

Assessing the Teaching Learning Procedures Implemented in Philippine History

Danilo F. Cebe

Cebu technological University, Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

How to cite this article: Danilo F. Cebe (2024). Assessing the Teaching Learning Procedures Implemented in Philippine History *Library Progress International*, 44(3), 8078-8085.

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to assess the Teaching-Learning implemented in Philippine history instruction of Cebu Technological University-Main Campus, Cebu City. The study employed the descriptive research and made use of the questionnaire in gathering data. The study revealed that the teaching methods always used in the teaching of the subject were the lecture, inductive, reporting, investigative and self pacing methods as perceived by the respondents. The teaching techniques always used were the lecture-discussion, reporting, relevance, transitional, direct instruction, unit or Morrison, individual or group techniques. However, the evaluations commonly used at all times were question and answer, chapter test, term examination and observation.

Based on the result of the study, the three identified factors: teacher factor, student factor, and school factor were described as Moderately affecting the Philippine History Instruction as perceived by the respondents. The test of the significant mean difference between the perceptions of respondent groups as to the teaching-learning procedures was accepted. This means that respondent groups perceived similarly the teaching-learning procedures used. There is a need to improve the teaching-learning procedures of the professors from often to always. The teacher, student and school as factors affecting in the teaching of the subject should be improved for a better performance towards quality education.

Keywords: Teaching Learning Procedures, Assessment, Philippine History

INTRODUCTION

Philippine History is a curricular subject offered in secondary and tertiary levels. As a curricular offering, it develops the students' different spheres of personality like intellectual, social, moral values and all qualities of individual as a useful citizen of the country. In other words it develops the total personality of the individual to ensure an upright citizen in a democratic society.

The Philippine History is an important part of education where the learner needs to understand themselves, the people around them, the community, the country and the world in which they live. It is a program of instruction that helps learners accept change and deal thoughtfully and intelligently.

THEORITICAL BACKGROUND

Mesiales and Cox (2002) expressed that teaching Philippine History would lead to understanding of social science fields and awareness of the interrelatedness of social knowledge, understanding of the significant and persistent problem of the society and developing in the individual's ability to apply skills of rational inquiry and understanding of social decisions.

Developing the Childs desirable habits will enable him to function eventually as a useful member of the society. Students attitudes toward themselves, their classmates, their instructors, and society in general are hope to be modified and improved as a result of their social experiences. (Wesley and Adams 1998)

Principles associated to successful teaching and learning in Philippine History are the following: individual have a suitable background of what he is studying, learning should be directed toward a goal, individual should have an opportunity to relate and organize the concepts learned, and should achieve a sense of accomplishment from his learning. (Gregorio at al 1998)

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The main purpose of this study was to assess the Philippine History instruction of the Cebu Technological University-Main Campus.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What teaching-learning procedures are utilize by the instructors/professors in Philippine history as to:
 - 1.1 Methods used,
 - 1.2 Teaching technique, and
 - 1.3 Evaluation
2. Is there significant mean difference between the perceptions of the respondent groups as to the aforementioned?
3. As perceived by the instructor/professors and students, to what extent do the following factors affect instructions?
 - 3.1 Teacher
 - 3.2 Student, and
 - 3.3 School?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was a descriptive research. It made use of a questionnaire in gathering the needed data as well as informal interview to verify the respondents' answers in the questionnaire.

Teaching Method Used as perceived by the CTTE and CITE students

TABLE1

Teaching Method	CTTE(n=63)						CITE(n=72)					
	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TWP	X	V D	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TWP	X	V D
Lecture Method	50	11	2	174	2.76	A	56	8	8	192	2.67	A
Inductive Method	32	19	12	146	2.31	O	45	24	3	186	2.58	A
Deductive Method	30	24	9	147	2.33	O	35	21	16	163	2.26	O
Demonstrative Method	25	23	15	136	2.15	O	33	30	9	168	2.33	O
Activity Method	25	26	12	139	2.20	O	43	16	13	174	2.42	O
Reporting Method	45	10	8	163	2.58	A	45	15	12	177	2.45	O
Integrative Method	36	20	7	155	2.46	O	42	10	20	166	2.30	O
Investigative Method	43	11	9	160	2.54	A	52	8	12	184	2.56	A
Self-Placing Method	40	13	10	156	2.48	O	51	10	11	184	2.56	A
Traditional Method	37	16	10	137	2.17	O	44	13	15	173	2.40	O
Average					2.40	O					2.45	O

