly negative, they were all very weak and not statistically significant, meaning that perceived quality of the strategic instructional materials was not associated with differences in academic performance in MAPEH in this sample. It means that the respondents' perceived quality of strategic instructional materials did not have a statistically significant relationship with their academic performance in MAPEH.

This additionally demonstrates that higher or lower ratings of the materials in terms of content, mechanics, organization, overall package, and overall quality were not accompanied by meaningful changes in academic performance. Thus, the academic performance of the respondents may have been influenced more strongly by other factors beyond their perceived evaluation of the strategic instructional materials.

This conveys that even when instructional materials are perceived as high in quality, such perception alone may not be enough to produce measurable differences in academic performance. This further conveys that academic achievement in MAPEH may also depend on other variables such as learner motivation, study habits, teacher support, classroom environment, prior knowledge, and engagement. UNESCO has noted that technology and educational resources can improve learning in some contexts, but their effects are not automatic and depend on how they are used within teaching and learning processes.

This result runs counter to the study by Ikram et al. (2023), which found that dimensions of education quality, including instructional materials, were positively associated with student-related outcomes. Similarly, UNESCO (2023) reported that some forms of educational technology and access to learning resources can improve learning in certain contexts. However, this result is consistent with UNESCO (2023), which cautioned that the effects of learning resources are context-dependent and do not automatically translate into better achievement merely by their presence or perceived quality. In this study, the nonsignificant relationship suggests that while the strategic instructional materials were rated high, academic performance may have been shaped by a wider set of interacting factors rather than by perceived material quality alone.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study reveal that the strategic instructional materials used in MAPEH were perceived by the respondents as **very high in quality** in terms of content, mechanics, organization, and overall package. This suggests that the materials were generally clear, relevant, organized, learner-centered, and aligned with the least-mastered competencies in MAPEH. Among the dimensions, **mechanics obtained the highest mean**, indicating that students found the activities, tasks, and lesson components practical, useful, and supportive of creativity and resourcefulness. This is important because MAPEH requires not only conceptual understanding but also active participation, skill execution, and performance-based learning. The high ratings imply that the SIM were useful tools in facilitating instruction, sustaining learners' interest, and guiding students toward better understanding of MAPEH lessons. However, the slightly lower rating in content suggests that although the materials were already highly acceptable, further enhancement may still be needed in making the activities more differentiated and responsive to the varied needs, readiness levels, and learning gaps of students.

The study also found that students' academic performance in MAPEH was generally **outstanding**, with most respondents belonging to the **Very Satisfactory** and **Outstanding** categories. This indicates that the learners demonstrated strong mastery of MAPEH competencies and were able to meet or exceed the expected academic standards. Such performance may reflect the combined influence of instructional support, teacher facilitation, learner engagement, classroom activities, and the use of appropriate learning resources. Since MAPEH involves cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains, the high academic performance of students may also suggest that learners were able to participate actively in both written and performance-based tasks. Nevertheless, the presence of a small number of students in the Satisfactory and Fairly Satisfactory categories implies that targeted support is still needed for learners who may require remediation, guided practice, or more individualized instructional assistance.

However, the test of relationship showed that the perceived quality of strategic instructional materials had **no significant relationship** with students' academic performance in MAPEH. The overall correlation was very weak and negative, and the p-value was greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that although the SIM were rated very high and the students performed well academically, the quality of the materials alone did not significantly explain students' academic performance. This implies that students' achievement in MAPEH may be influenced by other factors aside from the perceived quality of instructional materials, such as teaching strategies, learner motivation, study habits, prior knowledge, home support, classroom environment, feedback, and actual student engagement during performance-based activities. The result further suggests that instructional materials, even when well-designed, may not automatically lead to

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

higher academic performance unless they are effectively implemented through meaningful teacher guidance, active student participation, and continuous assessment.

