



# #IMADVANCED: ALIGNED+1 FRAMEWORK ON THE OBJECTIVITY OF TEACHERS' WEEKLY HOME LEARNING PLANNING IN THE PRINTED MODULAR DISTANCE LEARNING

Pabayos, Pebert Clyde G.  
Completed 2022



**E - Saliksik**  
Department of Education  
Research Portal  
[e-saliksik.deped.gov.ph](http://e-saliksik.deped.gov.ph)

*E-Saliksik: the DepEd Research Portal is the official repository of education research in the Department of Education (DepEd). This research was funded by the Basic Education Research Fund.*



Republic of the Philippines  
Department of Education  
REGION X  
SCHOOLS DIVISION OF VALENCIA CITY

---

**PROFORMA FOR RESEARCH ACCEPTANCE**

Title: **#ImAdvanced: ALIGNED+1 FRAMEWORK ON THE OBJECTIVITY OF TEACHERS' WEEKLY HOME LEARNING PLANNING IN THE PRINTED MODULAR DISTANCE LEARNING**

**Researcher: PEBERT CLYDE G. PABAYOS**

**Position:** Teacher II

**School:** Guinoyuran National High School

**Division:** Valencia City Division

- |                                     |                               |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Theme 1 Teaching and Learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Theme 2 Child Protection      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Theme 3 Human Resource        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Theme 4 Governance            |

Accepted by: Schools Division Research Committee (SDRC)

  
**CONNIEBEL C. NISTAL, PhD**  
Chairperson

  
**ESTHER V. TABAÑAG, PhD.**  
Vice-Chairperson

  
**JAYVY C. VEGAFRIA, PhD.**  
Vice-Chairperson

  
**JOHN BRIAN S. SALVAÑA**  
Member

  
**SARAH JANE A. VALDEZ**  
Member



Address: Lapu-lapu St., Poblacion, Valencia City, Bukidnon  
Telephone No: (088) 828-4415  
Website: <https://deped-valencia.org>



Management  
System  
ISO 9001:2015  
[www.tuv.com](http://www.tuv.com)  
ID: 910816406



## ABSTRACT

One of the instructional support systems the DepEd initiates in tracking the daily and general academic activities of learners in distance learning is the Weekly Home Learning Plan (WHLPlan). The study endeavored to delineate the effectiveness of conforming to Aligned+1 Framework to the objectivity of the Weekly Home Learning Planning (WHLPlanning) of teachers in the Printed Modular Distance Learning. Specifically, it aimed to differentiate the lexico-grammatical features of the WHLPlans constructed by the teachers in terms of instructional imperativeness and abstraction before and after exposure to Aligned+1 Framework and find out how the teachers perceive the WHLPlanning before and after exposure to the framework. The descriptive-qualitative study used content analysis and Halliday's (2014) Systemic Functional Linguistics. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, means, and percentages was utilized in analyzing the different lexico-grammatical indicators in the WHLPlans in terms of imperative mood system and transitivity. The teachers' perceptions in WHLPlanning, obtained through an open-ended questionnaire and virtual focus group discussion, were thematically analyzed following the coding techniques of Corbin and Strauss (2008).

At the lexico-grammatical level, the study shows that the first edition of WHLPlans itemized learning tasks as nonspecific headings of activities and generic imperatives which are open to interpretation and misunderstanding while Aligned+1 WHLPlans tabulated free imperative clauses which explicitly direct students' behavior in the content instruction and task instruction. Diverseness and specificity of actions and operations in the Aligned+1 WHLPlans are also evident in contrast to the predominance of the generic material process "answer" and mental process "read" in the first edition of WHLPlans. Results also reveal that the teachers conformed to directives only and initiated no ingenuity in learning planning and considered WHLPlanning a challenge on their assessment literacy before exposure to Aligned+1 Framework. After exposure to the framework, the teachers viewed WHLPlanning a multifaceted evaluation of instructions which goes beyond the MELCs Alignment and SLM Referral, regarded the task a critical examination of legitimate curriculum, and considered WHLPlanning a challenge on their lexico-grammatical competence. The study concludes that the Aligned+1 WHLPlans promoted balanced learning and supported holistic learning of students at the grammatical level and the framework empowered the teachers to become critical thinkers.

**Keywords:** *Aligned+1 Framework, discourse analysis, functional grammar, objectivity, teacher's perceptions, Weekly Home Learning Plan*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The success of the study is ascribed to the intervention of God Almighty who strengthens and blesses the teacher-researcher in all aspects. He is the ultimate source of knowledge and wisdom and the way to the people who have contributed to various ways to this paper and whom the researcher acknowledges:

His fiancée, Veronica, for inspiring him to continue his professional endeavor and for assisting him in editing the transcription of the discourse;

His School Head, Anaflor Q. Gahum, for the untiring support, trust, and encouragement, and constructive criticism to the output;

The Chief Education Supervisor of the Curriculum Implementation Division, Dr. Jayvy C. Vegafria, for responding to the request to become the speaker in the intervention-related seminar-workshop, extending his expertise in the institutionalized Weekly Home Learning Planning, and giving constructive inputs to the study;

The General Education Coordinator of Bukidnon State University's Kadingilan Campus, Jahzeel M. Candilasa, for providing constructive criticism to the research;

The Senior Education Program Specialist, John Brian S. Salvaña, for responding to the queries of the researcher regarding the Research Management Guidelines;

The Schools Division Research Committee for approving and supporting the conduct of the action research; and

His colleagues in Guinuyoran National High School for actively participating in the study.

The researcher extends his sincerest gratitude.

PEBERT CLYDE G. PABAYOS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
CONTEXT AND RATIONALE	1
INNOVATION, INTERVENTION, AND STRATEGY	6
Intervention	6
Conceptual Framework	9
Strategical Framework	12
ACTION RESEARCH QUESTIONS	15
ACTION RESEARCH METHODS	16
Research Design	16
Participants of the Study	17
Sources of Data and Information	17
Data Gathering Methods	18
Data Analysis	21
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND REFLECTION	24
Differences of the Weekly Home Learning Plans	24
Teachers' Perceptions of Weekly Home Learning Planning	36
ACTION PLAN	43
REFERENCES	46
ANNEXES	48

## CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

In the implementation and management of the Distance Learning Delivery Modalities in the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department of Education (DepEd) strategized and instituted activities that the teachers in the field are expected to administer. One of the instructional support systems the DepEd initiates in tracking the daily and general academic activities of learners is the Weekly Home Learning Plan (WHLP). The tool procedurally guides the learners in the learning modes and tasks needed to be considered and accomplished within the week. The WHLP, consisting of the learning areas, learning competencies, learning tasks, and mode of delivery, allows the teachers to monitor “in-school and off-school” activities and assessments feasible to the learning context of the students (San Antonio, 2020).

In response to the national call, the Division of Valencia City directed its teachers to prepare the said learning plan for SY 2020–2021 through the Division Memorandum No. 180, s. 2020 released on August 4, 2020 (Baguio, 2020). Two months after the directive, the teacher-made WHLPs, attached to the Self-Learning Modules (SLMs), were handed out to the learners.

