Acceptability of Field Study Learning Guides as Supplementary Resources for Teacher Education Students

Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Vol. 5 No.2, 67-75
May 2017 Part II
P-ISSN 2350-7756
E-ISSN 2350-8442
www.apjmr.com

Ritzelda A. Deri[1], Susan S. Janer[2], Felisa D. Marbella[3]
Sorsogon State College, Sorsogon City, Philippines
ritzeldaagnes2004@yahoo.com[1], sihjaner@yahoo.com[2], felymarbella03@gmail.com[3]

Date Received: February 21, 2017; Date Revised: May 12, 2017

Abstract - *This descriptive study aimed to determine the acceptability of the FS3 and FS4 learning guides as supplementary resources for teacher education students. The respondents of the study are 100 third year FS students and 12 FS teachers identified using the purposive sampling technique. The two-part survey questionnaire is the primary source of data. Aside from survey, unstructured interview was also undertaken to gather pertinent data from the respondents in the Teacher Education Department. The acceptability of the learning guides was determined based on four elements – target competency, learning plan, assessment, and technical aspect. All four elements were rated very much acceptable. The technical aspect of FS3 and the assessment element of FS4 learning guides gained the highest mean ratings from the respondents. The two groups of respondents have perceived the same level of acceptability of the learning guides. There are still gray areas in the guides that need improvement. The instructional materials review committee of the college must review the guides. Experts on instructional material development must be invited as critics to further improve the guides. Further, utilization of the guides maybe extended to FS students from other institution to determine its acceptability and thus come up with a balanced material that can permeate and be used by diverse academic cultures.*

Keywords – *Field Study, Teacher Education, Acceptability, Learning Guide*

INTRODUCTION

People learn in different ways and to different extent. Modalities of teaching and a variety of educational resources are necessities that could support optimum learning. Study guides supplement learning. It provides the teacher and the learner ideas of the important areas that should be given enough attention to acquire authentic and life-long learning. In the current generation, the attention span of the learners is too short and retention rate of new information lessen over time. While this is true, educational scientists had discovered and advocated the use of experiential learning to address knowledge retention as well as individual growth and potential. Salandanan [1] defined experiential learning as a basic means of obtaining knowledge or skills through experience. It is referred to as learning by doing, learning through action, learning through experience, discovery and exploration. It encourages progression and improvement of critical thinking, skill in solving problems and decision making among learners inside and outside the classroom.

The use of learning guides (LG) is based on Kolb's [2] theory of experiential learning, which concentrated, on the internal cognitive activity of the learner. A four-stage learning cycle illustrates the theory namely: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization and active experimentation. Reflective observation and abstract conceptualization stages require development of learning activities and materials that could back up and complement student's actual learning experience and knowledge retention.

In college teaching, experiential learning approach is widely used in almost all disciplines. The framework of the experiential programs in education is based on the principles of experiential learning which concerns the nature of the learners and its individual subjective experiences. Hence, teachers of experiential learning courses should demonstrate organizing and facilitating skills that would lead to the

learner's acquisition of authentic and lifelong learning.

The Teacher Education Program in the Philippines provides students with the necessary competencies that could adequately meet the demands of the learning environment in the K-12 Basic Education Schools. CMO 30, s, 2004 [3] mandates that teacher education students should be equipped with the learning experiences and requires the one-unit Experiential Learning Courses (ELC) known as Field Study (FS). These ELC's offer learning experiences where students could observe, discern and apply the theories and principles of the teaching and learning process along different school settings. The learning experiences, which are built around mentoring, will start from field observation progressing to participation and practice teaching[4].The ELC's also bridges the gap between its respective theoretical and conceptual professional courses and helps students in the "reflective observation" and "abstract conceptualization" stage of the learning cycle. It is believed to set up the standards for teacher competence since it becomes an avenue for validating, comparing and abstracting what has been taught in the theory and concept courses and methods and strategies courses. It complements the students' classroom learning which is more of contextualization and balances with didactic education. It deepens the students' understanding through out-of-classroom or off- campus activities.

