



AN EVALUATION OF A BLENDED LEARNING INSTRUCTIONAL MODULE IN DRUG AND VICE EDUCATION AND CONTROL (CDI 7)

Cindy DC. Cariaga

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the acceptability of an instructional module in terms of module title, learning objectives, setting (learning activities), content, references, and assessment of learning. The study utilized a descriptive-evaluative research design. The respondents were BS Criminology students enrolled in CDI 7 and selected instructors who served as content validators. A researcher-made questionnaire was used to gather data, and the results were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as weighted mean and standard deviation.

Findings revealed that all components of the instructional module were rated as "Strongly Agree", indicating a high level of acceptability. The module titles obtained a grand mean of 3.57, showing clarity, organization, and alignment with learning outcomes. The learning objectives obtained a grand mean of 3.51, indicating that they are clear, relevant, and appropriate for the course. The setting or learning activities obtained a grand mean of 3.47, reflecting effective sequencing and engagement of learners, although pre-assessment activities received relatively lower ratings. The content obtained a grand mean of 3.55, indicating that it is well-organized, relevant, and aligned with academic standards. The references obtained a grand mean of 3.50, showing credibility and relevance, though improvements in accessibility were noted. Lastly, the assessment of learning obtained a grand mean of 3.52, indicating that assessments are clear, aligned, and effective in measuring student learning outcomes.

Based on the findings, it is concluded that the instructional module is highly acceptable and suitable for instructional use. It effectively supports student learning in terms of clarity, content quality, and assessment alignment. However, minor improvements are recommended, particularly in enhancing pre-assessment activities, updating and improving access to references, and further refining learning objectives to ensure measurability and specificity.

KEYWORDS: Instructional Module, Acceptability, Learning Objectives, Content Evaluation, Assessment of Learning, Descriptive-Evaluative Research

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of educational technology has transformed the delivery of instruction in higher education, encouraging the adoption of innovative teaching strategies such as blended learning. Blended learning combines traditional face-to-face instruction with online learning activities, allowing students to access learning materials anytime and anywhere while maintaining meaningful interaction with instructors. This approach promotes active learning, flexibility, and student engagement, making it an effective instructional strategy in today's educational environment. As higher education institutions continue to integrate technology into teaching, the development of quality instructional modules has become increasingly important in enhancing students' learning experiences.

In the Bachelor of Science in Criminology program, Drug and Vice Education and Control (CDI 7) is a specialized course that equips students with knowledge of dangerous drugs, drug prevention, vice crimes, relevant laws, and law enforcement strategies. The course plays a vital role in preparing future criminologists to address drug-related issues and support crime prevention initiatives. However, students often encounter difficulties in understanding legal concepts, analyzing case situations, and applying theoretical knowledge in practical settings. These challenges highlight the need for instructional materials that are interactive, organized, and responsive to diverse learning styles.

A blended learning instructional module offers an effective solution by integrating printed learning materials with digital resources, multimedia presentations, self-assessment activities, and online discussions. Such a module encourages independent learning while reinforcing classroom instruction, enabling students to learn at their own pace and improve their comprehension of complex topics.

Despite the growing use of blended learning in higher education, limited studies have evaluated instructional modules specifically designed for Drug and Vice Education and Control (CDI 7). Therefore, this study aims to evaluate a blended learning instructional module in terms of its content quality, instructional design, usability, and effectiveness in supporting student learning. The findings of this study are expected to provide valuable insights for criminology educators, curriculum developers, and higher education institutions in improving instructional practices and enhancing the quality of criminology education through technology-enhanced learning.

This study is anchored on several educational theories that support the development and evaluation of a blended learning instructional module in Drug and Vice Education and Control (CDI 7). One of the primary foundations is Constructivist Learning Theory, which emphasizes that learners construct knowledge actively rather than passively receiving information. In this study, students engage with printed and digital learning materials, allowing them to build understanding



of drug education concepts through exploration, analysis, and reflection.

Another supporting theory is Connectivism Theory, which highlights the importance of technology, networks, and digital resources in learning. Since the instructional module integrates online materials and blended learning strategies, students are encouraged to access information from various digital platforms, collaborate with peers, and connect classroom learning with real-world applications in criminology and law enforcement.