Interestingly, the ‘usefulness’ of the Weekly Home Learning Plan became a discussion among the secondary school teachers in Guinuyoran National High School (GNHS). Qualitative data revealed an assumption among the teachers which questions the WHLP’s usefulness: the learners do not follow, read, or understand the WHLPs. The assumption is linked to the ‘required’ tasks and learners’ ‘unnecessary’ outputs – the graded tasks specified to be performed were not accomplished while the ungraded tasks to be disregarded were answered. The teachers reported a mutual dismay: regardless of the alignment of SLM learning tasks and the Most Essential Learning

Competencies (MELCs), the learners seemed to have found the WHLP ‘useless’.

Furthermore, content and discourse analyses of the aforementioned WHLPs showed that 99 learning tasks representing 52% of the data analyzed are itemized as nonspecific headings of activities while 93 learning tasks representing 48% of the data analyzed are stated as imperative sentences. For example, the nonspecific heading “Fitness Survey” (in a Physical Education WHLP) does not direct a specific behavior or provide details of *that* behavior that learners are expected to perform or observe. The extent of the heading’s specificity does not qualify it as an instruction creating an impression on the reader that the activity may not be answered or performed and may not be that relevant to the lesson. As far as explicitness of instruction is concerned, the imperatives are predominantly generic, as in the material process “Answer” in “...Answer What can I do, p33” and the mental process “Read” in “...Read What’s more on p. 9.” These generic imperatives are open to interpretation and misunderstanding; these do not direct a specific behavior or provide details of *that* behavior that learners are expected to perform or observe.

These observations suggest that the irrelevance and inapplicability of the WHLP in the learners’ study can be attributed to the teachers’ elementary and conventional approach to ‘Weekly Home Learning Planning,’ hereinafter abbreviated as WHLPlanning, which is bound to ‘MELCs–alignment and SLM–referral’. The teachers seemed to have focused on whether the formulated learning tasks reflect the activities in the SLM and theoretically support the acquisition or mastery of the learning competency and they seemed to have overlooked whether the learning tasks, at the grammatical level, communicate explicit instructions and the ideal “actions”, “operations”, or “processes” the learners are expected to do in order to

accomplish the activities in the SLM. In a functional perspective, the undefined communicative and functional purpose of the WHLP rendered the said written genre insignificant; the learning tasks or learning objectives in the WHLP did not communicate the teachers' expectations or the curriculum's intentions effectively.

Corresponding to the function of the Daily Lesson 'Planning' or Daily Lesson 'Logging' prescribed in DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2016 in the implementation of the face-to-face learning, the WHLPlanning legally and critically necessitates the teachers' progressive preparation of institutionalized instruction and delivery of the K to 12 curriculum in the Distance and Blended Learning (San Antonio, 2020). Therefore, if GNHS secondary school teachers do not possess adequate knowledge on a well-defined and objective approach in the preparation of WHLP, the delivery of the curriculum and instruction the learners depend on is jeopardized, that is, the teachers' orientation in WHLPlanning might affect the teaching-learning process or the teachers' delivery of instruction and the learners' academic achievement and performance. As far as the teachers' orientation in WHLPlanning is concerned, qualitative data showed that the teachers predominantly learned through self-study of modeled format.

The state of the teachers' present 'planning' called for an effective alternative aimed at improving the objectivity of their Weekly Home Learning Planning. To enhance the technical knowledge and skills of the teachers in WHLPlanning, specifically in learning tasks construction, a teacher-upgraded and well-defined framework, hereinafter entitled Aligned+1 Framework, anchored by the principles of institutionalized MELCs alignment, pedagogical concept of objective goal-setting, and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) was desirably needed.

In this study, objectivity refers to the aligned and well-defined quality of learning tasks or learning goals: specific, explicit, and



attainable. It also refers to the functional approach to Weekly Home Learning Planning, specifically in learning tasks writing.

This study endeavored to delineate the effectiveness of conforming to Aligned+1 Framework to the objectivity of the WHLPlanning of secondary school teachers in the Printed Modular Distance Learning. Specifically, it aimed to differentiate the lexico-grammatical features of the Weekly Home Learning Plans constructed by the secondary school teachers in terms of instructional imperativeness and instructional abstraction before and after exposure to Aligned+1 Framework and find out how the secondary school teachers perceive the WHLPlanning in the Printed Modular Distance Learning before and after exposure to Aligned+1 Framework.

This action research aims to increase the awareness of the constructive role the teachers play in learning or lesson planning, specifically in the delivery of the predetermined knowledge in the chosen modality. The undertaking serves as an eye opener for the teachers to 'write consciously' in the communication of the learning goals and expectations the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum mandates, that is, standard compliance to instituted directives, remarkable orientation of pedagogical practices, and literacy in functional grammar ensure the systematic planning and assessment the learners are subjected to.

Furthermore, the participation in the study intended to promote the teachers' professional development in the sense that they had to commit in studying lexico-grammatical features of effective written discourse methodologically in the realization of the abovementioned relevance. The increase of awareness in objective learning planning could help teachers change those grammatical features of the learning tasks which are detrimental to the learners' comprehension and modify approach that would cater their 'learning planning

competence.’ This puts emphasis that critical reflection and transformation affects the teaching–learning process.

Once the teachers’ learning planning competence is honed, the students are ensured of well-written and relevant Weekly Home Learning Plans and other instructional materials, thereby learning the quality education they deserve amidst the pandemic. At the administrative level, the results of this professional endeavor would provide school heads and supervisors baseline information in the conceptualization and conduct of faculty development programs; and with this initiative, the parents and guardians, and the community in general, are assured of their children’s optimum acquisition of the imperative knowledge and practical skills.

Further, the action research aimed to contribute insights to the literature of the Distance Learning Delivery Modalities in the Philippine educational system.

## INNOVATION, INTERVENTION, AND STRATEGY

This section discusses the conceptual framework of the innovation, intervention, and strategies in implementing the said alternative.

### Intervention

The researcher–conceptualized intervention that was deemed effective in equipping the secondary school teachers the technical knowledge and skills in the objective Weekly Home Learning Planning is termed as Aligned+1 Framework. The two–component framework which is focused in crafting aligned, objective, and functional learning tasks or goals is laid out as a tool for users to comprehend its systematic approach to Weekly Home Learning Planning (Appendix A). The author’s personal experience in and approach to WHLPlanning using functional grammar and the elaborate results of the content and discourse analyses of the teachers’ WHLPs in the gap analysis influenced the conceptualization of Aligned+1 Framework.

The term “Aligned+1” is a wordplay of “i+1” in Krashen’s (1988 as cited in Crystal, 2010) Input hypothesis in Second Language Acquisition. The hypothesis states that the learner progresses (or learns a second language) along the natural order once exposed to ‘comprehensible input’ (level ‘i+1’) or second language input which is one step beyond the current stage of linguistic competence (level ‘i’) the student is in. In the same manner, the framework of the intervention suggests that teachers improve their learning planning competence once oriented with a more technical approach in learning objective construction (approach ‘Aligned+1’ or the comprehensive reorientation on the technicalities in WHLP development and

implementation and functional grammar literacy) which is one step beyond their current learning planning orientation (superficial orientation in WHLP development and implementation).

