

Development and Validation of Contextualised Instructional Material in Legal Office Procedures in the Philippines

Genevie A. Estrebello

Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges, Nabua, Camarines Sur, Philippines
E-mail: bhaiestrebello@cspc.edu.ph

KEYWORDS Educational Resources. Legal Documentation. Legal Support Services. Office Administration. Outcomes-Based Education

ABSTRACT This study developed and validated a contextualised instructional material for the Legal Office Procedures course under the Bachelor of Science in Office Administration program in the Philippines. The study addressed the issue of limited availability and partial alignment of existing instructional resources with the competency requirements set by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), particularly in relation to contemporary legal office practices. Guided by the ADDIE (Analyse, Design, Develop, Implement, Evaluate) model, the research employed a descriptive-comparative and developmental design. Data were collected through purposive sampling from 130 fourth-year BSOA students and 5 instructors to assess the availability and alignment of existing materials. Identified gaps informed the design and development of an instructional material aligned with the description and competency expectations of the Legal Office Procedures course. The developed resource was subjected to two rounds of expert validation by a panel of 15 jurors, including legal practitioners, court personnel, and instructors. The material received very satisfactory ratings across all evaluation domains, indicating its pedagogical soundness and readiness for instructional use.

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary vocational and professional education, the quality of instructional materials (IMs)¹ increasingly determines whether curriculum intentions translate into demonstrable workplace competence. This concern is particularly acute in office administration programs, where graduates are expected to operate within legally sensitive environments that demand procedural accuracy, ethical compliance, and adaptability to evolving documentation systems. Instructional design scholarship consistently demonstrates that instructional materials do not merely support instruction; rather, they function as the principal mediating tools through which intended learning outcomes are operationalised into observable performance (Antipuesto et al. 2023; Alciso et al. 2023). Recent studies caution that curriculum coherence alone does not guarantee competence formation unless instructional resources actively structure opportunities for performance, judgement, and accountability (Eimer and Bohndick 2023; Ferns et al. 2025). Moreover, Zapanta et al. (2025) found that despite strong course-job relatedness, limited work experience remains a key employment barrier, underscoring the need for practice-oriented tasks and assessment routines. When instructional materials are poorly aligned with professional practice,

learning risks becoming declarative rather than performative, producing graduates who are theoretically informed yet insufficiently prepared for workplace demands.

Within the Philippine² context, Legal Office Procedures occupies a specialised position in the Bachelor of Science in Office Administration (BSOA)³ curriculum. This positioning is significant because the course functions as a primary site where policy-level competency expectations are translated into routine instructional practice. Mandated under outcomes-based education (OBE)⁴ policies of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED)⁵, particularly CHED Memorandum Order (CMO)⁶ No. 19, series of 2017, the course is expected to develop competencies in legal documentation, transcription, records management, confidentiality, and ethical communication. However, comparative and regional studies on OBE implementation indicate that while policy frameworks articulate intended competencies clearly, their enactment at the instructional level remains uneven, with learning resources often failing to translate outcomes into structured learning experiences (Ortega-Dela Cruz 2022; Mahrishi et al. 2025). This misalignment raises a critical concern regarding whether learning outcomes articulated at the policy level are meaningfully enacted at the instructional level. Recent Philippine curriculum

evaluations further report generally positive perceptions of office administration programs alongside persistent weaknesses in practical skill acquisition and assessment practices, underscoring gaps between curricular intent and instructional enactment (Barillo et al. 2024).

Empirical evidence across professional and vocational education further points to a persistent gap between curricular coverage and procedural competence. Studies consistently show that instructional designs tend to privilege conceptual understanding and ethical orientation while underrepresenting skill-intensive competencies that require practice under authentic constraints (Peerisia et al. 2024; Lawton et al. 2024). This imbalance is particularly consequential in legal office work, where competence depends not only on knowing procedures but on executing them accurately under time, confidentiality, and documentation standards. Thanaraj and Gledhill (2022) noted that digital court systems, remote litigation, and legal automation have transformed how legal support is delivered, thereby requiring updated pedagogical approaches that are explicitly aligned with digital workflows and evolving ethical standards. When instructional materials rely heavily on descriptive explanations rather than task-based engagement, students may acquire conceptual familiarity without developing procedural confidence or error-sensitive judgement-capabilities that are central to professional accountability in legal-administrative environments (Jackson 2025).

From a pedagogical standpoint, instructional design research increasingly emphasises that effective instructional materials must be contextualised, outcomes-aligned, and grounded in authentic professional tasks. Large-scale reviews of assessment and curriculum alignment demonstrate that skill transfer and employability outcomes are significantly enhanced when learning tasks and assessments mirror workplace demands and require students to demonstrate performance, not merely recall knowledge (Vlachopoulos and Makri 2024; Villarroel et al. 2024). Alciso et al. (2023) further argue that outcomes-based instructional materials require deliberate design and systematic validation to ensure coherence among objectives, learning activities, and assessment strategies. At the same time, critical perspectives caution that content adequacy and expert validation, while necessary, are insufficient to ensure competence un-

less instructional materials embed structured learning tasks and assessment mechanisms that explicitly require procedural enactment (Benedicto et al. 2025). Despite this growing consensus, there remains limited empirical work on the structured development and validation of instructional materials specifically tailored to Legal Office Procedures within the Philippine context.