FS courses has limited teacher-classroom interface in its own campus. The need for emphasizing and specifying important tasks and learning areas for competency development can be satisfied with good and substantial learning resources. Supplemental learning guide for learners will increase knowledge retention and offers direction towards acquisition of the necessary teacher competence and target competencies for FS students. It could also serve as an optional tool for measuring the extent of student learning from the out-of-classroom or off- campus learning based from their written observations and reflections.

The Experiential Learning Courses Handbook [5] authored by the Teacher Education Council of the Department of Education in 2006 provided the ELC framework, the guidelines for FS students, the course syllabi and a bit of recommended activity sheets for students. The limited supply of the handbook prompted several authors to develop FS Learning Guides and worksheets that would capture the needs of the teacher education FS students. The Technology in the Learning Environment (FS3) and Exploring the Curriculum (FS 4) are among the FS courses offered in SSC Teacher Education Department. For years, it had used the Learning Guides in the ELC Handbook and shifted to the FS3 and FS4 activity sheets from several authors. Over the years, the SSC with its advocacy to quality and excellence formulated a policy on Instructional material development with an end view of encouraging its faculty members to produce instructional materials that may be adopted by the college. Thus, in December 2013 the proponents develop FS learning guides for SSC teacher education students. Its development was to initially address the FS teachers' and students' need for supplemental learning resources for use during their off-campus deployment as FS learners. The learning guides were reproduced for use of the FS students and teachers whose initial issues are more on the expensiveness, unavailability of copies, inadequacy of learning activities and assessment procedures and unattractive layout of their currently used FS worksheets. The developed learning guides thus, took its solid foundation from the FS-tailored ELC Handbook of the Teacher Education Council [5].

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Generally, this study aimed to determine the acceptability of the FS3 and FS4 learning guides as supplementary resources for teacher education students. Specifically, answers to the following questions were sought: 1) determine the level of acceptability of the learning guides in terms of target competency, learning plan, assessment, and technical aspect; 2) determine the significant difference in the level of acceptability of the learning guides as perceived by the teachers and the students; 3) determine the over-all acceptability of the guides as supplementary resources for teacher education students. (4) Identify the gray areas that need improvement as identified by the two groups of respondents.

METHODS

The study utilized the descriptive research design to determine the acceptability of the FS3 and FS 4 learning guides as supplementary resources for teacher education students. A two-part questionnaire is the primary source of data. Part 1 provides

indicators of acceptability on target competency, learning plan, assessment and technical aspect. Part 2 is an open-ended question on the following aspects: (a) over-all acceptability of the guides as supplementary resources in the study of FS3 and FS4 courses in the teacher education program. (b) Identification of the gray areas in the learning guide that needs improvement. A panel of experts and the dry run procedures conducted to FS students who were not included as respondents of the study established the validity of the instrument. The purposive sampling technique was utilized to identify the number of respondents using the Slovin's formula. Survey and unstructured interviews, were undertaken to gather pertinent data from the 100 third year BSED and BEED students enrolled in both FS3 and FS4 classes. On the other hand, 12 teachers who handled FS3 and FS4 courses in the Teacher Education department were also utilized as teacher-respondents. These are the respondents who signified their participation in the study. Learning guides were used from SY 2014-2015. The level of acceptability is determined using a researcher-devised five-point scale namely: 4.50-5.00, very much acceptable (VMA), 3.50-4.49, much acceptable (MA), 2.50-3.49, acceptable (A), 1.50-2.49, less acceptable (LA), 1.00-1.49 least acceptable (LeA). The gathered data were treated using frequency count, percentage, weighted mean and chi-square.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Acceptability of the Learning Guides in Field Study 3 and Field Study 4

The framework of the analysis of this study is based from the four elements of acceptability of the learning guides. These are target competency, learning plan, assessment, and technical aspect. Target competency refers to the objectives contained in every worksheet of the learning guide. Learning plan pertains to the specific tasks or activities specified in the worksheet that the students have to undertake during FS sessions. Assessment refers to the students' observation and reflective writing tasks provided at the end of every worksheet. Technical Aspect concerns the typography, layout, color, and overall visual appearance of the learning guide.