The concept of i+1 steels the foundation of the upgraded goal-setting framework and weaves the interplay of one (1) pedagogical standard – MELCs Alignment in the Weekly Home Learning Planning – and one (1) language theory – Systemic Functional Linguistics. The components of Aligned+1 Framework are as follow:

- Reorientation on the MELCs Alignment in the WHLPlanning
- Orientation on the Metafunctions of Language

#### Reorientation on the MELCs Alignment in the WHLPlanning

The first component of the framework concerns with the alignment of the Most Essential Learning Competencies and the activities suggested in the Self-Learning Modules. The component is an emphasis of the fifth and seventh procedures in the development of WHLP: “...teachers should be guided with a long-term vision of what they want their learners to master and achieve in terms of content and competencies... without sacrificing time-bound attainment of learning competencies” (San Antonio, 2020, p. 14).

The thematic analysis revealed that the teachers predominantly learned WHLPlanning through self-study of modeled format. Other means few teachers were exposed to include nontechnical assistance from colleagues and brief technical assistance from division-wide orientation. However, their first orientation in WHLPlanning seemed to be inadequate given the undesirable response or performance of the learners. Hence, the first component of the framework aims to comprehensively reorient the teachers on the detailed technicalities in WHLP development and implementation as mandated by the Department of Education (San Antonio, 2020): legal and pedagogical

bases of lesson planning for the basic education, procedures in WHLP design, integral parts of the WHLP, distribution and implementation, and reasonable adjustment in WHLP for learners who are given remediation.

### Orientation on the Metafunctions of Language

The implication that the undefined communicative and functional purpose of the WHLP rendered the said written genre insignificant informed the need to educate the teachers about the basic concepts of the metafunctions of language. The second component of the framework suggests that MELCs–alignment and SLM–referral approach to writing learning tasks or learning objectives is insufficient in the effective communication of the teachers’ expectations or the curriculum’s intentions to the learners.

The teacher’s assessment of whether the imperatives, commands realized as learning tasks, overtly direct students’ behavior in the content instruction (the specification on how the content of the topic or lesson is learned and mastered) and task instruction (the specification of the activity, task, output, or the steps in accomplishing the task) helps him/her weigh the input the learner needs and output the student needs to accomplish. The said means allows the teacher to adjust or modify the number of learning tasks, as encouraged by the institutionalized WHLPlanning, to maximize knowledge acquisition and to cater the student’s learning profile and feasibility of the learning context.

Secondly, the teacher’s analysis of the transitivity of the imperatives helps her evaluate the ideal “actions”, “operations”, or “processes” the learners are expected to do in order to accomplish the activities stipulated in the SLM. The said course allows the teacher to necessarily adjust the “abstraction”, the difficulty or

comprehensibility, of a specific learning task to conform to the content and performance standards. In other words, it allows the teacher to simplify or complexify an instruction by rewording the verbs of the imperatives which are comprehensible at the student's cognitive level.

The orientation of the metafunctions of language, a step-up on WHLPlanning compared to the conventional approach mentioned above, aims to equip the teachers the analytical skills in the composition of 'understandable' learning objectives and analysis of the lexico-grammatical features of Weekly Home Learning Plans.

As far as Aligned+1 learning task construction is concerned, the framework advocates the active involvement of the learner in the written genre; hence, the students are directed explicitly in a second-person "YOU" as the subject of the imperative, as in "YOU Determine the type of relationship expressed in the pair of words given and choose your answer from the words inside the box on page 9," in contrast to the implied second-person subject in the first edition of WHLPs, as in "Answer "Connected to the Target" pages 9-10."

### Conceptual Framework

This study is anchored on Halliday's (in Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) Systemic Functional Linguistics, a theory which views the relationship between language and its functions in social settings. Interested in the way a teacher communicates expectations and instructions to the learners through language use (imperatives) in the accomplishment of everyday academic life (learning tasks or activities in WHLPs), the study adheres to the theory's views that language use is functional, semantic, and semiotic, that is, the function of the learning tasks or imperatives (as language use) is to make meanings and the process of using language is making meaning by choosing (Eggins, 2005; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) asserts that language performs limitless practical functions, which may be generalized into a set of highly coded and abstract functions inherent in every language, in different settings. The concept of interpersonal and ideational metafunctions of language served as the framework in the analysis of the lexico-grammatical features of the WHLP as a written genre that the teachers conceived and directed towards learners.

The interpersonal function deals with the interaction established by the participants. This metafunction regards the way the teacher uses language to establish communication and to express her expectations and attitudes. In the teacher-student communication that the Weekly Home Learning Plan abstractly creates, the teacher establishes an interaction through directing or commanding. This means of interaction, as the subject of this study, refers to the imperative mood system (Christie & Derewianka, 2010; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). The analysis of the teachers' self-assessment of the imperative mood system of their WHLPs, specifically the instructional imperativeness, revealed the input-output balance and lexico-grammatical modifications that the teachers made to maximize student learning. The instructional imperativeness refers to the explicitness of a command: Does the imperative guide students to learn a concept? Does the imperative direct students to perform an assessable task? It also refers to the commanding effect of a phrase or sentence to a student-reader to do something: Does the phrase or sentence sound like a command, request, or advice? Does the phrase or sentence comprehensibly instruct a learner to act?

Next, the ideational function considers the clause as a representation of reality and allows language users to present their world experience -- own consciousness, reactions, cognitions and perceptions -- through the lexico-grammatical choices they make

(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). In the teacher-student communication that the Weekly Home Learning Plan abstractly creates, the teacher, the source of predetermined instruction, embodies in language his/her experience of the phenomena relating to the real world. The analysis of the transitivity system, also termed in this study as the instructional abstraction of learning tasks, revealed the “actions”, “operations”, or “processes” the teachers want the learners to perform in order to master the learning competencies. Instructional abstraction refers to the difficulty or comprehensibility of a specific learning task to conform to the content and performance standards: Which of the two actions is more specific, comprehensible, and attainable? “YOU Do Activity 3: Am I Quadratic or Not?” “YOU Determine whether each equation is Quadratic or Not quadratic...”

Transitivity system recognizes six processes: material process, behavioral process, mental process, verbal process, relational process, and existential process (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). However, the significance of the analysis of the attributed process types concerns only the material, behavioral, mental, and verbal processes given that the clauses examined are imperatives. These processes and their participant roles were significant measures of the experiential content found in the WHLPs. Material processes pertain to doing-&-happening; those in which something is done. These processes are expressed by an action verb (e.g. write, go, give), an actor (logical subject), and the goal of the action (logical direct object, usually a noun or a pronoun). Mental processes involve sensing – those activities which take place in the consciousness: ‘perception’ (see, look), ‘reaction’ (like, please), and ‘cognition’ (know, believe, convince). A mental process involves two participants – senser and phenomenon. Verbal processes deal with the exchange of information, expression, and indication. Commonly used verbs include but are not limited to *say, tell, talk, praise, boast, and describe*. The main participants in



verbal clauses are sayers, receiver, and verbiage. Finally, behavioral processes pertain to physiological and psychological behaviors such as breathing, coughing, smiling, laughing, crying, staring, dreaming, etc.