This gap is not merely technical but conceptual. Much of the existing literature continues to treat instructional material development as a supplementary or descriptive activity rather than as a research-informed design process subject to empirical scrutiny. As a result, instructional alignment is frequently assessed in terms of content coverage rather than in relation to how learning tasks, assessments, and feedback mechanisms jointly support competence formation (Barthakur et al. 2022; Khan et al. 2025). Addressing this limitation requires a shift from descriptive accounts of instructional content toward analytically grounded design frameworks that explicitly link needs analysis, instructional decisions, and validation outcomes.

To respond to this gap, the present study adopts a systematic instructional design orientation grounded in the ADDIE⁷ (Analyse, Design, Develop, Implement and Evaluate) model as articulated in contemporary instructional design scholarship. ADDIE is employed here not as a prescriptive sequence but as an analytical framework for aligning instructional decisions with empirically identified learning and performance gaps. While ADDIE remains one of the most widely applied frameworks in instructional development, recent literature cautions against its superficial or linear application. Updated interpretations of ADDIE emphasise its iterative, decision-driven character, wherein each phase be anchored in explicit pedagogical and contextual rationales (LaMarca and LaMarca 2024). Rather than treating this as a procedural checklist, contemporary instructional design positions it as a reflective framework that foregrounds alignment, feedback, and continuous refinement.

Within this framework, the present study conceptualises instructional material development as an empirical process that begins with instructional needs analysis, proceeds through structured design and development, and culminates in expert validation involving both academic and professional stakeholders. Validation is treated not as an

ancillary step but as a methodological safeguard that enhances instructional credibility, usability, and professional legitimacy. Recent alignment studies further affirm that expert validation is most effective when paired with performance-oriented task design and assessment structures that reflect real-world practice (Barthakur et al. 2022; Villarroel et al. 2024). In legal and professional education contexts, this emphasis aligns with broader scholarship arguing that authentic assessment and skills-based instruction must be defensible, standards-based, and transparent (le Roux-Kemp 2024; Bedford et al. 2024).

By integrating contemporary instructional design theory, outcomes-based education principles, and professional practice requirements, this study contributes an empirically grounded and contextually responsive instructional material for Legal Office Procedures. More broadly, it reframes instructional material development as a form of applied educational research, one that moves beyond descriptive exposition toward critical alignment between curriculum policy, instructional design, and workplace competence.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to develop and validate a contextualised instructional material for the Legal Office Procedures course under the BSOA curriculum using the ADDIE instructional design model. Specifically, it sought to:

1. Determine the availability of instructional materials currently used in the course
2. Evaluate their alignment with the intended learning outcomes prescribed in CHED Memorandum Order No. 19, series of 2017
3. Examine differences between student and instructor responses regarding material availability and alignment
4. Assess and validate the developed instructional material in terms of alignment with learning objectives, inclusion of developmental activities and assessment components, and overall content quality, organisation, and currency through expert evaluation.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This section outlined the methods that were employed to gather data essential for the develop-

ment of the instructional material in Legal Office Procedures. The study adopted a data-driven approach combining needs assessment and expert validation to ensure instructional relevance and rigour.

Design

This study utilised a descriptive-comparative research design to analyse existing instructional conditions, alongside a developmental research design to guide the systematic creation and validation of a contextualised instructional material for the course Legal Office Procedures. The integration of quantitative survey data and qualitative expert feedback ensured that material development was empirically informed. The study followed the ADDIE instructional design model to ensure that the resulting material was pedagogically sound, competency-aligned, and responsive to both academic requirements and workplace practices.

Participants

Participants were selected through purposive sampling based on direct involvement with the Legal Office Procedures course at Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges (CSPC), Nabua⁹, Camarines Sur, Philippines. Two participant groups were involved in the study. The first descriptive-comparative group comprised 130 fourth-year Bachelor of Science in Office Administration (BSOA) students who completed the course during Academic Year 2023-2024 and 5 instructors who had taught the course. Students were included if they were enrolled in the BSOA program, had completed the course, and consented to participate, while instructors were included based on teaching experience in Legal Office Procedures. Individuals without direct course involvement or who could not complete the instruments were excluded, and the second assessment and validation group consisted of 15 expert jurors, including two practising lawyers, six legal administrative assistants, two court stenographers, and the same five instructors from the descriptive-comparative group. The inclusion of these instructors in the validation phase ensured continuity between identified instructional needs and expert evaluation of the developed material. Jurors were selected based on relevant professional experience in legal administrative prac-

tice or legal education, and those lacking appropriate expertise or unable to complete the evaluation instruments were excluded.

Materials and Instruments

To assess the availability and curricular alignment of existing instructional materials, two survey instruments adapted from Jintalan (2024) were utilised. One instrument measured the availability of instructional materials, while the second examined their alignment with the course description prescribed in CHED Memorandum Order No. 19, series of 2017.

For the evaluation of the developed instructional material, a researcher-developed instrument assessed alignment of the learning objectives, use of various developmental activities, and assessment used. In addition, the Evaluation Rating Sheet for Print Materials, based on the Department of Education's (n.d.) Learning Resources Management and Development System (LRMDS), was employed to examine content validity, technical quality, visual presentation, and accuracy of information. The use of both pedagogical and policy-based instruments strengthened the methodological rigour of the validation process.

A pilot study involving 10 students and 5 instructors, who were not part of the final sample, was conducted to establish instrument reliability. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.84 to 0.88 indicated high internal consistency.