The table brings forth data that support the idea of the use of various methods to afford the students variety of exposure for better learning. At least two assumptions maybe formed explaining why instructors/professors are at home using these foregoing methods: firstly, the common teaching methods like lecture, discussion, reporting, and demonstrations etc. requires simple and less elaborate preparation on the part of the teacher and secondly the procedure involved in each method may be simple and less cumbersome. But with the advent of the so-called "era of educational technology" new methods are recommended like investigatory and self pacing as equally affected as the popular common method.

TEACHING TECHNIQUES USED AS PERCEIVED BY THE CTTE AND CITE STUDENT RESPONDENTS

Table2

Teaching Techniques	CTTE(N=63)						CITE(N=72)					
	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TW P	X	VD	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TWP	X	VD
Outlining techniques	24	26	13	137	2.17	O	32	33	7	169	2.35	O
Component Techniques	28	29	6	148	2.35	O	16	34	24	140	1.94	O

Sequential Techniques	25	22	16	135	2.14	O	28	27	17	155	2.15	O
Relevance Techniques	31	22	10	147	2.33	O	19	38	15	129	1.79	O
Transitional Techniques	31	19	13	144	2.28	O	15	33	25	136	1.89	O
Small Group Discussion	27	20	16	137	2.17	O	19	25	28	135	1.87	O
Socialized Classroom Discussion	31	18	14	143	2.27	O	16	33	23	137	1.90	O
Panel Discussion	25	19	19	132	2.09	O	11	31	30	125	1.74	O
Direct Instruction	31	12	20	137	2.17	O	28	27	17	155	2.15	O
Recitation Techniques	28	29	6	148	2.35	O	22	36	14	152	2.11	O
Interview	24	24	15	135	2.14	O	3	33	36	111	1.54	O
Unit or Morrison	11	36	16	121	1.92	O	28	24	20	152	2.11	O
Individual or Group	22	22	19	129	2.05	O	31	31	10	165	2.29	O
Reading or story telling	21	10	32	115	1.82	O	14	35	23	135	1.87	O
Schematic techniques	20	18	25	121	1.92	O	25	23	25	146	2.03	O
Symposium	14	27	22	118	1.87	O	15	26	31	128	1.78	O
Teacher-Directed	37	17	9	154	2.44	O	15	20	37	122	1.69	O
Student-Directed	11	33	19	118	1.87	O	19	37	16	147	2.04	O
Teacher-Student	30	20	13	143	2.27	O	30	28	14	160	2.22	O
Resource speaker	15	29	19	122	1.94	O	18	27	27	135	1.87	O
Project	17	33	13	130	2.06	O	21	17	34	131	1.82	O
Field Trip	8	24	31	103	1.63	O	21	14	37	128	1.78	O
Brainstorming	6	40	17	115	1.82	O	21	23	28	137	1.90	O
Debate teaching	17	30	16	127	2.02	O	11	27	34	121	1.68	O
Dramatization	10	26	27	109	1.73	O	2	34	36	110	1.53	O
Role Play	12	23	28	110	1.74	O	7	34	31	120	1.67	O
Simulation-Game	14	13	36	104	1.65	O	10	22	40	114	1.58	O
Lecture Discussion	48	9	6	168	2.67	A	45	20	7	182	2.53	A
Demonstration Lecture	34	22	7	153	2.43	O	20	37	15	149	2.07	O
Film Showing Discussion	25	11	27	124	1.97	O	18	26	28	134	1.86	O
Reporting Discussion	50	7	6	170	2.70	A	48	17	7	185	2.57	A
Inductive-deductive	22	23	18	130	2.06	O	34	26	12	166	2.31	O
Laboratory	13	10	40	99	1.57	O	20	21	31	133	1.85	O
Problem Solving	24	25	14	136	2.16	O	15	25	32	127	1.76	O
Research Technique	22	21	20	128	2.03	O	17	30	25	136	1.89	O
Field Study	23	24	18	135	2.14	O	17	28	27	134	1.86	O
Experimenting	10	21	22	114	1.81	O	9	23	40	113	1.57	O
Programmed	24	23	16	134	2.13	O	13	22	37	120	1.67	O
Modular	24	23	16	134	2.13	O	15	21	36	123	1.71	O
Self-learning kit	26	25	12	140	2.22	O	23	29	20	147	2.04	O
Courses	24	22	17	133	2.11	O	23	27	22	145	2.01	O
Mastery Learning	28	24	11	143	2.27	O	24	37	11	157	2.18	O
Textbook Learning	26	28	9	143	2.27	O	28	32	12	160	2.22	O
Role Learning	22	24	17	131	2.08	O	14	29	29	129	1.79	O
Directed Learning	37	24	2	161	2.56	A	33	34	5	172	2.39	O
Memorization	31	25	7	150	2.38	O	18	28	26	136	1.89	O
Average					2.11	O					1.94	O