Learning Guide in FS 3. Table 1 reveals the level of acceptability of FS3 learning guide (Technology in the Learning Environment) as perceived by the teachers and students. It can be seen from the table that the learning guide for FS3 is very much acceptable to both groups of respondents. Technical aspect has the highest acceptability mean (4.74) while the learning plan element has the smallest mean (4.62).

The table shows that both teacher and student respondents rated the technical aspect very much acceptable as indicated by the highest mean value of 4.87 and 4.60 respectively. These imply that the technical aspect of the material suits the standard set by the respondents. It connotes adequacy and sufficiency of the material in terms of readability of texts, appropriateness of font type and size, suitability of illustrations and graphics, proper margins and indentions, choice of colors, and adequacy of spaces. The development of the guide entails critical need for imagination and ingenuity[6].Artists have to have a good perceptual ability to think of design that will make each element complement with one another. In like manner, teachers who opted to make learning materials for use of students and teachers should also acquire the same good perceptual ability and creativity in designing materials appropriate to the learning tasks provided in the material and to the nature of its users. The guide should at least have to be different from the design of similar materials that are commonly sold in the market. Attractiveness of the material may serve as an avenue to frequency of usage and retention boosters that may warrant patronage.

Table 1. Level of Acceptability of FS 3 Learning Guide

Indicators	FS3 Mean		Grand Mean	Level of Acceptability
	T	S		
Target Competency	4.83	4.53	4.68	VMA
Learning Plan	4.79	4.44	4.62	VMA
Assessment	4.86	4.54	4.70	VMA
Technical Aspect	4.87	4.60	4.74	VMA

Legend: T – Teachers; S - Students

Moreover, the technical aspect of the material provides for its visual impact. Malamed [7] relates processing fluency, or the ease with which a person processes information, to the visual clarity of contents of the learning material. She emphasized that the ease with which information is internally processed affects a person's judgment and decision-making. People

have positive feelings about visuals when they are easy to perceive and process and they tend to experience aesthetic pleasure from something when processing is easy. These ideas suggest significant educational implications. It says that if the instructional materials prepared by the teachers are visually appealing, most likely, students will gain a meaningful learning as theorized by Ausubel[8].

On the other hand, the learning plan has the lowest grand mean of 4.62. It indicates that the learning plan offered in the material maybe inadequate or just similar to the existing guide. It means that the respondents may still be looking for far better activities than the ones they were exposed to. The importance of the learning plan as part of a learning material cannot be understated. Organizing and structuring of the learning activities from prerequisite knowledge and skills to reinforcing or enriching activities should be carefully studied to ensure achievement of the desired outcomes. Moreover, learning plan should equally sustain the interest of the users and guide them gracefully to the target outcome with optimum learning and understanding of the concept or skill. Motivating, engaging and synthesizing activities are important components in the learning material that could bridge the learning gaps of the students from the theoretical or conceptual subjects and aid them at the same time to "reflective thinking". Though a perfect guide is hardly attainable, approximating perfection is possible.

Learning Guide in FS4. The result on the level of acceptability of FS 4(Exploring the Curriculum) material is reflected on Table 2. The data shows that the level of acceptability of FS4 learning guide as perceived by the teachers and students is very much acceptable. It can be seen from the table that assessment has the highest mean value of 4.72 while the learning plan element has the smallest mean value of 4.63.

These findings imply that the assessment strategies provided in the guide is appropriate and challenging in accordance with the established target competencies for. Students may find it easy to reflect on their experiences from the learning tasks offered in the guide. Reflection writing as a form of assessment procedure requires them to write simple sentences that may not be too tedious on their part. Items on assessments may have met the difficulty levels set by the respondents and perceived it to be adequate, appropriate and encouraging. Hence, it paves way for measuring the amount of learning that took place in the Field Study course. Janer[9] stressed that assessment is particularly important among all the management skills of the teachers due to its effectiveness to measure teaching-learning process.