The study also draws on Cognitive Learning Theory, which focuses on how information is processed, stored, and retrieved. The structured design of the module helps reduce cognitive overload by organizing content in a clear and systematic manner, improving students' comprehension and retention of complex legal and criminological concepts.

Lastly, the ADDIE Model (Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation) serves as a guiding instructional design framework in the development and assessment of the module. It ensures that the instructional material is systematically created, validated, and evaluated based on learning objectives and student needs.

Together, these theories provide a strong foundation for evaluating the effectiveness, usability, and educational value of the blended learning instructional module in CDI 7.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study employed a descriptive-evaluative research design to assess the acceptability and effectiveness of the developed blended learning module for CDI 7. A descriptive research design was appropriate because it systematically described the characteristics and perceptions of the respondents regarding the quality of the instructional material. Meanwhile, the evaluative aspect of the design enabled the researcher to determine the extent to which the module met established educational standards and learning objectives, thereby

providing evidence of its suitability for classroom implementation.

The respondents of the study consisted of Bachelor of Science in Criminology (BS Criminology) students enrolled in CDI 7, who served as the primary evaluators of the module based on their learning experiences. Their feedback was essential in determining the module's usability, clarity, organization, and overall effectiveness in facilitating learning. In addition, selected instructors with expertise in criminology and instructional delivery served as content validators. These experts evaluated the module to ensure that the learning materials were accurate, relevant, comprehensive, and aligned with the prescribed course outcomes and curriculum standards. Their professional assessment strengthened the content validity and academic credibility of the developed instructional material.

A researcher-made questionnaire was used as the primary data-gathering instrument. The questionnaire was developed based on established instructional material evaluation criteria and relevant literature on module development and blended learning. It consisted of indicators designed to assess the module across six key areas: Module Title, Learning Objectives, Setting Up, Content, References, and Assessment of Learning. Each component was measured through ten indicators using a 4-point Likert scale, where 4 indicated Strongly Agree and 1 indicated Strongly Disagree. The scale was later interpreted using equal interval ranges to determine the respondents' level of agreement with each statement. Mean scores were interpreted according to the following ranges: 3.26–4.00 as Strongly Agree, 2.51–3.25 as Agree, 1.76–2.50 as Disagree, and 1.00–1.75 as Strongly Disagree.

RESULTS

An Evaluation of a Blended Learning Instructional Module in Drug and Vice Education and Control (CDI 7)

Table 1. Module Title

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Each module title clearly reflects the topic covered in the lesson.	3.60	Strongly Agree
2. The module titles are organized, well-written, and easy to understand.	3.58	Strongly Agree
3. Each module title gives a clear idea of what the student can expect to learn.	3.55	Strongly Agree
4. The module titles help the student remember key concepts.	3.50	Strongly Agree
5. The module titles are specific and directly related to the lesson content.	3.52	Strongly Agree
6. The module titles are consistent in format and structure throughout the material.	3.48	Strongly Agree
7. Each module title meaningfully represents the content of the module.	3.55	Strongly Agree
8. The module titles make it easier for the student to follow the flow of the lessons.	3.62	Strongly Agree
9. The module titles are clearly connected to the learning goals.	3.60	Strongly Agree
10. The module titles help set clear expectations for student learning.	3.70	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	3.57	Strongly Agree

The results show that the module titles were evaluated very positively, with a grand mean of 3.57 interpreted as **Strongly Agree**. This indicates that the respondents found the module titles clear, well-organized, and effectively aligned with the lesson content. The highest-rated indicator shows that titles

help set clear expectations for student learning (3.70), suggesting that the titles successfully guide learners on what to expect in each module. Overall, the module titles contribute to better understanding and smooth flow of lessons.