Different methods can be used with varied techniques, that is, a teacher can make use of a method with techniques that would suit the level of understanding of the students. An effective and efficient teacher can make maximum use and command of the techniques in the classroom which would surely redound to the benefits of the students.

EVALUATION USED AS PERCIEVED BY THE CTTE AND CITE STUDENTS RESPONDENTS

Table3

Evaluation	CTTE(n=63)						CITE(n=72)					
	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TWP	X	V D	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TWP	X	V D
Question and answer	27	20	16	137	2.17	O	31	30	11	164	2.28	O
Chapter Test	36	19	8	154	2.44	O	31	25	16	159	2.21	O
Term Examination	34	11	18	142	2.25	O	40	19	13	171	2.38	O
Project	16	19	28	114	1.81	O	13	21	38	119	1.65	O
Observation	25	27	10	139	2.21	O	19	31	22	141	1.96	O
Research Work	18	31	14	130	2.06	O	25	28	19	150	2.08	O
Work Group Activity	11	19	33	104	1.65	O	21	22	29	136	1.89	O
Contest	7	16	40	93	1.67	S	10	22	40	114	1.58	O
Average					2.01	O					2.00	O

The table reflects the various evaluations of the instructors/professors to complete instruction by using evaluative measures to identify and remedy teaching scenarios. Evaluation is important not only for the instructors/professors but also for students and their parents. Teachers should always make it a point to evaluate activities done in the classroom and make use of the findings, whether qualitatively or quantitatively, for the improvement of instruction in general, and the learned students in particular.

TABLE4 Summary on the Teaching Learning Procedures Utilized by the instructors/Professors and Students in Philippine History as Perceived by the CTTE and CITE Student Themselves.

Teaching Learning Procedures	CTTE(N=63)		CITE(N=72)		TOTAL	
	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD	\bar{x}	VD
Method used	2.40	O	2.45	O	2.43	O
Teaching Techniques	2.11	O	1.94	O	2.02	O
Evaluation	2.01	O	2.00	O	2.00	O
Average	2.17	O	2.13	O	2.15	O
Standard Deviation	0.203		0.279		0.243	

Table 4 summarizes the teaching learning procedure utilizes by the instructors/professors and students in Philippine history subject as perceived by the CTTE and CITE student.

As revealed in the table, the CTTE students obtained a mean legend of 2.40 for the “Method Used” 2.11 for the “Teaching Techniques”; and 2.01 for the “Evaluation” all described as **Often** used. It registered an average mean of means of 2.17 and standard deviation of 0.203 described as **Often**. In the case of the CITE students, the “Method used” got a mean of means of 2.45; “teaching techniques” with a mean of means of 1.94; and “Evaluation” with mean of means of 2.00 all described as **Often**. The CTTE students also got an average means of means of 2.13 with a standard deviation of 0.279 described as **Often** used.