Table 2. Level of Acceptability of FS4 Learning Guide

Indicators	FS4 Mean		Grand Mean	Level of Acceptability
	T	S		
Target Competency	4.81	4.60	4.70	VMA
Learning Plan	4.78	4.48	4.63	VMA
Assessment	4.83	4.60	4.72	VMA
Technical Aspect	4.82	4.60	4.71	VMA

Legend: T – Teachers; S - Students

On the other hand, the learning plan has the lowest grand mean of 4.63. It indicates that the learning plan offered in the material maybe inadequate or just similar to the existing guides used by the respondents. It means that the respondents may still be looking for far better activities than the ones they were exposed to. They may have view the tasks to be less challenging and may have construed some inadequacy in areas pertaining to presenting prerequisite knowledge and skills, motivating, engaging, synthesizing and enriching activities of the material. Uneven levels of difficulty among the four elements considered in the acceptability of the guide may be analyzed to address flaws that may affect its acceptability status. This in effect would improve the learning plan element of the material and may in turn earn high acceptability mean from its users.

On the other hand, the lowest grand mean for learning plan element could also be attributed to the duplication of the tasks already known to the students. It may be the same activities that are routinely performed by any teacher education student. Hence, FS4 students automatically accomplished the tasks even if no written or verbal instructions were received from their teachers or from the learning guide. It should be noted that some college students are aware of their learning needs. Structuring their learning tasks to a "one size that fits all" model to gain a meaningful learning experience is no longer appropriate. Individual difference still needs to be considered. Hence, different learning resources should be made to

suit and to supplement the individual needs of the learners.

In general, the FS3 and FS4 learning guides are very much acceptable along the four elements. However, technical aspect has the highest grand mean and learning plan has the lowest grand mean for FS3 (Technology in the Learning Environment). On the other hand, assessment has the highest grand mean while learning plan has the lowest grand mean for FS4 (Exploring the Curriculum). The acceptability of the guides indicates positive implications. It expresses the possibility that the teachers and students will adopt the materials as supplementary resource materials in field study courses. Field study students may opt to use the materials to guide and assist them in their experiential learning endeavors. While field study teachers may use the materials as tools in gauging and evaluating their students on the amount of knowledge and skills acquired through independent and experiential learning.

Difference in the Level of Acceptability of the Learning Guides as Perceived by the Teachers and Students

This objective was analyzed and discussed based on the level of acceptability of the learning guides as supplementary resources for the two FS courses. It analyzes the level of acceptability of the guides based from the perceptions of the FS students and teachers in each of the considered elements of acceptability. This section may validate the congruency of their perceptions, which would serve as basis for sound conclusion and appropriate recommendation.

Field Study 3

The learning guide intended for this course is entitled 'Technology in the Learning Environment'. It provides experiential learning tasks necessary to enrich and deepen the student's knowledge and experiences in making and using appropriate technology to facilitate learning[5]. In table 3, the null hypothesis is not rejected since the computed values of 2.978, 4.393, 2.81 and 1.916 are all lower than the chi-square critical value of 5.99 and 7.82 respectively. This means that the perceptions of the two groups of respondents on the level of acceptability of the FS3 learning guide in terms of target competency, learning plan, assessment, and technical aspect do not vary significantly.

Table 3. Difference in the Level of Acceptability of FS3 Learning Guide

Elements	ρ-value	χ^2	Decision on Ho	Description
Target Competency	5.99	2.978	Do not Reject	Not Significant
Assessment	5.99	4.393	Do not Reject	Not Significant
Learning Plan	5.99	2.810	Do not Reject	Not Significant
Technical Aspect	7.82	1.916	Do not Reject	Not Significant

$\alpha = 0.05$

The data says that both groups of respondents find the learning guides' objectives (target competency) achievable and attainable. Similarly, the assessment area of the guides are appropriate, challenging and encourages reflective thinking, parallel with the other elements and capable of measuring students' learning. The respondents also concur that the learning plan of the guide provides presenting, exploring, engaging, deepening and enriching activities that are suitable to their needs and level of understanding.