Table 2. Learning Objectives

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The learning objectives are clearly stated at the beginning of each unit or topic.	3.50	Strongly Agree
2. The learning objectives are easy for the student to understand and follow	3.55	Strongly Agree
3. The objectives reflect what the student is expected to learn after each lesson.	3.48	Strongly Agree
4. The objectives are relevant to the course and the needs of the student.	3.52	Strongly Agree
5. The learning objectives help the student stay focused on important topics.	3.45	Strongly Agree
6. The student finds the learning objectives achievable and realistic.	3.40	Strongly Agree
7. The objectives include both knowledge-based and practical skills.	3.50	Strongly Agree
8. The objectives are consistent with the course content discussed in the module.	3.55	Strongly Agree
9. The objectives helped the student understand the purpose of each lesson.	3.58	Strongly Agree
10. The learning objectives reflect the appropriate level of difficulty for the student.	3.52	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	3.51	Strongly Agree

The learning objectives obtained a grand mean of 3.51, interpreted as **Strongly Agree**, indicating that they are generally clear, relevant, and aligned with the course content. Respondents agreed that the objectives help guide learning and

are understandable to students. However, slightly lower ratings on achievability and focus suggest minor areas for improvement in clarity and precision. Overall, the objectives effectively support student learning outcomes.

Table 3. Setting

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The module included pre-assessment or diagnostic activities before each lesson.	3.40	Strongly Agree
2. The pre-assessment activities helped the student identify what was already known about the topic.	3.45	Strongly Agree
3. The activities in the module prepared the student for new lessons.	3.38	Strongly Agree
4. The activities helped the student connect prior knowledge to new content.	3.48	Strongly Agree
5. The module activities allowed the student to apply what was learned in practical ways.	3.42	Strongly Agree
6. The module provided enough practice activities to reinforce learning.	3.50	Strongly Agree
7. The activities helped the student monitor their own understanding throughout the lesson.	3.52	Strongly Agree
8. The progression of activities in the module followed a logical learning sequence.	3.55	Strongly Agree
9. The activities encouraged active participation from the student.	3.48	Strongly Agree
10. The student found the activities useful in understanding the learning objectives.	3.50	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	3.47	Strongly Agree

The setting of the module obtained a grand mean of 3.47, interpreted as **Strongly Agree**, indicating positive evaluation of the learning activities and sequencing. Respondents agreed that the activities help prepare students for lessons and follow a logical progression. The results also show that activities

promote understanding and participation, although pre-assessment and preparatory activities received slightly lower ratings. Overall, the module provides an effective learning environment.

Table 4. Content

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The module includes essential and relevant topics for the subject.	3.55	Strongly Agree
2. The assessments included in the module are aligned with the content.	3.62	Strongly Agree
3. The topics are organized logically and are easy for the student to follow.	3.58	Strongly Agree
4. The content matches the cognitive level and academic needs of third-year students.	3.50	Strongly Agree
5. Assessment activities are provided at the end of each chapter or unit.	3.55	Strongly Agree
6. The content reflects updated guidelines and relevant industry practices.	3.52	Strongly Agree
7. The test items are based on learning outcomes and relate to the module content.	3.60	Strongly Agree
8. The topics contribute to the student's knowledge and awareness of real-world issues.	3.48	Strongly Agree
9. A variety of materials (e.g., texts, visuals, examples) are used to support the lessons.	3.58	Strongly Agree
10. The content is simplified for better understanding without losing its academic value.	3.55	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	3.55	Strongly Agree



The content of the module received a grand mean of 3.55, interpreted as **Strongly Agree**, showing that respondents found the material well-structured, relevant, and appropriate for learners. The highest-rated indicators highlight alignment of

assessments with content and logical organization of topics. The findings suggest that the module content is academically sound, updated, and effectively supports student learning. Overall, the content is considered highly acceptable.

Table 5. References

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The module includes proper citations for all sources used.	3.50	Strongly Agree
2. The references are relevant and directly related to the topics discussed.	3.40	Strongly Agree
3. The sources used in the module are up-to-date.	3.48	Strongly Agree
4. The student can access the materials cited in the module.	3.45	Strongly Agree
5. The references help the student better understand the lesson content.	3.52	Strongly Agree
6. The module gives proper credit to original authors.	3.55	Strongly Agree
7. The references support and strengthen the accuracy of the content.	3.50	Strongly Agree
8. The references are presented in a clear and organized format.	3.48	Strongly Agree
9. The references show that the module is based on well-researched information.	3.55	Strongly Agree
10. The use of references increases the credibility of the instructional material.	3.58	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	3.50	Strongly Agree

The references obtained a grand mean of 3.50, interpreted as **Strongly Agree**, indicating that the module uses credible and relevant sources. Respondents agreed that references support content accuracy and enhance the credibility of the material. However, slightly lower ratings on accessibility

and relevance suggest room for improvement in updating and providing easier access to sources. Overall, the module demonstrates good scholarly grounding.