Procedure

Data collection was conducted in three phases. Participants were briefed on the study's pur-

pose, and informed consent was secured prior to involvement. In the first evaluation phase, student and instructor participants completed two validated survey instruments on the availability and alignment of instructional materials. Surveys were distributed in both print and digital formats. Quantitative data were analysed using weighted mean, while the standard deviation, and independent samples t-test (Welch's) to determine if statistically significant differences existed between groups. In the second, the assessment phase and third, the validation phase, expert jurors participated in a two-round evaluation process to assess the features and validate the developed IM. Jurors rated the instructional material using a 4-point Likert scale from 'Not Satisfactory' to 'Very Satisfactory' and provided written feedback. Revisions were made based on one round of feedback, and the revised material was re-evaluated in round two to confirm integration of recommendations and instructional readiness. This study complied with institutional ethical standards. Participation was voluntary, and all provided informed consent. Data confidentiality was maintained through anonymisation and aggregate reporting.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Availability of IM in Legal Office Procedures

Table 1 presents the comparative ratings of students and instructors regarding the availability of instructional materials (IMs) for the Legal Office Procedures course. Both groups rated the overall availability of instructional materials as '*sometimes available*', with an average weighted mean of 2.72 for students and 2.80 for instructors. Among the

Table 1: Comparative weighted mean ratings of students and faculty on the availability of instructional materials in Legal Office Procedures

	Students (n=130)	Instructors (n=5)	Interpretation
Availability of IM in the library	2.69	2.60	Sometimes available
Availability of reference materials related to Legal Office Procedures in the library	2.70	2.80	Sometimes available
Availability of IM in bookstores	2.77	2.60	Sometimes available
Availability of online/internet sources for Legal Office Procedures	2.97	3.40	Sometimes available
Availability of library linkages with other institutions or universities for access to Legal Office Procedures resources	2.45	2.60	Sometimes available
Average Weighted Mean	2.72	2.80	Sometimes available

4 – Always Available; 3 – Sometimes Available; 2 – Rarely Available; 1 – Not Available

sources assessed, online and internet-based materials were rated as the most accessible (Students: WM = 2.97; Instructors: WM = 3.40). In contrast, inter-library linkages with other institutions were rated as the least available source of instructional materials (Students: WM = 2.45; Instructors: WM = 2.60). Availability of instructional materials in libraries and bookstores received moderate and inconsistent ratings across respondents but remained within the *sometimes available* category.

The findings indicate that instructional materials for Legal Office Procedures are only sometimes available, with both students and instructors relying primarily on online sources rather than institutionally consolidated resources. This pattern reflects functional yet unstable access, where learning is supported through ad hoc materials instead of a coherent, validated instructional base. Ortega-Dela Cruz (2022) argues that in outcomes-based systems, such conditions often emerge when institutions articulate competencies clearly but underinvest in instructional infrastructure needed to enact them. Barthakur et al. (2022) further contend that reliance on externally sourced materials signals a shift from systematic instructional design toward compensatory practices by instructors and learners, potentially weakening instructional coherence.

Although digital access enhances immediacy and flexibility, Peersia et al. (2024) caution that accessibility should not be conflated with instructional adequacy, particularly in skill-intensive and practice-oriented courses. They argue that uncured digital resources vary widely in accuracy and pedagogical alignment, which can fragment learning trajectories. Eimer and Bohndick (2023) similarly emphasise that employability and competence formation depend on stable learning conditions that allow repeated engagement with consistent materials, rather than episodic exposure. Mahrishi et al. (2025) extend this argument by noting that outcomes-based education often falters at the implementation level when instructional resources are unevenly available, undermining the transla-

tion of policy-level outcomes into sustained competence. The low ratings for inter-library linkages in this study further highlight structural limitations in institutional resource-sharing, restricting access to authoritative and specialised legal materials.

From an instructional design perspective, Vlachopoulos and Makri (2024) argue that competence development is strengthened when learners repeatedly interact with stable, outcomes-aligned resources that support progressive skill building. Viewed through this lens, the findings suggest that current instructional material availability may suffice for short-term supplementation but remains inadequate for systematic competence formation, reinforcing the need for a consolidated and contextually validated instructional material for Legal Office Procedures.

To determine whether students and instructors differed significantly in their perceptions of instructional material availability for Legal Office Procedures, a Welch's t-test was conducted to account for unequal group sizes (Students = 130; Instructors = 5). As shown in Table 2, students recorded a mean weighted score of 2.72 (SD = 0.19), while instructors reported a slightly higher mean of 2.80 (SD = 0.35). The analysis yielded a t-value of -0.48 with a corresponding p-value of 0.650, indicating no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of students and instructors ($p > 0.05$). Both groups therefore shared the perception of limited but moderately accessible resources.

The absence of a statistically significant difference between student and instructor perceptions indicates a shared assessment of instructional material availability in the Legal Office Procedures course. Rather than indicating adequacy, this convergence reflects an institutional normalisation of moderate access, wherein both learners and instructors adapt to constrained resource conditions and recalibrate expectations accordingly. Similar patterns have been documented in recent professional and vocational education studies, which

Table 2: Welch's t-test comparison of student and instructor ratings on the availability of Instructional Materials

Group	N	k	M (WM)	SD	t	p	Interpretation
Students	130	5	2.72	0.19			
Instructors	5	5	2.80	0.35	-0.48	0.650	No significant difference

Where: N= participants; k = number of items; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; t = t-statistic; p = probability value; á = .05

observe that prolonged exposure to limited instructional infrastructure often produces aligned but diminished standards of adequacy among academic stakeholders (Ortega-Dela Cruz 2022; Barthakur et al. 2022). From an instructional design perspective, such convergence is not neutral, as it may suppress critical evaluation of resource sufficiency and delay institutional responses to instructional gaps. Contemporary outcomes-based education research further cautions that perceived sufficiency can obscure underlying weaknesses in instructional coherence and stability, particularly when sustained competence development depends on continuous access to validated, course-specific materials rather than situational availability (Eimer and Bohndick 2023; Mahrishi et al. 2025).