Both groups of respondents affirmed that the FS3 learning guide is in accordance with its course description as provided in the ELC Handbook. It centers on activities that provides students exposure to school learning resources and actual use of ICT in teaching. It includes inventory of learning resources and involves identifying and classifying of resources that facilitates teaching and learning processes. Tasks like, appraising the effectiveness of displays and bulletin board designs, preparing instructional material that is appropriate to the learning content, recognizing the strengths and weaknesses of slide presentations and determining the appropriateness of internet resources to a learning task are among the focus of the leaning plan of the guide.

The technical aspect of the material has positive visual impact on both groups of respondents. Both groups construed that the FS3 guide could lighten the cognitive processing of the learners due to illustrations and graphics, style and size of fonts used, simplicity and clarity of the language employed for instructions. The appearance of the guide provides distinction and an edge over other learning resources in FS3.

Generally, the data also suggests coherence, continuity, and usefulness of the FS3 learning guide as supplementary resource for teacher education students. More learning materials may be consistently formulated to support optimum learning and

acquisition of the desired outcomes for quality teacher education graduates.

Field Study 4

Based on the handbook, this course is about 'Exploring the Curriculum'. It is designed to provide the students with the opportunity to validate the knowledge acquired in the study of curriculum development and build insights on how to implement appropriately and effectively a curriculum for diverse learners[5]. Table 4 shows the result on the level of acceptability of the learning guide for FS24 as perceived by the teachers and the students. Data reveal that the computed values recorded for target competency, learning plan, assessment, and technical aspect, which are 1.581, 2.188, 2.074, and 1.663 are all less than the critical value of 5.99 and 7.32 respectively, hence, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This means that the perceptions of the teachers and students on the level of acceptability of the FS4 learning guide in terms of the four elements of acceptability do not differ significantly. The two groups of respondents displayed similar views on the acceptability and use of the material for FS4.

Similar to FS3 guide, the statistical results for FS4 says that both groups of respondents find the learning guides' objectives (target competency) achievable and attainable. The assessment area of the guides are appropriate, challenging and encourages reflective thinking. It is also parallel with the other elements and capable of measuring students' learning. The learning plan is adequate and provides presenting, exploring, engaging, deepening and enriching activities that are suitable to their needs and level of understanding.

Table 4. Difference on the Level of Acceptability of FS4 Learning Guide

Elements	ρ-value	χ^2	Decision on Ho	Description
Target Competency	5.99	1.581	Do not Reject	Not Significant
Assessment	5.99	2.188	Do not Reject	Not Significant
Learning Plan	5.99	2.074	Do not Reject	Not Significant
Technical Aspect	7.82	1.663	Do not Reject	Not Significant

$\alpha = 0.05$

Meanwhile, theFS4 guide prioritized insightful tasks to students especially on how curriculum may be effectively implemented. It considers tasks that could open avenues for communicating clear learning goals that are appropriate for learners and for establishing learning environment that responds to the aspiration of the community. Moreover, it includes tasks that show how to create a healthy psychological climate for learners, how to understand and accept the learners diverse background and experience. Activities also cover instructional planning, methods, materials and resources, assessment strategies that are aligned to the objectives of the lesson.

Both groups of respondents affirmed that the FS4 learning guide is in accordance with its course description as provided in the ELC Handbook. It implies that the guide tackles the goal the material is designed to. The material showed effectiveness in giving students the chance to expose them to the existing curriculum in the basic education and to see for them how it is implemented.

The technical aspect of the material has positive visual impact on both groups of respondents. Both groups affirmed that the FS4 guide could facilitate the students' processing of information easily due to illustrations and graphics, style and size of fonts used in the material. The colors provide attractiveness and motivation to the learners and the simplicity and clarity of the language employed for instructions encourages independent learning. The appearance of the guide differentiates the FS4 guide from other FS4 resources. Generally, FS4 guide suggests usefulness and appropriateness and maybe utilized as a supplementary resource for teacher education students.