Overall, the findings emphasize that strategic instructional materials remain valuable instructional supports in MAPEH, but their effectiveness depends on how they are used within the teaching-learning process. The very high evaluation of the SIM confirms their usefulness in organizing lessons, facilitating instruction, and supporting learner participation. However, the nonsignificant relationship with academic performance highlights the need to view student achievement as a multidimensional outcome shaped by several interacting factors. Thus, MAPEH teachers should continue improving and contextualizing SIM while also strengthening differentiated instruction, guided practice, performance-based assessment, learner motivation, and feedback mechanisms. Future studies may include additional variables to better explain academic performance and determine which instructional, learner-related, and environmental factors most strongly contribute to achievement in MAPEH.

CONCLUSION

The study concluded that the strategic instructional materials used in MAPEH in Potungan District were perceived by the respondents as very high in quality, particularly in mechanics, overall package, organization, and content. The respondents also demonstrated generally high academic performance, with the overall result interpreted as Outstanding and with most students falling under the Very Satisfactory and Outstanding categories.

However, the findings showed no significant relationship between the perceived quality of strategic instructional materials and students' academic performance in MAPEH. This indicates that while the materials were highly rated and useful as instructional supports, academic performance may also be shaped by other learner, teacher, family, and classroom factors that were not covered in the study.

Based on these findings, DepEd officials and school heads may continue supporting the development, validation, and contextualization of strategic instructional materials, while MAPEH teachers may strengthen their use through differentiated activities, guided practice, and performance-based assessment. Students are encouraged to use the materials actively, and future researchers may examine additional variables such as teaching style, learner motivation, home support, prior knowledge, and classroom engagement to better explain MAPEH achievement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author acknowledges the assistance of the school administrators, teachers, student-respondents, parents or guardians, and all individuals and institutions who supported the conduct of this study. Their cooperation and meaningful contributions helped make the completion of this research possible.

REFERENCES

1) Airasian, P. W., & Miranda, H. (2002). The role of assessment in the revised taxonomy. In L. W. Anderson & D. R. Krathwohl (Eds.), A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives (pp. 249-254). Longman.
2) Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Longman.
3) Andrade, H. L., & Heritage, M. (2018). Using formative assessment to enhance learning, achievement, and academic self-regulation. Routledge. Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. David McKay Company.
4) Asian Development Bank. (2022). Education in the Philippines: Challenges and opportunities. Asian Development Bank. https://www.adb.org/publications/education-philippines
5) Breda, J. (2020). Physical activity and academic achievement: An umbrella review. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(16), 5972.
6) Brookings Institution. (2022). Improving instructional materials in basic education. Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/
7) Carbonneau, N., Vallerand, R. J., & Lafrenière, M. A. K. (2023). Academic achievement across grades: Child and socio-familial characteristics. Journal of Educational Psychology, 115(2), 245-260.
8) Casiano, M. R., Dela Cruz, J. P., & Santos, L. M. (2024). Perceptions of senior high school students on instructional materials: A multi-profile analysis. Philippine Journal of Education Research, 12(1), 45-62. du Preez, J. (2025). Pedagogical and visual design principles for learning materials: A synthesis. Educational Technology Research and
9) Check, J., & Schutt, R. K. (2017). Research methods in education (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
10) Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). E-learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning (4th ed.). Wiley.
11) Commission on Higher Education. (2023). Philippine higher education landscape. Republic of the Philippines. https://ched.gov.ph/
12) Council of Chiefs of State School Officers. (2021). Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards. CCSSO. https://ccsso.org/
13) Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (6th ed.). Pearson.
14) Department of Education. (2015). Grading system for Senior High School (DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015). Republic of the Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/DO_s2015_08.pdf
15) Department of Education. (2016). K to 12 Curriculum Guide: MAPEH (Physical Education). Republic of the Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/PE-CG.pdf