This study is also predicated on the educational philosophy called critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy promotes the emancipation or elimination of oppression in all forms at different levels in the educational system and aims for a student-centered and more progressive approach about teaching-learning experiences and teacher empowerment. Giroux (2006), Gee, (2008), and Peterson (1991 as cited in Rodden, 2014) viewed the teachers as intellectuals, critical thinkers, and catalysts of change rather than deskilled professionals and students as active members of the society. The perspective, therefore, encourages teachers to be aware of power relations or roles embedded in a written communication.

A teacher's reflection then suggests that his or her involvement in the curriculum and critical examination of how language and ideology are constructed in his or her written discourse as a formal instruction (Weekly Home Learning Plans) play a vital role to the holistic development of a student. This reflection is a remarkable perspective of education that supports critical analysis of Weekly Home Learning Plan as a written genre.

### Strategical Framework

The intervention was administered through a weeklong and output-based seminar-workshop entitled “#ImAdvanced: Aligned+1 Framework and Weekly Home Learning Planning.” Day 1 of the training (April 14, 2021) was allotted for the collective discussion, demonstration, and workshop of Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Planning. Day 2, Day 3, and Day 4 (April 19–21, 2021) were scheduled

for individual consultation. Day 5 and Day 6 (December 19, 10, 2021) were set for the focus group discussion and open forum of collective-based evidence and experiences relative to WHLPlanning.

### Objectives and Expected Results

The training was designed to equip secondary school teachers of Guinuyoran National High School the critical awareness and discourse analytic skills in the objective Weekly Home Learning Planning in the Printed Modular Distance Learning. Specifically, the teachers were expected to:

- review the guidelines of the institutionalized Weekly Home Learning Planning,
- conduct a self-reflective discourse analysis of one's Weekly Home Learning Plans, and
- revise Weekly Home Learning Plans based on the results of one's self-reflective discourse analysis.

### Seminar Description

The workshop covered two (2) topics:

- MELCs Alignment in Weekly Home Learning Planning
- Imperativeness and Transitivity in Weekly Home Learning Planning

### Seminar Implementation Strategy

The seminar used the following strategies:

- Lecture: To orient participants information and principles relevant to the pedagogy, Weekly Home Learning Planning, and discourse analysis

- **Demonstration:** To show participants logical steps or systematic approaches relative to the application of Aligned+1 Framework
- **Workshop:** To provide participants opportunities in the application of the knowledge acquired, to exhibit outputs for constructive criticism, and to share ideas applicable to the context
- **Focused Group Discussion and Open Forum:** To elicit feedback, responses, or clarifications from participants and to share contemplation on individual and collective-based evidence and experiences relative to the construction of Weekly Home Learning Plans and implementation of the Printed Modular Distance Learning in the institution
- **Consultation:** To elicit responses or clarifications from and provide feedback to participants

## ACTION RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study was conducted to delineate the effectiveness of conforming to Aligned+1 Framework to the objectivity of the Weekly Home Learning Planning of teachers in the Printed Modular Distance Learning. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the lexico-grammatical differences of the Weekly Home Learning Plans constructed by the teachers in terms of:
  - a. instructional imperativeness before and after exposure to Aligned+1 Framework and
  - b. instructional abstraction before and after exposure to Aligned+1 Framework?
2. How do the teachers perceive the Weekly Home Learning Planning in the Printed Modular Distance Learning before and after exposure to Aligned+1 Framework?

## ACTION RESEARCH METHODS

This section presents the research design, participants, sources of data and information, data gathering procedure, and statistical treatment of the study.

### Research Design

This descriptive–qualitative study used content analysis in examining the instructional imperativeness of the learning tasks of the written genre that the teachers conceived and directed towards learners. First, the analysis assessed the commanding effect of sentences (imperatives) to a student–reader to do something in contrast to nonspecific phrases. Second, the method checked the teachers’ self–assessment of instruction specifics, whether a learning task is directed as a content instruction or task instruction (Component 2.1 of Aligned+1 Framework). The content analysis of the instructional imperativeness revealed the teachers’ endeavor to balance input and output and the lexico–grammatical modifications that the teachers made to maximize student learning.

The study also used Systemic Functional Linguistics in analyzing the instructional abstraction of the learning tasks. The discourse analysis of the imperatives showed the “actions,” “operations,” or “processes” the teachers want the learners to do in order to master the learning competencies.

The case of the Weekly Home Learning Planning of one school called for a case study approach. The approach was deemed appropriate as the investigation explored how teachers perceive a contemporary phenomenon (in this case, WHLPlanning) before and after an intervention. The novel implementation of WHLPlanning in

the Distance Learning Delivery Modalities in the Philippine educational system makes it “a real-life contemporary context... in a bounded system” (Creswell, 2013). Details unique to these cases informed the thematic analysis of the teachers’ perspectives on the conventional and objective WHLPlanning.

### Participants of the Study

Of the 26 secondary school teachers of Guinuyoran National High School for the SY 2020–2021, 18 participated in the study. The DepEd’s WHLPlanning necessitates the alignment of the SLM learning tasks and the MELCs/Curriculum Guide (San Antonio, 2020) and these eight (8) non-participant teachers claimed that Curriculum Guides of the subjects they were teaching (the subjects the teachers are expert of) are not available in the department, hence their exclusion in the study. The availability of the MELCs/Curriculum Guides of the 18 teacher-participants’ subjects met the condition of the instituted WHLPlanning. Fourteen of the 18 teacher-participants are Bachelor of Secondary Education graduates and four (4) are Certificate of Teaching (CT) completers. Thirteen teachers are affiliated with the Junior High School (JHS) Department and five (5) are affiliated with the Senior High School (SHS) Department. These participants were given pseudonyms in the study for anonymity.

### Sources of Data and Information

The Weekly Home Learning Plans were the corpora for the content and discourse analyses. Among the WHLPs constructed by a teacher on Quarter 1, only one (1) WHLP of a subject the teacher is expert of was examined. The expertise of a teacher in a subject was

considered a critical factor in the formulation, weighing, and abstraction of learning goals. The same WHLP was critiqued or revised in the seminar–workshop. In total, two (2) different editions of 18 WHLPs were subjected in the content and discourse analyses based on the total population of the concerned teachers.

As far as the purposive sampling of the corpora is concerned, the WHLPs on Quarter 1 ‘best’ exemplify the teacher’s ideology in elementary or objective WHLPlanning. This notion informed the decision to analyze the WHLPs on the first grading. The analyses only covered the learning tasks of Module 1 in the WHLP.