Table 5 Teaching Techniques Used as Perceived by the CTTE and CITE Instructor/Professor Respondents

Teaching Techniques	CTTE(N=5)						CITE(N=10)					
	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TWP	X	VD	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TWP	X	VD
Outlining Techniques	2	2	1	11	2.20	O	3	4	3	20	2.00	O
Component Techniques	0	0	5	5	1.00	S	0	5	5	15	1.50	O
Sequential Techniques	0	3	2	8	1.60	O	0	5	5	15	1.50	O
Relevance Techniques	3	2	0	13	2.60	A	6	4	0	26	2.60	A
Transitional Techniques	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	5	5	0	25	2.50	A
Small Group Discussion	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	4	4	2	22	2.20	O
Socialized Classroom Discussion	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	2	3	5	17	1.70	O
Panel Discussion	1	2	2	9	1.80	O	0	7	3	17	1.70	O
Direct Instruction	4	1	0	14	2.80	A	2	6	2	20	2.00	O
Recitation Techniques	2	3	0	12	2.40	O	0	5	5	15	1.50	O

Interview	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	3	3	4	19	1.90	O
Unit or Morrison	4	1	0	14	2.80	A	2	2	6	16	1.60	O
Individual or Group	3	2	0	13	2.60	A	2	4	4	18	1.80	O
Reading or Story Telling	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	2	6	2	20	2.00	O
Schematic Techniques	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	1	5	4	17	1.70	O
Symposium	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	2	2	6	16	1.60	O
Teacher-Directed	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	2	4	4	18	1.80	O
Student-Directed	0	3	2	8	1.60	O	2	6	2	20	2.00	O
Teacher-Student	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	1	4	5	16	1.60	O
Resource Speaker	0	3	2	8	1.60	O	0	6	4	16	1.60	O
Project	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	3	0	7	16	1.60	O
Field Trip	0	2	3	8	1.60	O	2	4	4	18	1.80	O
Brainstorming	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	0	5	5	15	1.50	O
Debate Teaching	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	0	5	5	15	1.50	O
Dramatization	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	0	6	4	16	1.60	S
Role Playing	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	0	3	7	13	1.30	S
Simulation-Game	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	0	3	7	13	1.30	O
Lecture Discussion	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	6	2	2	24	2.40	O
Demonstration Lecture	1	2	2	9	1.80	O	3	6	1	22	2.20	O
Film Showing Discussion	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	1	5	4	17	1.70	O
Reporting Discussion	2	3	0	12	2.40	O	5	3	2	23	2.30	O
Inductive-deductive	0	0	5	5	1.00	S	3	2	5	18	1.80	O
Laboratory	0	2	3	7	1.40	S	2	6	2	20	2.00	O
Problem Solving	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	2	5	3	19	1.90	O
Research technique	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	0	4	6	14	1.40	S
Field study	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	1	3	6	15	1.50	O
Experimenting	0	0	5	5	1.00	S	0	5	5	15	1.50	O
Programmed	0	3	2	8	1.60	O	2	3	5	17	1.70	O
Modular	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	1	4	5	16	1.60	O
Self-Learning Kit	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	2	2	6	16	1.60	O
Courses	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	0	6	4	16	1.60	O
Mastery Learning	0	4	1	9	1.80	O	4	4	2	22	2.20	O
Textbook Learning	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	1	6	3	18	1.80	O
Role Learning	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	2	3	5	17	1.70	O
Directed Learning	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	2	2	6	16	1.60	O
Memorization	2	2	1	11	2.20	O	5	3	2	23	2.30	O
AVERAGE					1.89	O					1.79	O

The data show that there are still some methods and techniques that instructors and professors have to use maximally in the classrooms to make possible for the students to avail of the benefit of learning from the use of these methods and techniques which instructors and professors perceived as **Seldom** used.

This also implies that flexibility should be considerate in the use of any teaching method while they use of any teaching method suggests order and system in conducting a particular lesson or an activity; it does not mean that it is highly prescriptive. Certain steps on techniques within a method maybe changed or modified and more

significantly, the whole method maybe altered by another one which proves to be more effective considering the interplay of several learning factors in the classroom.

The instructor and professor should adjust an “experimental attitude “in his methodology of teaching. While the standard teaching methods could be sufficient to meet certain classroom requirements, he should be involved in a continuous search for better methodologies in affecting more satisfactory learning outcomes. This means that he is willing to modify teaching methods and to try out new teaching strategies.