Alignment of IM in Legal Office Procedures

Table 3 presents the comparative ratings of students and instructors regarding the alignment of existing instructional materials with the intended learning outcomes for the Legal Office Procedures course. Both groups rated the instructional materials as ‘*mostly aligned*’ with CHED-prescribed competencies, with an average weighted mean of 3.08

for students and 3.37 for instructors. Higher alignment ratings were observed for competencies on ethical behaviour (Students: WM = 3.25; Instructors: WM = 3.60) and confidentiality and professionalism (Students: WM = 3.22; Instructors: WM = 3.80). In contrast, lower ratings appeared in dictation/transcription (Students: WM = 2.82; Instructors: WM = 3.00) and court-document preparation (Students: WM = 3.06; Instructors: WM = 3.00), although these indicators remained within the ‘*mostly aligned*’ category.

The results indicate that existing instructional materials are generally aligned with CHED-prescribed competencies, particularly in ethics, confidentiality, and professional conduct. This pattern suggests that normative or value-oriented competencies are easier to “show” in instructional materials than procedural competencies that require repeated performance. Ortega-Dela Cruz (2022) notes that outcomes-based teaching may appear coherent at the level of stated outcomes, yet learner experience depends on how outcomes are translated into concrete learning work. Eimer and Bohndick (2023) likewise argue that employability and competence are not secured by curricular statements alone, but by learning conditions that con-

Table 3: Comparative weighted mean ratings of students and faculty on the Alignment of Instructional Materials in Legal Office Procedures

	<i>Students (n=130)</i>	<i>Instructors (n=5)</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
The instructional material prepares students for the duties and responsibilities of a legal secretary in a legal office.	3.07	3.40	Mostly aligned
Legal terminology is covered, enabling students to understand and apply key legal vocabulary.	3.09	3.33	Mostly aligned
Instruction on preparing legal documents and correspondence includes both court and non-court documents.	3.03	3.40	Mostly aligned
Preparation of court documents such as pleadings, motions, and litigation-related materials is clearly explained.	3.06	3.00	Mostly aligned
Non-court document preparation, including real estate, corporate, and administrative legal documents, is included.	3.02	3.20	Mostly aligned
Exercises on dictation and transcription, using traditional and modern tools, are provided.	2.82	3.00	Mostly aligned
The ethics of the courts and the expected ethical behaviour of legal office personnel are discussed.	3.25	3.60	Mostly aligned
Confidentiality and professionalism, as key ethical considerations, are emphasised throughout the material.	3.22	3.80	Mostly aligned
The activities and assessments in the material help students develop practical skills necessary for working in a legal office.	3.26	3.40	Mostly aligned
The instructional material aligns with the expected competencies and skills needed for a career as a legal secretary in a legal office.	3.00	3.60	Mostly aligned
Average Weighted Mean	3.08	3.37	Mostly aligned

4 – Fully Aligned; 3 – Mostly Aligned; 2 – Partially Aligned; 1 – Not Aligned

sistently require judgement and accountability. In this light, the higher ratings for ethics-related competencies may signal strong policy visibility rather than guaranteed procedural readiness, an alignment that is credible on paper but potentially thinner in practice.

In contrast, lower alignment ratings for dictation/transcription and court-document preparation indicate where “alignment” becomes harder to sustain, that is, in skill-intensive tasks that demand sequencing, accuracy, and feedback. Barthakur et al. (2022) warn that objective-assessment alignment often breaks down when assessment tasks do not systematically represent targeted skills, producing what can be read as surface alignment-coverage without dependable measurement. Benedicto et al. (2025) reinforce this critique by arguing that instructional materials may be rated highly for coherence yet still fall short when assessment does not require observable performance under authentic constraints. Barillo et al. (2024) similarly report that office administration programs can be evaluated positively while practical skills remain a persistent weakness, implying that instructional supports and assessment routines, not content inclusion, often limit competence formation. The findings mirror this tension, that is, procedural competencies are acknowledged, but their instructional enactment appears less robust than ethics-oriented domains.

Overall, the uneven alignment across competency domains suggests that existing materials meet formal outcome requirements but offer weaker support for sustained procedural expertise. Bedford et al. (2024) argue that authentic assessment strengthens competence when tasks mirror professional demands and make performance defensible. le Roux-Kemp (2024) extends this point by emphasising that professional legitimacy depends on transparent, standards-based competence development. Applied to the results, the implication

is direct, that is, improving “alignment” in Legal Office Procedures requires more than stating competencies, it requires building repeated, assessable performance opportunities in transcription, drafting, and court-document routines. This strengthens the case for a contextualised instructional material that operationalises CHED outcomes into learner-experienced tasks while sustaining ethical and professional standards.

To determine whether students and instructors differed significantly in their perceptions of the alignment of instructional materials with course competencies, a Welch’s *t*-test was conducted due to unequal group sizes (Students = 130; Instructors = 5). As shown in Table 4, students reported a mean weighted score of 3.08 (SD = 0.13), while instructors rated alignment higher, with a mean of 3.37 (SD = 0.26). The analysis yielded a *t*-value of -3.17 and a *p*-value of 0.006, indicating a statistically significant difference between the two groups ($p < 0.05$).