The retrieved questionnaires which contain the responses of the participants and the transcripts of the interview and focus group discussions were significant sources of teachers’ perceptions on conventional and Aligned+1 WHLPlanning.

### Data Gathering Methods

The discourse project did not undergo scrutiny from an Ethics Review Board. However, the key informant interviews conducted throughout the study observed a relational approach which promotes humanist ethos, reflexive learning, and ethical treatment of those directly involved (Ann, 2017). The author’s background and experience in teaching Practical Research 1 or qualitative research writing in the Humanities and the Social Sciences to Senior High School students and in conducting a qualitative research which involved the analysis of teachers’ discourse and students’ perceptions of the said discourse provide him an in–depth understanding of the ethical, professional, and academic sensitivities involved in the study.

The steps taken in data collection and treatment endeavored to meet Lincoln and Guba’s (1985, as cited in Paltridge, 2012) criteria in qualitative research writing – Credibility, Transferability,

Dependability, and Confirmability – to establish the trustworthiness of the results with the consideration that the critical discourse analysis is subjective and explanatory by nature.

#### Pre-implementation of the Intervention

A communication letter which expounded the purpose of the action research was sent to the School Principal on April 7, 2021. Once approved at the administrative level, a letter of informed consent was delivered to the teacher-participants and a one-on-one conversation was conducted on the same day to elaborate the objectives and nature of the study, collection and treatment of data, the conduct of an intervention, and rights of the participants in the research. The hard copy of the teachers' WHLPs on Quarter 1 was acquired from the School Principal with the consent of the teachers. After the acquisition of the said documents, the teacher-participants verified the authenticity and ownership of their learning plans. The participants were also asked to differentiate the learning tasks according to instruction specifics, that is, they recalled the learning tasks they graded (tasks administered to assess the learners' mastery of the learning competencies termed as task instruction) and those they did not grade (tasks which concern with the acquisition of predetermined knowledge and content termed as content instruction). Some of teachers transmitted the soft copy of their Weekly Home Learning Plans to the researcher through Messenger. These learning plans were subjected to content and discourse analyses.

Before the conduct of the seminar-workshop as part of the intervention, survey and interview (of teacher-participants who opted for interview) were conducted on April 5–9, 2021. The open-ended questionnaire aimed to elicit the teachers' elementary and/or objective approaches to WHLPlanning such as, but not limited to, knowledge on



the technicalities in WHLPlanning, pedagogical principles observed in WHLPlanning, lesson planning activity preferences, lesson planning strategy preferences, attitude towards WHLPlanning, personal resources, and language proficiency and language difficulties. This technique helped substantiate both the effectiveness and discrepancies of the predominant and insignificant number of lexico-grammatical features of the WHLPs to its objectivity. The survey and interview which regarded teachers' reflective thinking were guided by questions aimed to elicit the effect of the teachers' elementary and/or objective orientation to WHLPlanning. The written responses of the teachers gathered in the gap analysis and pre-implementation stage and transcriptions of the interview were subjected to thematic analysis.

### Implementation of the Intervention

The weeklong seminar-workshop was conducted on April 14, 19–21, 2021. The teachers' Aligned+1 or revised WHLPs were collected on May 3, 2021. The revisions were also subjected to content and discourse analyses. Another open-ended questionnaire (a revision of the questionnaire utilized before the conduct of the said workshop) was distributed to the teacher-participants on the second week of May 2021. The survey aimed to elicit the approaches of the teachers to WHLPlanning and their perspectives on WHLPlanning after exposure to Aligned+1 Framework. The written responses were also subjected to thematic analysis.

### Post-implementation

To triangulate the teachers' perceptions of conventional and Aligned+1 WHLPlanning, a focus group discussion was conducted on

December 9 and 10, 2021 via Google Meet. In the focus group discussion, the teacher-participants were grouped into five (5). The interview protocol consisted of items enumerated in the revised open-ended questionnaire administered in the implementation stage and new questions aimed to obtain in-depth viewpoints on Aligned+1 WHLPlanning. The transcriptions of the focus group discussion were showed to the participants for them to verify the authenticity of the data before these were subjected to thematic analysis.

### Data Analysis

In the analysis of the instructional imperativeness and abstraction of the first edition of WHLPs, the implied second-person subject “YOU” in the controlling imperatives, as in “[YOU] Do the following physical activities with safety and precautions”, is made explicit. The reason is to match the grammatical structure of the Aligned+1 learning tasks which explicitly address learners through a second-person “YOU” as the subjects of the imperatives in order to obtain comparable results.

The content analysis of the instructional imperativeness, teachers’ self-assessment of instruction specifics and the commanding effect of learning tasks, revealed the input-output balance and lexico-grammatical modifications that the teachers made to maximize student learning. In the analysis of the transitivity system, the processes and participants were singled out. This showed the “actions,” “operations,” or “processes” the teachers want the learners to do in order to master the learning competencies. The analyses helped reveal whether the lexico-grammatical choices made by the teachers reinforce or impede student learning. These analyses substantiated the objectivity of the teachers’ WHLPs.

Close reading was a practical approach in differentiating nonspecific headings from imperatives and in determining the lexico-grammatical features of the learning tasks and the frequency of imperatives (according to instruction specifics) and transitivity processes (material, mental, verbal, and behavioral).

As for the Weekly Home Learning Plans of teachers whose subjects are delivered in Filipino, translation of Filipino clauses or learning tasks was done following translation-oriented text analysis, direct translation, and structural shifts (Munday, 2012).

The study utilized descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, means, and percentages in analyzing the different lexico-grammatical choices and features in the Weekly Home Learning Plans in terms of imperative mood system and attributed process types. The technique led to the understanding of the objectivity of the WHLPs and the teachers' views on the objective WHLPlanning.

The responses of the teacher-participants in the survey, interview, and focus group discussion were thematically analyzed to obtain their perceptions on conventional and Aligned+1 WHLPlanning. Emerging themes and patterns were extracted following Corbin and Strauss's (2008) analytic procedure which includes open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. Manual coding and memoing were crucial in the analysis.

Member checking allowed the participants to see whether their reality or experience is an objective representation of their Weekly Home Learning Planning (Creswell, 2013). The confirmation of the participants on the accuracy of the data, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions ensured the trustworthiness of the study. The colloquium happened in one of the Learning Action Cells where the researchers gave the participants full access of the results of the study and time to check the credibility of the account. This qualitative process influenced the final results of the research.

The evaluation of the process of the project, review of the analysis and result of the study, and personal interpretations and suggestions of the School Head of the locale of the study and two (2) English teachers who are proficient in language education, language studies, and qualitative research (one of which is the Chief Education Supervisor of the Curriculum Implementation Division and the other an instructor in Bukidnon State University) contributed to the data analysis, interpretations, and implications of the research and helped establish the trustworthiness of the results.

## DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND REFLECTION

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of data. Tabular, numeric, and textual presentations are used to obtain an objective understanding of the teachers' Weekly Home Learning Planning.