Table 6 Evaluation Used As Perceived By Ctte And Cite Instructor/Professor Respondents

Evaluation	CTTE(N=5)						CITE(N=10)					
	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TW P	X	V D	A (3)	O (2)	S (1)	TWP	X	VD
Question and Answer	2	3	0	12	2.40	O	6	3	1	25	2.50	A
Chapter Test	5	0	0	15	3.00	A	5	3	2	23	2.30	O
Term Examination	5	0	0	15	3.00	A	2	3	5	17	1.70	O
Project	3	1	1	12	2.40	O	4	5	1	23	2.30	O
Observation	3	2	0	13	2.60	A	4	1	5	19	1.90	O
Research Work	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	1	5	4	17	1.70	O
Work Group Activity	0	5	0	10	2.00	O	2	5	3	19	1.90	O
Contest	0	0	5	5	1.00	S	3	2	5	18	1.80	O
Average					2.30	O					2.01	O

The data depicts that there are identified means of evaluating students’ performance in or outside of the class. Anything that a teacher does that is not usually done would always trigger the excitement of the learners and this would be a very good start of a lifelong quest for more knowledge and skills.

Table 7 Summary Table on Factors Affecting Philippine History Instruction As Perceived By Ctte and Cite Students Respondents

FACTORS	CTTE(N=63)		CITE(N=72)	
	ξ	VD	ξ	VD
Teacher	1.70	MA	1.71	MA
Student	1.86	MA	1.98	MA
School	1.80	MA	2.04	MA
AVERAGE	1.79	MA	1.91	MA

As shown in the table, all the foregoing factors were described by the CTTE student respondents as **moderately affected**. These were “*teacher*” with a weighted mean of 1.70, “*student*” with a weighted mean of 1.86, and “*school*” with a weighted mean of 1.80. On the other hand, CITE students also perceived all factors as **Moderately affected** such were “*teacher*” with a weighted mean of 1.71, “*student*” with a weighted mean of 1.98, and “*school*” with a weighted mean of 2.04.

The same table reveals the over-all mean of 1.79, described by the CTTE students as **moderately affected**. On the other hand, the CITE students got the average weighted mean of 1.91, described as **Moderately affected**.

Table 8 Summary Table On Factors affecting Philippine History Instruction As Perceived By Ctte And Cite Instructor/Professor

FACTORS	CTTE(N=5)		CITE(N=10)	
	ξ	VD	Ξ	VD
Teacher	2.32	MA	1.80	MA
Student	2.35	MA	2.05	MA
School	2.35	MA	2.08	MA
AVERAGE	2.34	MA	1.98	MA

The table shows the average weighted mean of 2.34, described by the CTTE instructors as **Moderately Affected**.

The same table reveals the average weighted mean of 1.98, described by the CTTE instructors as **Moderately Affected**.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based from the data gathered and interpreted, the following findings were revealed:

Teaching Learning Procedures utilized by the instructors/professors and students in Philippine History as perceived by CTTE and CITE students.

The CTTE students obtain a mean of means of 2.40 in “Method used” described as **often**; 2.11 in “Teaching techniques”, also described as **Often**; and 2.01 in “Evaluation”, and described as **Often**. It registered an average mean of means of 2.17 and a standard deviation of 0.203, described as **Often**. In the case of the CITE students, the “Method use” got a mean of means of 2.45 described as **Often**; “Teaching techniques” with a mean of means of 1.94; and “Evaluation” with means of means 2.00, also described as **Often**.

Teaching Learning Procedures utilize by the instructors/professors and students in Philippine History as perceived by CTTE and CITE instructor/professor respondent.

The CTTE instructor/professor respondents obtained a means of mean of 1.86 “Method use”, described as **Often**; 1.89 in “teaching techniques, also described as often; and 2.30 in “Evaluation”, described as **Often**. It registered an average mean of means of 2.17 at standard deviation of 0.246, described as **Often**. In the case of the CITE instructors/professors respondents, the “Method used” got a mean of means of 1.86 described as **Often**; “Teaching Technique” with a mean of means of 1.79; and “Evaluation” with means of means of 2.01 also described as **Often**. The CITE instructors /professors also got an average means of means of 1.89 with a standard deviation of 0.113 and described as **Often**.

Factors affecting Philippine History instruction as perceived by CTTE and CITE student respondents

The CTTE and CITE student respondent have similar perception with regards to the factors affecting Philippine History instruction. The former obtained an average weighted mean of 1.79 while the latter obtained an average weighted mean of 1.91. Both were described as **moderately affected**.