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

16) Department of Education. (2019). Learning resource management and development system (LRMDS) standards. Republic of the Philippines. https://lrmds.deped.gov.ph/
17) Department of Education. (2020). Contextualized learning resource guidelines. Republic of the Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/DM_s2020_076.pdf
18) Department of Education. (2021a). Quality assurance of self-learning modules (DepEd Memorandum No. 2021-042). Republic of the Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/DM_s2021_042.pdf
19) Department of Education. (2021b). Evaluation rating sheets for Quarter 3 and 4 modules. Republic of the Philippines. https://lrmds.deped.gov.ph/
20) Department of Education. (2021c). Learning resource evaluation criteria. Republic of the Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/
21) Department of Education. (2022). MAPEH performance indicators report. Republic of the Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/mapeh-indicators-2022/
22) Department of Education. (2023). Learning resource materials quality standards. Republic of the Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/
23) Department of Education. (2024). National learning recovery program report. Republic of the Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/nlrp-report-2024/
24) Department of Education. (2025). Junior High School curriculum implementation guidelines. Republic of the Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/
25) EdTech Hub. (2023). Multimedia learning in low-resource contexts. EdTech Hub. https://edtechhub.org/
26) El Refae, G. A., Kaba, A., & Eletter, S. (2021). The impact of demographic characteristics on academic performance. International Journal of Educational Management, 35(4), 789-805. Fernández-García, C. M., Maulana, R., Opdenakker, M. C., & den Brok, P. (2019). Student perceptions of teaching effectiveness: Variation by personal and educational factors. Learning Environments Research, 22(2), 231-250.
27) Gagné, R. M., Wager, W. W., Golas, K. C., & Keller, J. M. (2005). Principles of instructional design (5th ed.). Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
28) Garay Abad, R. (2025). Teachers' judgments of instructional material quality: Content relevance and appropriateness. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 57(1), 34-51.
29) Garay Abad, R., & Hattie, J. (2025). Holistic features in teacher judgments of instructional material quality. Teaching and Teacher Education, 135, 104321.
30) Ghai, A. (2022). Visual design and perceived usability of learning resources: The role of typography, layout, and graphics. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 25(3), 112-126.
31) Global Partnership for Education. (2024). Learning assessment and instructional materials. GPE. https://www.globalpartnership.org/
32) Guo, W. (2020). Grade-level differences in students' perceptions of teacher feedback and self-regulated learning. Educational Psychology, 40(5), 589-605.
33) Ikram, M., Kenayathulla, H. B., & Uzair, M. (2023). Dimensions of education quality and student-related outcomes. Quality Assurance in Education, 31(2), 210-226.
34) INEE. (2023). Minimum standards for education: Learning materials. Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. https://inee.org/
35) International Bureau of Education. (2022). Curriculum alignment and learning resources. UNESCO IBE. http://www.ibe.unesco.org/
36) International Society for Technology in Education. (2024). ISTE standards for students. ISTE. https://www.iste.org/standards/students
37) Irambona, A. (2023). Instructional materials and learners' achievement: A comparative analysis. African Journal of Educational Studies, 18(1), 45-59.
38) Islam, M. S., Sultana, S., & Sharmin, N. (2021). Family income level as a factor influencing academic performance. International Journal of Educational Development, 85, 102463.
39) James, M., Todd, C., Scott, S., & Stratton, G. (2023). Physical activity and academic performance: A review of evidence. Journal of School Health, 93(2), 145-156.
40) Kalyuga, S. (2011). Cognitive load theory: How many types of load does it really need? Educational Psychology Review, 23(1), 1-19.
41) Mayer, R. E. (2001). Multimedia learning. Cambridge University Press.
42) Mayer, R. E. (2020). Multimedia learning (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
43) Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (2007). Interactive multimodal learning environments. Educational Psychology Review, 19(3), 309-326. Öksüz, H. İ., & Keskin, H. K. (2022). Readability and comprehensibility in instructional materials. Reading & Writing Quarterly, 38(4), 321-337.
44) Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. M., Morrison, J. R., & Kalman, H. K. (2019). Designing effective instruction (8th ed.). Wiley.
45) National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). Condition of education 2023: Enrollment trends. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/
46) National Center for Education Statistics. (2024). Enrollment in postsecondary education: Age distribution trends. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/
47) Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/education/education-at-a-glance/
48) Partnership for 21st Century Learning. (2023). Framework for 21st century learning. Battelle for Kids. https://www.battelleforkids.org/networks/p21