Over all, the FS3 and FS4 learning guides are very much acceptable to the students and teachers. It deemed to be adopted to assist the FS students in connecting concepts learned in the theoretical courses with their observation and engagement in the actual practice in the field. It helps students validate what they have learned in the classroom with what really transpired outside the classroom by immersing themselves in the actual basic education school scenarios. The guides let them discover the realities in their chosen career and make them reflect to gain insightful and meaningful learning. Students are given support instrument to actively put them to work with the learning content [10]. Discovery learning demands specific manipulative or apparatus in organizing an activity or tasks that could facilitate learning [11].

The gray areas that need improvement as identified by the two groups of respondents

There are three gray areas on the learning guides that need improvement as identified by the respondents. The discussions centered on the analysis of these areas in FS3 and FS4 learning guides, the group o respondent who raised the comments, and the possible ways and means to address the issues at hand.

Inapplicability of the learning plans to other fields of discipline.

This gray area relates to FS3 learning guide and is raised by the two groups of respondents. Both groups of respondents said that the FS3guidehad some activities that are discipline specific. They identified it in worksheet numbers 5, 8,13, and 14. Agreeably, the guide uses learning situations, topic and themes that are mostly used in an English class. Since FS3 subject is common to all teacher education students, it should cater to all types of specialization and concentration disciplines. It should remove tasks and instructions that may be construed as biases to particular subject areas. Although the researchers may initially believe that areas in English subject as a general education course of the respondents may well suit their experience, it does not make sense for a field study course. The bias may only satisfy the assessment phase but may falsely generate reliable data of students learning. Hence, FS3 may somehow failed to observe the main purpose of the guide which is to cater the individual learning needs and to support individual learning of the students in field study courses. And since FS students and teachers are those considered diverse in terms of specialization and concentration courses, these worksheets should be generally made to address their learning priorities and preferences. Furthermore, a discipline biased guide may contribute to the possible difficulties that an FS students and teachers may experience. It may not help them reach optimum field study satisfaction and delimit them from authentic learning in which experiential learning advocates. An example may be depicted by the following teacher education courses considered in the study. Bachelor in Secondary Education (BSED) is discipline-specific. Their use of FS3 guide becomes inappropriate and unacceptable since its contents are mostly restricted in English context. As English is only one of the many fields of specialization of BSED, non-English majorsare not given justice and was short changed of what they deserved. Further, they found the guide difficult to accomplish because they cannot relate to the activities presented in the guide.

The authors will consider revisions of the guide for FS3 based on the comments and suggestions of the teachers and the students. The learning situations along English previously identified in the table will be removed and leave it blank instead. The students will fill in the table anew of the learning situations based on their major field.

Layout Issues

This gray area relates to FS4 learning guide and is raised by the two groups of respondents. Both groups of respondents said that the FS4guide had some violations with respect to layout rules. For instance, the kerning rules are sometimes neglected in some of the worksheets. Kerning refers to fine-tuning of spaces in between characters [12].Texts should be neat and orderly. Spaces in between letters should be evenly and appropriately defined to ensure visual clarity of words in the layout. Another is the disregard of readability rules for purposes of aesthetics. In some of the worksheets, too huge and heavy designs affect the readability as well as the legibility of the texts. It draws much attention to the reader and distracts them from focusing to the texts that are more important than the graphics. Also, loud and strong colors may also affect readability of texts that are typed-over it and might express confusion on message and emotions relayed to the reader. It was suggested that it be minimize to give way to the main purpose of the guide. Finally, the box provided for reflection writing or answers denoting written expressions of observations and thoughts are sized insufficiently. Comprehensive and detailed answers on the worksheet may not be contained completely and legibly in the enclosed space provided. Though, the authors intentionally thought of answers to be concise, clear and straight forward by limiting the sizes of the space for answers, the worksheets' heavy design and graphics had eaten much of the space. It was recommended that the large percentage of the worksheet be allotted to the responses area and learning tasks than its visual designs.