The statistically significant difference indicates that instructors perceive stronger alignment between instructional materials and course competencies than students. This divergence suggests that alignment evident at the curricular or design level is not always experienced during instructional implementation. Faculty evaluations tend to reflect intended learning outcomes and formal coverage, whereas students’ perceptions are shaped by their direct engagement. Recent studies report similar perceptual gaps, emphasising that alignment becomes meaningful to learners only when competencies are operationalised through visible, performance-oriented tasks (Eimer and Bohndick 2023; Villarroel et al. 2024). This discrepancy highlights the need to make alignment pedagogically explicit, ensuring that instructional materials translate intended competencies into concrete, learner-experienced instructional pathways.

Table 4: Welch’s *t*-test comparison of student and instructor ratings on the Alignment of Instructional Materials

Group	<i>N</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Interpretation
Students	130	10	3.08	0.13	-3.17	0.006	Significant difference
Instructors	5	10	3.37	0.26			

Where: *N* = participants; *k* = number of items; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation; *t* = *t*-statistic; *p* = probability value; $\alpha = .05$.

Features of the Developed Instructional Material

In features, as shown in Table 5, the instructional material showed notable improvements between the initial and final expert evaluations, with the Grand Average Weighted Mean (GAWM) rising from 3.60 to 3.74, both interpreted as ‘*Very Satisfactory*’. Among the domains, **Alignment with Learning Objectives** received the highest final score (AWM = 3.76), followed by **Use of Developmental Activities** (AWM = 3.75) and **Assessment** (AWM = 3.71).

For **Alignment with Learning Objectives**, the strongest indicator was that objectives were specific, measurable, and attainable (WM = 3.87, Very Satisfactory), while the lowest was the direct link between assessments and objectives (WM = 3.67, Very Satisfactory). Other indicators, such as clarity at the beginning of lessons and relevance to

topics (WM = 3.73–3.80), also confirmed consistent strength. Jurors noted that the objectives were “clear” and “comprehensive”, making the module easy to follow. In **Use of Developmental Activities**, authenticity and inclusivity ranked highest, with activities simulating legal scenarios and catering to varied learning styles both rated ‘*Very Satisfactory*’ (WM = 3.80). The lowest was a variety of engaging activities (WM = 3.67). In between, active participation and clarity of instructions received 3.73 each, also ‘*Very Satisfactory*’. For **Assessment**, the strongest indicator was the use of varied and appropriate methods (WM = 3.80, Very Satisfactory). The lowest was constructive feedback (WM = 3.60, Very Satisfactory). Other indicators, such as alignment with objectives, self-assessment and reflection, and measuring application, scored 3.67–3.73. Overall, results confirm strong constructive alignment of objectives, activities, and assessments.

Table 5: Evaluation of the features of the Developed Instructional Material

	Initial evaluation WM	Final evaluation WM	Δ	Final interpretation
<i>Alignment of the Learning Objectives</i>				
The instructional material clearly outlines the learning objectives at the beginning.	3.67	3.80	+0.13	Very satisfactory
The objectives are well-planned, formulated and organised.	3.67	3.73	+0.06	Very satisfactory
The objectives stated are specific, measurable and attainable.	3.67	3.87	+0.20	Very satisfactory
The objectives are relevant to the topics of each lesson of the module.	3.53	3.73	+0.20	Very satisfactory
The assessment tasks or questions directly relate to the stated learning objectives.	3.47	3.67	+0.20	Very satisfactory
Average Weighted Mean	3.60	3.76	+0.16	Very satisfactory
<i>Use of Various Developmental Activities</i>				
The instructional material includes a variety of engaging activities (for example, case studies, role-plays, etc).	3.60	3.67	+0.07	Very satisfactory
The activities provided encourage active participation and interaction among learners.	3.60	3.73	+0.13	Very satisfactory
The activities are relevant and practical, simulating real-world legal office scenarios.	3.53	3.80	+0.27	Very satisfactory
Clear instructions for each activity guide learners on what is expected.	3.67	3.73	+0.06	Very satisfactory
The activities cater to different learning styles and preferences of learners.	3.53	3.80	+0.27	Very satisfactory
Average Weighted Mean	3.59	3.75	+0.16	Very satisfactory
<i>Assessment</i>				
The assessment tasks are clearly defined and aligned with the learning objectives.	3.67	3.73	+0.06	Very satisfactory
The assessment methods used are varied and appropriate.	3.67	3.80	+0.13	Very satisfactory
The assessment measures the understanding and application of legal office procedures effectively.	3.60	3.67	+0.07	Very satisfactory
The assessment provides constructive feedback to learners.	3.47	3.60	+0.13	Very satisfactory
The assessment allows for self-assessment and reflection.	3.60	3.73	+0.07	Very satisfactory
Average Weighted Mean	3.60	3.71	+0.11	Very satisfactory
Grand Average Weighted Mean	3.60	3.74	+0.14	Very satisfactory

Jurors praised the resource for its “rich content”, “interesting presentation”, and “attractive layout”, but stressed the importance of continuous updates and more detailed feedback mechanisms.

The consistently high expert ratings across feature domains indicate that the developed instructional material achieves functional instructional coherence rather than merely satisfying formal outcomes-based requirements. Villarroel et al. (2024) argue that learning objectives often fail to influence learning because they remain abstract or symbolic, functioning primarily as compliance artefacts within OBE frameworks. In contrast, Lawton et al. (2024) contend that objectives exert instructional power only when they are explicit, measurable, and operationally embedded within learning tasks. The strong ratings for clarity, relevance, and measurability in this study support the latter position, demonstrating that the objectives in the developed material actively structure instructional flow and learner expectations. This finding challenges persistent critiques that outcomes-based instructional materials privilege documentation over instructional utility, showing instead that objectives can function as practical design instruments when deliberately formulated.