### Differences of the Weekly Home Learning Plans

Table 1 shows the overall result of the lexico-grammatical differences of the Weekly Home Learning Plans constructed by the secondary school teachers in terms of instructional imperativeness and instructional abstraction before and after exposure to Aligned+1 Framework.

#### **Instructional Imperativeness**

The analysis of the teachers' self-assessment of the imperativeness of the learning tasks in their Weekly Home Learning Plans revealed two (2) modifications: imperative formulation and adjustment of the number of learning tasks according to instruction specifics. As far as imperative formulation is concerned, the use of commands in the first edition of WHLPs totaled a frequency of 93 representing 48% of the data analyzed. Ninety-nine learning tasks representing 52% of the data analyzed are itemized as nonspecific headings of activities.

The following learning tasks are communicated as imperatives in the first edition:

WHLP 2	YOU Answer What's more (Activity 3), p14.
WHLP 3	YOU Answer the following questions...

**Table 1**  
*Overall Lexico–grammatical Differences*

Differences		WHLP 1		WHLP 2		WHLP 3		WHLP 4		WHLP 5		WHLP 6		WHLP 7		WHLP 8		WHLP 9		WHLP 10		WHLP 11		WHLP 12		WHLP 13		WHLP 14		WHLP 15		WHLP 16		WHLP 17		WHLP 18		Total			
		Freq		%		Freq		%		Freq		%		Freq		%		Freq		%		Freq		%		Freq		%		Freq		%		Freq		%		Freq		%	
Instructional Imperativeness																																									
1 <sup>st</sup> ed.	Nonspecific	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	6	6	9	9	2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	30	30	8	8	7	7	7	7	0	0	99	52		
	TI	0	0	14	21	2	3	5	7	9	13	0	0	4	6	8	12	0	0	1	1	6	9	7	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	6	9	4	6	67	35		
	CI	0	0	4	15	0	0	4	15	7	27	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	2	8	0	0	3	12	0	0	1	4	0	0	26	14		
																																						Total		192	100
+1	CI	4	3	14	11	7	5	5	4	12	9	4	3	9	7	10	8	2	2	5	4	4	3	7	5	14	11	14	11	4	3	7	5	5	4	1	1	128	63		
	TI	2	3	6	8	3	4	2	3	4	5	4	5	12	16	5	7	2	3	3	4	4	5	4	5	3	4	5	7	4	5	2	3	5	6	4	5	74	37		
	Nonspecific	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Instructional Abstraction																																									
1 <sup>st</sup> ed.	Material	0	0	18	28	1	2	7	11	10	15	0	0	1	2	8	12	0	0	1	2	7	11	7	11	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	65	76		
	Mental	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	14	6	29	0	0	3	14	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	4	19	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	24		
	Verbal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Behavioral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
																																						Total		86	100
+1	Mental	6	5	12	10	9	8	4	3	11	9	3	3	10	9	5	4	3	3	6	5	5	4	5	4	10	9	9	8	6	5	4	3	6	5	2	2	116	57		
	Material	0	0	8	10	0	0	3	4	5	6	5	6	11	13	10	12	1	1	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	8	10	2	2	5	6	4	5	3	4	82	41		
	Behavioral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.5	
	Verbal	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5		
																																						Total		202	100

Legend:  
1<sup>st</sup> ed. : First Edition  
+1 : Aligned+1  
CI : Content Instruction  
TI : Task Instruction  
Freq : Frequency

WHLP 4	YOU Answer Activity 1 on p. 3.
WHLP 5	YOU Answer Activity 8: Think Beyond the Pages (pg. 9).
WHLP 7	YOU Do the following physical activities with safety and precautions.
WHLP 8	YOU Answer Activity 2 “IRF” Lesson 1.
WHLP 10	YOU Answer Post Assessment Module 1A.
WHLP 11	YOU Answer “You Can Do It” page 13.
WHLP 12	YOU Do Activity 3: Am I Quadratic or Not?
WHLP 15	YOU Choose the best answer from the options provided on page iv...

and the following instructional activities are presented as headings of activities in the same edition:

WHLP 1	What I Have Learned 1–5 page 13
WHLP 7	Fitness Survey
WHLP 8	Generalization in page 28
WHLP 9	Gawain 4: The Map Says (p.14)
WHLP 14	Gawain 5: Halika’t Pag-isipan Mo!
WHLP 15	What I can Do! Activity 3 My Budget Plan on page 6 numbers 1-2 only.

On the other hand, the second edition of WHLPs presented 202 learning tasks as imperatives. For example, the heading “Fitness Survey” in the first edition of WHLP 7 is presented as an imperative “YOU Describe your health and fitness habits and how it affects your personal lifestyle following Fitness Survey procedure on pages 3 to 5” in the second edition. Compared to the controlling imperative clause, the nonspecific heading “Fitness Survey” does not direct a specific behavior or provide details of *that* behavior that learners are expected to perform or observe. The extent of the heading’s specificity does not qualify it as an instruction creating an impression on the reader that the activity may not be answered or performed and may not be that relevant to the lesson.

The teachers’ report that the graded tasks specified to be performed were not accomplished can be linked to the absence or

insufficiency of explicit imperatives. The learners' nonachievement in the said task indicates the critical role of the teachers' competence in formulating clear instructions. After exposure to Aligned+1 Framework, the WHLPs tabulated free imperative clauses which explicitly direct students' behavior in the content instruction and task instruction. The lexico-grammatical features of the Aligned+1 learning tasks conform to Print's (1993, cited by Latifa, 2016) specificity of behavioral objectives in lesson planning – effective behavioral objectives are written explicitly.

The adjustment of the number of learning tasks, communicated as imperatives, according to instruction specifics is also evident in the discourse. Of the 93 imperatives in the first edition of WHLPs, 14% direct students' behavior in the content instruction and 35% predominantly focus on task instruction. While the WHLPs are demanding for a number of tasks the students are expected to accomplish, the imperatives which are aimed at equipping the learners the predetermined knowledge needed for the mastery of the learning competencies seem insufficient. The learners' nonachievement of the graded tasks specified to be performed, as reported by the teachers, can also be linked to the numerous tasks enumerated in the WHLPs. The number of activities plus the difficulty of these tasks might have compromised the accomplishment of the graded assessments. The concern indicates the teachers' role in the selection of appropriate assessment to cater the student's learning profile and feasibility of the learning context given the nature of the subject matter.

In contrast, 63% imperatives of the 202 learning tasks in the second edition predominantly center on the content instruction and 37% imperatives concentrate on task instruction. More emphasis is given in the input to produce the desired output. After exposure to Aligned+1 Framework, the WHLPs tabulate free imperative clauses



which direct students' behavior in the content instruction and task instruction. The lexico-grammatical features and functions of the Aligned+1 learning tasks fit Hattie's (2012) descriptions of good learning intentions: straightforward in the teachers' expectations and clear on the type and/or level of performance that the learners are expected to achieve.