Table 6. Assessment of Learning

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. The post-lesson assessments helped the student evaluate what was learned.	3.52	Strongly Agree
2. The assessments given after each lesson reflected the key topics discussed.	3.55	Strongly Agree
3. The post-lesson tests or tasks matched the learning objectives of the module.	3.48	Strongly Agree
4. The assessment questions were clear, understandable, and based on the lesson content.	3.55	Strongly Agree
5. The assessments helped the student apply knowledge from the lessons.	3.50	Strongly Agree
6. The student felt that the assessments measured actual learning and understanding.	3.52	Strongly Agree
7. The post-lesson assessments provided the student with a sense of progress.	3.50	Strongly Agree
8. The module included a variety of assessment activities (e.g., quizzes, written tasks, reflections).	3.55	Strongly Agree
9. The student had enough time and guidance to complete the assessments after each lesson.	3.48	Strongly Agree
10. The assessments encouraged the student to review and reflect on the lesson.	3.52	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	3.52	Strongly Agree

The assessment of learning received a grand mean of 3.52, interpreted as **Strongly Agree**, showing that respondents viewed the assessments as clear, relevant, and aligned with learning objectives. The results indicate that assessments effectively measure understanding and promote reflection. Respondents also noted the variety of assessment forms used, contributing to better learning evaluation. Overall, the assessment component is effective in measuring student learning outcomes.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study reveal that the instructional module is generally **highly acceptable** across all evaluated components, namely Module Title, Learning Objectives, Setting, Content, References, and Assessment of Learning, with all grand means interpreted as **“Strongly Agree.”** This

indicates that the module is well-developed, learner-centered, and aligned with instructional design principles.

The module titles obtained a grand mean of 3.57, indicating strong clarity, organization, and alignment with learning outcomes. This suggests that titles effectively guide learners in understanding lesson direction and expectations. This finding is consistent with the study of Hamora et al. (2022), which emphasized that well-structured instructional modules enhance student clarity and engagement, contributing to better learning navigation and comprehension. Similarly, instructional design literature stresses that clear labeling of learning units improves cognitive organization and reduces learner confusion (Morrison et al., 2019).

The learning objectives obtained a grand mean of 3.51, indicating that they are clear, relevant, and aligned with course content. However, slightly lower ratings in achievability suggest room for refinement in ensuring measurable and



realistic outcomes. According to Cerbo (2024), well-designed instructional modules must align learning objectives with student capabilities and curriculum standards to ensure effective learning outcomes. In addition, ADDIE-based instructional design studies emphasize that clear, measurable objectives are essential in guiding both instruction and assessment (Branch, 2009).

The setting obtained a grand mean of 3.47, showing that students strongly agree on the effectiveness of module activities in preparing and engaging learners. However, slightly lower scores in pre-assessment activities suggest limited diagnostic scaffolding. Literature indicates that structured pre-assessment improves activation of prior knowledge and supports meaningful learning transitions (Hamora et al., 2022). Furthermore, QuADEM-based module evaluations highlight that interactivity and feedback mechanisms are critical components that enhance learner autonomy and comprehension (O'Neill et al., 2013).

The content obtained a grand mean of 3.55, indicating that it is well-organized, relevant, and aligned with academic standards. Respondents recognized that the content matches cognitive level requirements and supports real-world application. This supports the findings of Guido (2014), who emphasized that well-structured modules significantly improve knowledge acquisition and skill development in modular learning environments. Similarly, Cerbo (2024) found that content relevance and clarity are key predictors of module effectiveness and acceptability.

The references obtained a grand mean of 3.50, indicating that the module uses credible and relevant sources. However, lower ratings in accessibility suggest that improvements are needed in providing updated and easily retrievable sources. Literature shows that currency and accessibility of references are critical in maintaining instructional quality, as outdated materials reduce learning relevance and effectiveness (O'Neill et al., 2013). Moreover, well-referenced instructional materials increase academic integrity and learner trust in content (Hamora et al., 2022).