The evaluation of developmental activities further reinforces this position by revealing a clear departure from traditional, text-dominated instructional formats. Peersia et al. (2024) explicitly caution that work readiness cannot be achieved through content exposure alone but requires repeated engagement with tasks that simulate professional constraints and decision-making conditions. Jackson (2025) strengthens this critique by arguing that descriptive instruction produces compliance-oriented learners rather than procedurally competent practitioners. The high expert ratings for realism, inclusivity, and engagement indicate that the instructional material directly responds to these critiques by embedding simulated legal office scenarios and varied activity designs. These features position the material as a vehicle for procedural rehearsal and judgement formation, rather than as a repository of legal-administrative information.

However, the comparatively lower ratings for assessment-objective linkage and feedback expose a critical limitation that cannot be overlooked. Bedford et al. (2024) argue that assessment features frequently undermine otherwise strong instruction-

al designs when feedback remains generic, delayed, or insufficiently performance-oriented. Benedicto et al. (2025) further assert that expert validation confirms internal coherence but does not guarantee competence enactment unless assessment tasks require observable performance under authentic conditions. From this perspective, the findings indicate that while the instructional material is structurally sound and pedagogically advanced, its assessment and feedback features remain the most vulnerable components. This limitation underscores the necessity of treating evaluation within the ADDIE framework as an ongoing design responsibility, particularly in legal office education where competence is inseparable from accuracy, accountability, and procedural execution.

Validity of the Developed Instructional Material

The developed instructional material underwent a two-round expert validation process evaluating four core domains. As presented in Table 6, the IM improved, increasing from the overall Grand Average Weighted Mean (GAWM) of 3.65 to 3.75 (Very Satisfactory). The highest-rated domain was **Format** (AWM = 3.83), followed by **Presentation and Organisation** and **Accuracy and Up-to-datedness** (both AWM = 3.73), and **Content** (AWM = 3.72).

In **Content**, the highest-rated indicator was the capacity to promote higher-order thinking skills such as problem-solving (WM = 3.80, Very Satisfactory). The lowest were contributing to subject objectives and freedom from ideological or cultural bias, both at WM = 3.67. Other indicators, including developmental appropriateness and ability to sustain interest (WM = 3.73), confirmed its accessibility. Jurors commended the “richness of content” but advised regular updates and inclusion of commonly used terms.

For **Format**, the strongest indicators were font readability and simplicity of illustrations (both WM = 3.93, Very Satisfactory). The lowest was illustrations clarifying and supplementing text (WM = 3.80). Mid-range indicators such as layout, paper quality, and binding consistently rated 3.80-3.87. Jurors praised its “attractive layout” and “appealing design”, highlighting readability and professional presentation.

In **Presentation and Organisation**, engaging and understandable presentation ranked highest

Table 6: Validation of the Developed Instructional Material

	<i>Initial evaluation WM</i>	<i>Final evaluation WM</i>	Δ	<i>Final interpretation</i>
<i>Content</i>				
Content is suitable to the student's level of development.	3.71	3.73	+0.02	Very satisfactory
Material contributes to the achievement of specific objectives of the subject area and grade/year level for which it is intended.	3.53	3.67	+0.14	Very satisfactory
Material provides for the development of higher cognitive skills such as critical thinking, creativity, learning by doing, inquiry, problem-solving, etc.	3.73	3.80	+0.07	Very satisfactory
Material is free of ideological, cultural, religious, racial, and gender biases and prejudices	3.47	3.67	+0.20	Very satisfactory
Material has the potential to arouse the interest of the target reader.	3.64	3.73	+0.09	Very satisfactory
Average Weighted Mean	3.62	3.72	+0.10	Very satisfactory
<i>Format</i>				
<i>Prints</i>				
Size of letters is appropriate to the intended user.	3.80	3.87	+0.07	Very satisfactory
Spaces between letters and words facilitate reading.	3.87	3.87	+0.00	Very satisfactory
The font is easy to read.	3.73	3.93	+0.20	Very satisfactory
Printing is of good quality (that is, no broken letters, even density, correct alignment, properly placed screen registration).	3.87	3.87	+0.00	Very satisfactory
<i>Illustrations</i>				
Simple and easily recognisable.	3.93	3.93	+0.00	Very satisfactory
Clarify and supplement the text.	3.53	3.80	+0.27	Very satisfactory
Realistic and relevant	3.60	3.73	+0.13	Very satisfactory
<i>Design and Layout</i>				
Attractive and pleasing to look at.	3.73	3.80	+0.07	Very satisfactory
Simple and does not distract the attention of the reader.	3.67	3.73	+0.06	Very satisfactory
Adequate illustration in relation to text.	3.60	3.67	+0.07	Very satisfactory
Harmonious blending of elements such as illustrations and text.	3.53	3.73	+0.20	Very satisfactory
<i>Paper and Binding</i>				
Paper used contributes to easy reading.	3.80	3.87	+0.07	Very satisfactory
<i>Size and Weight of Resource</i>				
Easy to handle	3.87	3.93	+0.06	Very satisfactory
Relatively light	3.80	3.87	+0.07	Very satisfactory
Average Weighted Mean	3.74	3.83	+0.09	Very satisfactory
<i>Presentation and Organisation</i>				
Presentation is engaging, interesting, and understandable.	3.73	3.87	+0.14	Very satisfactory
There is logical and smooth flow of ideas	3.53	3.73	+0.20	Very satisfactory
Length of sentences is suited to the comprehension level of the target reader.	3.53	3.67	+0.14	Very satisfactory
Sentences and paragraph structures are varied and interesting to the target reader	3.60	3.67	+0.07	Very satisfactory
Average Weighted Mean	3.60	3.73	+0.13	Very satisfactory
<i>Accuracy and Up-To-Datedness of Information</i>				
Presentation of content will not lead to the development of misconceptions or misunderstandings, and no conceptual error found.	3.56	3.73	+0.17	Very satisfactory
No factual error found, no outdated information, and oversimplified models, examples, or simulations.	3.73	3.80	+0.07	Very satisfactory
No grammatical error found.	3.47	3.53	+0.06	Very satisfactory
No obsolete information found.	3.80	3.87	+0.07	Very satisfactory
Typographical and other minor errors (for example, inappropriate or unclear illustrations, missing labels, wrong captions, etc.).	3.67	3.73	+0.06	Very satisfactory
Average Weighted Mean	3.64	3.73	+0.09	Very satisfactory
Grand Average Weighted Mean	3.65	3.75		Very satisfactory