The following imperatives in the second edition are directed to content instruction:

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| WHLP 2  | YOU Read the discussion in Lesson 1 – The nature, function of Social Science, Natural Science and Humanities from page 10 to page 13 carefully.                  |
| WHLP 4  | YOU Summarize the role of individual/position involved in the decision making of the company.  |
| WHLP 6  | Tukuyin [YOU Identify] kung ang pahayag ay nagsasaad ng katotohanan sa pagsulat ng titik <b>K</b> o nagsasaad ng opinyon sa pagsulat ng titik <b>O</b> .         |
| WHLP 8  | YOU Extract explicit and implicit information from the discussion by evaluating functions and solving the given problems in Activity 2: Check it out on page 18. |
| WHLP 10 | YOU Read the Steps in Scientific Method comprehensively from page 5 to 7.  |

whereas the following imperatives are focused on task instruction:

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| WHLP 3  | YOU Recall the text “Everything has a Name” and pick out lines that show flashback, foreshadowing and in medias res on page 14. |
| WHLP 5  | YOU Create an infographic regarding the unique characteristics of planet earth.   |
| WHLP 7  | YOU Create a Wellness Tracker by filling in the necessary information about your wellness lifestyle...                          |
| WHLP 9  | Magbigay [YOU Provide] ng halimbawa ng mga anyong lupa at anyong tubig at isulat ito sa unang kolum.                            |
| WHLP 11 | YOU Make a force collage showing action–reaction forces observed from day to day activities.                                    |

## Instructional Abstraction

The analysis of the transitivity system – the processes involved in the learning tasks – revealed the diverseness of actions and operations that the teachers want their students to take or do in order to learn the predetermined lesson and in order to accomplish the instituted activities in the SLMs. From all of the corpora in the first edition, the material process obtained the highest frequency of 65 representing 76% of the data analyzed followed by the mental process with a total frequency of 21 or 24%.

The material process or dominant action the learners are expected to perform revolves on ‘answering’. In fact, the action “answer” obtained a frequency of 60. The process “answer” in this context is synonymized as a ‘writing’ action, as in “YOU Write a reflection by choosing one social issue...” in Aligned+1 WHLP 2, instead of a ‘speaking’ action given the printed modular learning context: teacher–student physical interaction is restricted.

The following lines, the ‘material’ clauses of which are underlined and the actors italicized, manifest the psychomotor operation of learning tasks which support the mastery of the Most Essential Learning Competencies:

WHLP 2	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> What can I do, p33.
WHLP 3	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> the following questions...
WHLP 4	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> What I can Do: Activity 1.4 on p. 11.
WHLP 5	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> activity 11...
WHLP 8	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> Activity 3 “What Can I Do” in page 19.
WHLP 10	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> Post Assessment Module 1A.
WHLP 11	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> “You Can Do It” page 13.
WHLP 12	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> the Pre-Assessment.

The mental process ranks second in the analysis. The action the learners are expected to initiate revolves on ‘reading’. The action

“read” is directed in the corpora 16 times. The reader is required to involve themselves in the acquisition of knowledge and mastery of the subject matter in the task completion. The mental process the learners are engaged in or expected to learn relates to cognition and perception.

The following lines, the ‘mental’ clauses of which are underlined and the sensors italicized, manifest the cognitive operation of learning tasks which support the mastery of the Most Essential Learning Competencies:

- WHLP 3      *YOU Read* the Poem “A poison Tree” on Page 2.
- WHLP 4      *YOU Read* What’s more on p. 9.
- WHLP 5      *YOU Read* what is it (pg. 6).
- WHLP 8      *YOU Read...* the concepts in the modules.
- WHLP 12     *YOU Read* what I need to know.
- WHLP 15     *YOU Read* on What’s In page 1.

The predominance of the material process is evident in the first edition of WHLPs. On the contrary, the mental process in the second edition of WHLPs obtained the highest frequency of 116 representing 57% of the data analyzed, followed by the material process with a total frequency of 82 or 41%, the behavioral process with a total frequency of 3 representing 1.5% of the data analyzed, and lastly, the verbal process with a total frequency of 1 or 0.5% of the data analyzed.

Though the mental process “read” is still used in the second edition of WHLPs, different mental actions are evident in each of the learning plans. The following lines, the ‘mental’ clauses of which are underlined and the sensors italicized, manifest the diverseness of cognitive operations of learning tasks which support the mastery of the Most Essential Learning Competencies:

- WHLP 1      *YOU Determine* the type of relationship expressed in the pair of words given...
- WHLP 2      *YOU Extract* explicit and implicit information on

- basic concepts and principles of the major social science theories by answering two (2) questions from page 24 to page 25.
- WHLP 3 *YOU Analyze* the statements and identify what literary device is being described.
- WHLP 4 *YOU Differentiate* the Financial instruments, financial institutions and financial market on pages 6.
- WHLP 5 *YOU Extract* explicit and implicit information from the discussion you read by answering the questions listed in Activity 8 on page 9.
- WHLP 6 Tukuyin [*YOU Identify*] kung ang pahayag ay nagsasaad ng katotohanan sa pagsulat ng titik **K** o nagsasaad ng opinyon sa pagsulat ng titik **O**.
- WHLP 7 *YOU Recall* relevant terms, ideas and concept about physical activity, exercise and eating habits by answering the multiple-choice type post-test from page 10.
- WHLP 8 *YOU Solve* the given problem involving functions on page 27...
- WHLP 9 Kumuha [*YOU Extract*] ng impormasyon na base sa larawan sa pamamagitan ng pagsagot sa dalawang (2) katanungan.
- WHLP 10 *YOU Identify* the appropriate scientific investigation vocabulary words by answering Activity: 3 on page 8.
- WHLP 11 *YOU Reflect* on what you have learned about analogy by answering the assessment on page 15.
- WHLP 12 *YOU Determine* whether each equation is Quadratic or Not quadratic...
- WHLP 13 *YOU Identify* the action-reaction forces in each diagram/picture...
- WHLP 14 Basahin [*YOU Read*] ang ikatlong yugtong CBDRRM o disaster response sa pahina 5-7.
- WHLP 15 *YOU Recall* terms about fractions by writing the letter of the correct in pretest test II.

Aside from the addition of content and task instructions, the diverseness of cognitive operations in the Aligned+1 WHLPs is also linked to the rewording of the material process “answer” to more specific actions which entail mental processes. For example:

WHLP 2 Edition 1 *YOU Answer* What’s new (Activity 3), p24-

		25.
	Aligned+1	<i>YOU</i> <u>Extract</u> explicit and implicit information on basic concepts and principles of the major social science theories by answering two (2) questions from page 24 to page 25.
WHLP 3	Edition 1	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> the following questions: Why is the title of the writing A Poison Tree? What does the poem trying to teach us?
	Aligned+1	<i>YOU</i> <u>Extract</u> implicit and explicit information from the poem "A Poison Tree" by answering guide questions 1 and 2 on page 2.
WHLP 8	Edition 1	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> "What I Know" pre-test page 5-6.
	Aligned+1	<i>YOU</i> <u>Recall</u> relevant concepts and ideas about functions and their graphs by answering the 15-item multiple choice-type pre-test from page 5-6.
WHLP 11	Edition 1	<i>YOU</i> <u>Answer</u> "Connected to the Target" pages 9-10.
	Aligned+1	<i>YOU</i> <u>Determine</u> the type of relationship expressed in the pair of words given and choose your answer from the words inside the box on page 9
WHLP 12	Edition 1	<i>YOU</i> <u>Do</u> Activity 3: Am I Quadratic or Not?
	Aligned+1	<i>YOU</i> <u>Determine</u> whether each equation is Quadratic or Not quadratic...