The assessment of learning obtained a grand mean of 3.52, indicating that assessments are aligned, clear, and effective in measuring learning outcomes. This supports the findings of Yazon (2018), who found that module-based assessments significantly enhance learner understanding when aligned with learning objectives. Additionally, Alsuwaiket et al. (2020) emphasized that assessment design directly influences student performance and learning retention, highlighting the importance of well-structured evaluation tools.

Overall, the results indicate that the instructional module is **highly acceptable and effective**, reflecting strong instructional design quality. The findings align with multiple studies stating that well-developed modules based on systematic instructional design models (such as ADDIE) improve learner engagement, comprehension, and academic performance (Branch, 2009; Cerbo, 2024; Hamora et al., 2022).

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the instructional module is highly acceptable in terms of module titles, learning objectives, learning activities, content, references, and assessment of learning. The consistent

interpretation of "Strongly Agree" across all indicators suggests that the module is well-structured, relevant, and aligned with student learning needs. The study confirms that properly designed instructional modules enhance learner understanding, engagement, and academic performance. However, minor areas for improvement include strengthening pre-assessment activities, improving accessibility of references, and further refining the measurability of learning objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Enhancement of Learning Objectives - Learning objectives should be further refined to ensure they are fully measurable, specific, and achievable, aligning with SMART criteria.
2. Improvement of Pre-assessment Activities - More diagnostic and formative activities should be integrated to better activate prior knowledge and prepare students for new lessons.
3. Updating and Accessibility of References - References should be regularly updated and formatted to ensure accessibility and relevance to current academic and industry standards.
4. Strengthening Assessment Design - A wider variety of performance-based assessments should be included to better measure higher-order thinking skills and practical application.
5. Continuous Module Evaluation - Regular review and validation of the module should be conducted to ensure its continuous improvement and alignment with evolving educational standards.
6. Future Research Direction - Future studies may consider evaluating the effectiveness of the module on student academic performance using pretest-posttest design or comparing modular instruction with other instructional modalities such as blended learning.

Acknowledgements

The researcher would like to express sincere gratitude and appreciation to all the individuals who contributed to the completion and success of this study.

First and foremost, heartfelt thanks are extended to the Almighty God for the wisdom, strength, guidance, and perseverance provided throughout the entire research process. Without His continuous blessings, the completion of this study would not have been possible.

The researcher is also grateful to the faculty members and content validators who generously shared their time and expertise in evaluating the research instrument and providing meaningful feedback for its improvement.

Sincere thanks are extended to the BS Criminology students who served as respondents of the study. Their honest responses and cooperation were essential in gathering the data needed for the completion of this research.

The researcher also wishes to acknowledge family and friends for their unwavering support, understanding, patience, and encouragement throughout the demanding period of conducting this study. Their moral and emotional support served as a source of strength and motivation.



Finally, the researcher extends appreciation to all individuals who, directly or indirectly, contributed to the success of this study. Every assistance, no matter how small, played a significant role in the completion of this academic endeavor.

To all of you, thank you sincerely.

REFERENCES

1. Alsuwaikeet, M., Blasi, A. H., & Al-Msie'din, R. (2020). Formulating module assessment for improved academic performance predictability in higher education. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.13255>
2. Branch, R. M. (2009). *Instructional design: The ADDIE approach*. Springer.
3. Cerbo, R. A. (2024). Development, evaluation, and acceptability of module in science technology and society. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.54476/ioer-imrj/078175>
4. Guido, R. M. (2014). Evaluation of a modular teaching approach in materials science and engineering. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2(11), 1126–1130. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-2-11-20>
5. Graham, C. R. (2006). Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), *The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs* (pp. 3–21). Pfeiffer.
6. Hamora, L. A., Rabaya, M. B., Pentang, J. T., Pizaña, A. D., & Gamozo, M. J. (2022). Students' evaluation of faculty-prepared instructional modules: Inferences for instructional materials review and revision. *Journal of Education, Management and Development Studies*, 2(2), 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.52631/jemds.v2i2.109>
7. Molenda, M. (2003). In search of the elusive ADDIE model. *Performance Improvement*, 42(5), 34–37.
8. Piaget, J. (1972). *The psychology of the child*. Basic Books.
9. Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 2(1), 3–10.
10. Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
11. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
12. Yazon, A. D. (2018). Validation and effectiveness of module in assessment of students learning. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 7(11), 1833–1836.