(WM = 3.87, Very Satisfactory). The lowest were sentence length and variation (WM = 3.67). Other aspects, such as logical flow (WM = 3.73), confirmed improvements after revisions. Jurors described the material as “well-organised” and “interesting”.

In **Accuracy and Up-to-datedness**, the strongest indicator was absence of obsolete information (WM = 3.87, Very Satisfactory). The lowest was grammatical correctness (WM = 3.53, Very Satisfactory). Mid-range scores included factual accuracy (WM = 3.80) and conceptual clarity (WM = 3.73). Jurors affirmed that the material was accurate and current but recommended continuous updating to maintain reliability.

The uniform ‘Very Satisfactory’ ratings across all validation domains indicate that the developed instructional material meets accepted standards of instructional validity, usability, and professional relevance. The improvement observed between the initial and final validation rounds further demonstrates the effectiveness of expert-informed revision in enhancing instructional quality. The highest ratings for format and presentation highlight the role of visual clarity, readability, and logical organisation in supporting learner engagement, particularly in modular and skills-oriented materials. Recent instructional design research affirms that well-structured layouts and readable formats reduce cognitive load and enable learners to focus on task execution rather than navigation, an essential consideration in professional education contexts (Vlachopoulos and Makri 2024; Lawton et al. 2024).

The favourable evaluation of content validity, especially in promoting higher-order thinking skills such as problem-solving and inquiry, suggests that the material extends beyond procedural familiarity toward analytical and practice-oriented learning. Contemporary scholarship consistently argues that instructional materials in vocational and professional programs must cultivate applied reasoning to prepare learners for complex workplace decisions rather than routine task execution alone (Jackson 2025; Villarreal et al. 2024). At the same time, the comparatively lower ratings for contribution to objectives and bias sensitivity underscore the inherently dynamic nature of instructional validity. These indicators point to the need for periodic review to ensure that content remains inclusive, contextually appropriate, and fully aligned with evolving professional standards.

From an ADDIE-informed perspective, the validation process functioned not as a terminal check-

point but as a mechanism for targeted enhancement. Recent studies emphasise that sustained instructional validity depends on iterative evaluation and re-validation, particularly in professional fields where practices and expectations evolve (Bedford et al. 2024; le Roux-Kemp 2024). Overall, the results support the instructional material’s readiness for instructional use while reinforcing the importance of continuous updating to maintain relevance, credibility, and pedagogical effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

This study developed and validated a contextualised instructional material for the Legal Office Procedures course under the BSOA curriculum to address documented gaps in instructional material availability, alignment, and quality. Findings indicated that existing resources were only moderately accessible and that alignment with CHED-mandated competencies, particularly in procedural areas such as transcription and court-document preparation, was uneven. In response, the developed instructional material demonstrated strong constructive alignment among learning objectives, activities, and assessments and was consistently rated “*Very Satisfactory*” across feature evaluation and validation criteria. Expert review further confirmed its accuracy, readability, and professional relevance, indicating its readiness for instructional use. Overall, the study highlights the role of systematic instructional design and validation in strengthening competency-based and practice-oriented legal office education. By integrating needs analysis, instructional alignment, and expert validation, this study illustrates a systematic, evidence-informed approach to instructional material development beyond purely descriptive curricular practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To further strengthen its instructional value, the developed instructional material should undergo pilot implementation to examine classroom usability and learner engagement in actual teaching contexts. Regular review and revision should be institutionalised to ensure continued alignment with evolving legal procedures, digital tools, and workplace practices. Enhancing feedback mechanisms and expanding activity design are also rec-

ommended to support deeper learning and inclusivity. Finally, the structured ADDIE-based approach employed in this study may be applied to the development and validation of instructional materials in other applied and professional programs where competency-based and practice-oriented learning is required.

ENDNOTES

1. IM: Instructional Material, a resource designed to support teaching and learning.
2. The study was conducted in the Philippines, focusing on instructional gaps and validation processes in the Legal Office Procedures course.
3. BSOA: Bachelor of Science in Office Administration, a four-year degree program preparing graduates for administrative, legal, and business office roles.
4. OBE: Outcomes-Based Education, emphasising curriculum alignment with measurable learning outcomes.
5. CHED: Commission on Higher Education in the Philippines, which oversees tertiary-level program standards.
6. CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 19, series of 2017, sets standards for BSOA, including competencies in legal office procedures.
7. ADDIE: Analyse, Design, Develop, Implement, Evaluate, which is a structured instructional design framework.
8. Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges is a state-funded institution of higher education located in Nabua, Camarines Sur, Philippines, and served as the setting for this study.
9. Nabua, Camarines Sur is a municipality in the Bicol Region of the Philippines, recognised as an educational hub in the province.