Factors affecting Philippine History instruction as perceived by CTTE and CITE instructor/professor respondents

Both the CTTE and CITE instructor/professor respondents perceived the factors affecting the Philippine History instruction as **Moderately affected** with over all weighted mean of 2.34 and 1.98, respectively.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were arrived at:

Most of the instructors/professors need to finish their master’s degree in spite of their acceptable performance of their jobs.

There is a need for both the CTTE and CITE instructors/professors to improve their teaching learning procedures from often to always.

Both groups of respondents have to perceive better the teacher, student, and school factors if better performance and quality education has to be achieved.

The test of significant mean difference between the perceptions of respondent groups as to teaching learning procedures was **Accepted**.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, the following recommendations were given:

1. Instructors/professors should be afforded by management better package of incentives so that all instructors will be able to finish their master’s degree.
2. Instructors/professors of Philippine History should be given better chances to attend more seminars/workshops/training in the course to improve their profile on this area. Besides their attendance to these professional activities would enhance their teaching capabilities thus affecting the performance of the college in general.
3. Problems with teacher, student, and school should be look into by both the teachers and students as well as concern personnel in the college with the help of the proper authorities, so that they would be able to address these problems, thus perform as expected.

REFERENCES

- Ascarez,Ursulito C. “The Status of the Implementation of Social Studies in Public Elementary Schools of Madrid District, Division of Surigao Del Sur, S.Y 1980- 81, an appraisal, “Unpublished Masters these, Southwestern University, Cebu City 1981.

- Gregorio Herman 1976. Principles and Methods of Teaching. Quezon City: Garotech Publishing
- Mesialas, Bryan G. And Benjamin Cox. Inquiry in Social Studies. New York Harper and row Publishers, 1968

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Periodicals

Cruz, Pilar et all **Teaching the elementary school Subject. Manila:** Rex Bookstore 1976.

E, Shirley M.”**Thoughts in regard to Revisions of Social Studies Curriculum**”, Social Education Journal. Mart, 1963.

Hunt, Maurice P. And Laurence Metcaff. **Teaching Social Studies** New York: Mc Craw-Hill Book Co.1966.

Mesialas, Bryan G. And Benjamin Cox. **Inquiry in Social Studies.** New York Harper and row Publishers, 1968

Mursell, James L. **Development of teaching.** New York : Mc. Craw-Hill Co., Inc. 1956.

Serion, Josefina “**The disabilities of a Concept –Based Curriculum**”, New Thrust in Phil. Educ.Vol.1, Current Events Digest, Inc.1974.

Te, Muray and Tris Tee.”Schools Responsibility” **The Child and His Curriculum.** New York; Appleton-Century Crafts Inc.1976.

The New Lexicon Webster Dictionary of the English Language,Vol.1, Danbury, Connecticut, USA: Lexicon Publications Inc.1995.

UNPUBLISHED THESES

Alesma, Catalino, “The Problems in Teaching Social Studies in The Public, Intermediate Schools in the Division of Cebu City”, Unpublished Masters Thesis, Cebu Normal College. Cebu City 1966.

Arcilla, Repuerto,”Contents, Methods and technique in teaching social studies”, Unpublished masters thesis, National University Manila 1954.

Ascarez,Ursulito C. “The Status of the Implementation of Social Studies in Public Elementary Schools of Madrid District, Division of Surigao Del Sur, S.Y 1980-81, an appraisal, “Unpublished Masters these, Southwestern University, Cebu City 1981.

Manto, Conception,. “A critical Evaluation of the Professional Preparation and other factors Affecting Teaching Success of Elementary Schools Social Studies Teachers in

Danao City”/ Unpublished Masters Thesis, University Of San Carlos City 1964.

Tanipar Leonora “the Problem Of teaching Social Studies In Public Elementary, School In the District of Pardo, Cebu”Unpublished Masters thesis, University Of The Visayas , Cebu City,1973.

Paz, Vicente de. “The Teaching of Philippine History in the College Department Of the University Of Bohol. A Status Study .”Unpublished Masters Thesis, University Of Bohol, City of Tuburan,1974.