No examples given in the learning plan.

This problem is inherent to the two learning guides as observed only by the student- group. While examples are not necessary for the completion of FS3

and FS4 guides, students suggests that examples be provided to give them enough information and assist them on how to process the task. Two possible attributions can be linked to this issue. First, the FS students have limited knowledge of the conceptual or theoretical aspects for which field study subjects bridged. The FS teachers may have insufficiently taught or inadequately lectured important topics relating to the competencies the field study course considers. The students are not well back up with information relating to the fieldwork. Hence it does not allow students to compare and determine relationships between the actual setting and the task stipulated in the guide. Second, the authors may have failed to look into the necessity of providing examples to help students accomplish the tasks easily even with insufficient conceptual or theoretical back up from the corresponding and prerequisite subjects of the field study courses.

The authors will revisit the two guides. It will either improve the existing or replace it with a new one. Either way, it suggests the possibility of addressing the issue raised by the students.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, these conclusions were formulated. The two groups of respondents find the learning guides as very much acceptable. In general, the level of acceptability of the two FS guides does not vary significantly between the two groups of respondents. Both implied that the materials designed for the two FS courses are possible for adoption by the different FS classes in the college provided that the identified gray areas for improvement will be properly addressed. Learning plan and layout issues are the core areas to be considered for the improvement of the guides. The need for providing examples in the guide as suggested only by the student-respondents should also be given equal consideration.

Teachers must continuously strive to support their students by creating valid instructional materials. However, the material must be ensured in terms of its validity by subjecting it to review by the instructional materials review committee of the college. Services of the content and grammar editors must also be secured to check the total package of the material. Experts on instructional material development must be invited as critics to further improve the guides. Utilization of the guides maybe extended to FS students from other institution to determine its acceptability and thus come up with a balanced material that can permeate and use by diverse academic cultures. The study does not include the effectiveness of the material as supplementary resources for teacher education students. Hence, future study maybe conducted to gauge the amount of its contribution in the improvement of the students' performance in field study courses.

REFERENCES

[1] Salandanan, G. G. (2012) Teaching and the Teacher. Revised Edition. Manila: Lorimar Publishing Inc. pp 73-74.

[2] Kolb, David. (1984). Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

[3] CMO No. 30, series 2004. Revised Policies and Standards for Undergraduate Teacher Education Curriculum

[4] DepEd Order No. 3, s., 2007, Guidelines in the Deployment of Pre-service Teachers under Experiential Learning: Field Study and Practice Teaching.

[5] Experiential Learning Courses Handbook (2006). A Project of Teacher Education Council of the Department of Education

[6] Smith, P. L. & Ragan, T.J. (1999) Instructional Design. John Wiley and Sons Inc. Retrieved from: http://steinhardtapps.es.its.nyu.edu

[7] Malamed, C. (2015). How Visual Clarity Affects Learning. The eLearning Coach for Designing Smarter Learning Experiences. Retrieved from: http://theelearningcoach.com

[8] Ausubel, D. (2000) Learning Theories retrieved from: http://www.fpmipa.upi.edu on 10-7-2016

[9] Janer, S. S. (2013) Personal Factors that Relate to the Assessment Practices of Science Teachers. IAMURE International Journal of Education, Volume 5, January 2013. Retrieved from: http://iamure.com

[10] Waes, S.V., Vanthournout, G., Gijbels, D., Donche, V., Petegem, P.V. (2010) Fostering Students' Learning with Study Guides: The Relationship with the Students' Perception and Learning Patterns. Facilitating Effective Student Learning Through Teacher Research and Innovation. Ljubljana: Faculty of Education. Retrieved from: http://www.pef.uni-lj.si

[11] Taber, K. S. (2012) Constructivism as Educational Theory: Contingency in Learning and Optimally Guided Instruction. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc. Retrieved from: https://camtools.cam.ac.uk

[12] Kliever, Janie. (2015) A Beginner's Guide to Kerning like a Designer. Canva 2015. Retrieved from https://designschool.canva.com