REFERENCES

- Alciso RM, Boo AA, Julongbayan PE, Ramos QG, Aclan BL, Porley RN 2023. Development of outcomes-based instructional materials in professional teacher education courses for a flexible set-up. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 10(1): 61-67. <https://doi.org/10.20448/jeelr.v10i1.4378>
- Antipuesto N, Derecho JI, Ellama GL, et al. 2023. Competency Of Office Administration Graduating Students In A State University. *International Journal Of Research In Engineering And Science*, 11(12): 16-28. From <https://www.ijres.org/papers/Volume-11/Issue-12/11121628.pdf> (Retrieved on 11 February 2024) .
- Barillo J, Bogo DJ, Sudaria V 2024. Evaluating the effectiveness and preparedness of office administration curriculum among 4th year students in Philippine College Foundation. *International Journal Of Novel Research And Development*, 9(7): c964.
- Barthakur A, Joksimovic S, Kovanovic V, Richey M, Pardo A 2022. Aligning objectives with assessment in online courses: Integrating learning analytics and measurement theory. *Computers & Education*, 190: 104603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104603>
- Bedford N, Bonython W, Taylor A 2024. Law as it is, and how it could be: Law reform participation as authentic assessment and a pedagogical tool. *The Law Teacher*, 58(1): 58-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069400.2023.2288415>
- Benedicto AB, Artajo RT, Martir EM 2025. Development, validation, and acceptability of instructional module in organization and management. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 96-114. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v8i4p107>
- Commission on Higher Education 2017. Policies, Standards and Guidelines for the Bachelor of Science in Office Administration (BSOA) Program (CMO No. 19, s. 2017). From <https://ched.gov.ph> (Retrieved on 5 February 2024).
- CHED 2017. Policies, Standards and Guidelines for Bachelor of Science in Office Administration (BSOA) Program (CMO No. 19, s. 2017). From <https://ched.gov.ph/cmo-19-s-2017/> (Retrieved on 5 February 2024).
- Department of Education (n.d.). Learning Resources Management And Development System (LRMDS) Evaluation Tools For Print Materials. From <https://lrmds.deped.gov.ph> (Retrieved on 12 February 2024).
- Eimer A, Bohndick C 2023. Employability models for higher education: A systematic literature review and analysis. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 8(1): 100588. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100588>
- Ferns SJ, Zegwaard KE, Pretti TJ, Rowe AD 2025. Defining and designing work-integrated learning curriculum. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 44(2): 371-385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2399072>
- Jackson D 2025. Work-Integrated learning in Business and Management: Gauging impact and opportunities for growth. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 23(2): 101132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2025.101132>
- Jintalan J 2024. Development of textbook in machine shorthand for Bachelor of Science in Office Administration (BSOA). *Kurdish Studies*, 12(2): 5866-5873. doi:10.58262/ks.v12i2.435
- Khan HF, Qayyum S, Beenish H, Khan RA, Iltaf S, Faysal LR 2025. Determining the alignment of assessment items with curriculum goals through document analysis by addressing identified item flaws. *BMC Medical Education*, 25(1): 200. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-06736-4>
- LaMarca VJ, LaMarca JM 2024. Using the ADDIE model of instructional design to create programming for comprehensive ABA treatment. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, 17(2): 371-388. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40617-024-00908-2>
- Lawton V, Pacey V, Jones T, Dean C 2024. Developing work readiness in university graduates: A case study in mapping a university curriculum to work readiness domains in an Australian physiotherapy degree. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*, 41(5): 1070-1082. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593985.2024.2384654>
- Le Roux-Kemp A 2024. A critical analysis of the role of legal higher education and training in the institutionalisation

- of the English legal profession: quo vadis for English law schools? *The Law Teacher*, 58(3): 396-420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069400.2024.2353990>
- Mahrishi M, Ramakrishna S, Hosseini S, Abbas A 2025. A systematic literature review of the global trends of outcome-based education (OBE) in higher education with an SDG perspective related to engineering education. *Discover Sustainability*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-01496-z>
- Ortega-Dela Cruz RA 2022. Learners' attitude towards outcomes-based teaching and learning in higher education. *Tuning Journal for Higher Education*, 9(2): 99-119. <https://doi.org/10.18543/tjhe.1965>
- Peersia K, Rappa NA, Perry LB 2024. Work readiness: definitions and conceptualisations. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(8): 1830-1845. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2366322>
- Thanaraj A, Gledhill K 2022. Teaching Legal Education In The Digital Age: Pedagogical Practices To Digitally Empower Law Graduates. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. From <https://books.google.com/books/about/Teaching_Legal_Education_in_the_Digital.html?id=rXiGEAAAQBAJ> (Retrieved on 10 February 2024).
- Vlachopoulos D, Makri A 2024. A systematic literature review on authentic assessment in higher education: Best practices for the development of 21st century skills, and policy considerations. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 83: 101425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101425>
- Villaruel V, Melipillán R, Santana J, Aguirre D 2024. How authentic are assessments in vocational education? An analysis from Chilean teachers, students, and examinations. *Frontiers in Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1308688>
- Zapanta A, Lebita J, De La Peña V, Suso J, Casundo D, Cano J 2025. Employment outcomes of Office Administration Graduates of Bohol Island State University - Candijay Campus, Philippines. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0697>

Paper received for publication in August, 2025

Paper accepted for publication in March, 2026