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

49) Penuel, W. R., Gallagher, D. J., & Moorthy, S. (2024). Standards-aligned instructional materials: Engaging diverse learner interests and needs. Educational Researcher, 53(2), 89-102.
50) Philippine Statistics Authority. (2023). Annual poverty indicators survey. Republic of the Philippines. https://psa.gov.ph/apis
51) Philippine Statistics Authority. (2024). Family income and expenditure survey. Republic of the Philippines. https://psa.gov.ph/fies
52) RAND Corporation. (2023). Instructional materials and teacher effectiveness. RAND. https://www.rand.org/
53) Raosoft. (n.d.). Sample size calculator. http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html
54) Reiser, R. A., & Dempsey, J. V. (2021). Trends and issues in instructional design and technology (5th ed.). Pearson.
55) Research4Life. (2024). Instructional design and developing country contexts. Research4Life. https://www.research4life.org/
56) Schnotz, W., & Kürschner, C. (2007). A reconsideration of cognitive load theory. Educational Psychology Review, 19(4), 469-508.
57) Schunk, D. H. (2020). Learning theories: An educational perspective (8th ed.). Pearson.
58) SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2019). K to 12 curriculum review: Synthesis report. Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization. https://www.seameo-innotech.org/
59) SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2020). Curriculum support initiatives: Improving learning materials in Southeast Asia. SEAMEO Regional Center for Educational Innovation and Technology. https://www.seameo-innotech.org/
60) SHAPE America. (2014). *National standards & grade-level outcomes for K-12 physical education*. Human Kinetics.
61) Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization. (2023). Regional report on MAPEH education. SEAMEO. https://www.seameo.org/
62) Suarez, M. T., & Casinillo, L. F. (2020). Strategic instructional materials and student achievement in addressing learning gaps. Philippine Journal of Education, 98(2), 145-162.
63) Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257-285.
64) Sweller, J. (2020). Cognitive load theory and educational technology. Educational Technology Research and Development, 68(1), 1-16.
65) Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). Cognitive load theory. Springer. Barbosa, A., Whiting, S., Simmonds, P., Scotini Moreno, R., Mendes, R., &
66) Teig, N., & Nilsen, T. (2022). Instructional clarity and support: Associations with student achievement. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 72, 101115.
67) UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2024). Participation in tertiary education: Age group concentration worldwide. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/
68) UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2025). Global education statistics: Secondary school enrollment. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/
69) UNESCO. (2021). Technology in education: A tool on whose terms? United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/
70) UNESCO. (2023). Global Education Monitoring Report 2023: Technology in education - A tool on whose terms? United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000385723
71) UNESCO. (2024). Ensuring quality educational content: Teaching and learning materials for inclusive and meaningful education. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/
72) UNESCO. (2025). Quality learning and learner engagement: The role of structured instructional materials. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/
73) UNICEF. (2023). Child poverty and inequality: Long-term effects on health, learning, and nutrition. United Nations Children's Fund. https://www.unicef.org/reports/child-poverty
74) UNICEF. (2024). Access to quality learning in the Philippines: Barriers for low-income families. United Nations Children's Fund. https://www.unicef.org/philippines/reports/education-brief
75) UNICEF. (2025). State of the world's children 2025: Education and equity. United Nations Children's Fund. https://www.unicef.org/reports/state-of-worlds-children
76) Van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Sweller, J. (2010). Cognitive load theory in health professional education: Design principles and strategies. Medical Education, 44(1), 85-93.
77) Wen, M., Su, S., & Li, X. (2020). Family income and school grades: Robust associations. Child Development, 91(3), 789-805.
78) What Works Clearinghouse. (2022). Instructional materials and student achievement. Institute of Education Sciences. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/
79) World Bank. (2021). Learning poverty in the Philippines. World Bank Group. https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/philippines/publication/learning-poverty-philippines
80) World Bank. (2024). Global enrollment trends: Female tertiary enrollment exceeds male enrollment. World Bank Group. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education
81) World Education Blog. (2023). Quality teaching materials and student outcomes. UNESCO GEM Report. https://worldeducationblog.org/
82) World Health Organization. (2022). Physical activity and young people. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/physical-activity
83) Zhang, D., & Nunamaker, J. F. (2023). Multimedia learning and student engagement: A meta-analysis. Journal of Educational

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/