The material process in the Aligned+1 WHLPs ranks second in the analysis. Different material actions are evident in the learning plans. The following lines, the 'material' clauses of which are underlined and the actors italicized, manifest the diverseness of psychomotor operations of learning tasks which support the mastery of the Most Essential Learning Competencies:

WHLP 2	<i>YOU</i> <u>Create</u> a concept map based on your understanding of the lesson by following the format on page 32.
WHLP 4	<i>YOU</i> <u>Summarize</u> the role of individual/position

- involve in the decision making of the company.
- WHLP 5 *YOU Create* an infographic regarding the unique characteristics of planet earth.
- WHLP 6 Itala [*YOU List*] ang mga palatandaang sa palagay mo'y hindi mo pa tinataglay at ano ang iyong gagawi
- WHLP 7 *YOU Construct* a Recreational Activity Diary following the procedure and sample format...
- WHLP 9 Magbigay [*YOU Write*] ng halimbawa ng mga anyong lupa at anyong tubig at isulat ito sa unang kolum.
- WHLP 10 *YOU Describe* the steps of the scientific method by answering the ASSESSMENT.
- WHLP 12 *YOU Create* your Home quarantine Pass on page 9.
- WHLP 13 *YOU Make* a force collage showing action-reaction forces observed from day to day activities.
- WHLP 14 Sumulat [*YOU Compose*] ng repleksyon tungkol sa kahalagahan ng pagiging handa sa pagharap ng kalamidad tulad ng pagputok ng bulkan at lindol.
- WHLP 15 *YOU Create* your own family budget by filling out the circle.

In addition, the rewording of the generic material process “answer” to more specific material action is manifested in the corpora:

- |         |           |   |
|---------|-----------|---|
| WHLP 2  | Edition 1 | <i>YOU Answer</i> What can I do, p33.   |
|         | Aligned+1 | <i>YOU Write</i> a reflection by choosing one social issue found on page 33.  |
| WHLP 12 | Edition 1 | <i>YOU Do</i> Activity 8: Sum it up.  |
|         | Aligned+1 | <i>YOU Summarize</i> the concepts and principles learned on quadratic equation given on page 8 using the diagram given. |

The behaviorial process in the Aligned+1 WHLPs ranks third in the analysis and constitutes only 1.5% of the data analyzed. The learner is required to involve themselves in physical and cognitive acquisition of knowledge and skills in the task completion. The following lines, the ‘behaviorial’ clauses of which are underlined and the behaviors italicized, manifest the diverseness of psychomotor

operations of learning tasks which support the mastery of the Most Essential Learning Competencies:

- WHLP 12     *YOU Watch* the video about the application of quadratic equation using the given link on page 7.
- WHLP 13     Panuorin [*YOU Watch*] ang video na may kaugnayan sa prevention and mitigation.  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a=gUcTWEvwc>  
 Maghanap [*YOU Look for*] ng balita tungkol sa isang kalamidad na naranasan sa inyong pamayanan.

The verbal process in the Aligned+1 corpus constitutes only 0.5% of the data analyzed. The learner is required to express ideas verbally or communicate thoughts in the task completion. The learning task in WHLP 3, the ‘verbal’ clause of which is underlined and the sayer italicized, manifests the verbal operation of an activity which supports the mastery of the Most Essential Learning Competency: “*YOU Recite* the poem loudly by recording your performance...”

The diverseness and specificity of actions and operations in the Aligned+1 WHLPs is evident in contrast to the predominance of the generic material process “answer” and mental process “read” in the first edition of WHLPs. Compared to the explicit operations, the generic process, as in the material process “answer”, is open to interpretation and misunderstanding; it does not direct a specific behavior or provide details of *that* behavior that learners are expected to perform or observe. The teachers’ report that the graded tasks specified to be performed were not accomplished can also be linked to the vagueness of imperatives. The concern indicates the impact of the teachers’ language use in the communication of predetermined knowledge and instituted activities; the language use either reinforces or impedes student learning. The examination of the “abstraction” of the actions or the comprehensibility and fruition of instructions allows

teachers to adjust and modify the difficulty of an action, operation, or process (reflected in the learning task) in order to support the learners' mastery of the Most Essential Learning Competencies and cater the learning profile and learning context of the students.

The teachers' "abstraction" of the learning tasks demonstrates Shayer's (2003, cited by Hattie, 2012) cognitive acceleration in lesson preparation: the assessment of the learners' range of mental levels and the level of cognitive demand of each of the learning task reinforces the teachers' lesson planning and intervention designed to obtain fruitful results. Furthermore, the diverseness and specificity of actions and operations in the Aligned+1 WHLPs reflect the use of the three domains of behavioral objectives – cognitive domain, affective domain, (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) and psychomotor domain (Dave, 1975, cited by Latifa, 2016).

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: The Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Plans promoted balanced learning and supported holistic learning of students at the grammatical level. The Aligned+1 WHLPs advocated knowledge acquisition (content instruction) not just in didactic discussion but also in hands-on activities and experiences. The Aligned+1 WHLPs also sought to engage the different aspects of the learner: physical, cognitive, social, and affective.

Based on the limitations of the study and the aforementioned reflection, the following recommendations were drawn: The Aligned+1 Framework may be adopted in Weekly Home Learning Planning to produce comprehensive and functional learning guides. In connection to the adoption of the Aligned+1 Framework, the institutionalized guidelines in Weekly Home Learning Planning may be revisited and elaborated (at least at the division-level).



### Teachers' Perceptions of Weekly Home Learning Planning

The analysis of the teachers' perceptions of the Weekly Home Learning Planning in the Modular Distance Learning extracted themes which relate to their approaches in the said task. From the teacher-participants' viewpoints before exposure to Aligned+1 Framework, there are two (2) themes which emerged: (a) conformity to directives and (b) challenge on the assessment literacy; after exposure to Aligned+1 Framework, three (3) themes emerged: (c) multifaceted evaluation, (d) critical examination of legitimate curriculum, and (e) challenge on the lexico-grammatical competence.

#### **Conformity to directives**

The first theme, conformity to directives, points out the teachers' observance to instituted directives (memorandum) in the construction of WHLPs. There is clear evidence that the teachers regarded the guidelines set by the DepEd as nonnegotiable. Teacher-Participant Jab's explicit note exemplifies the teachers' observance to instituted directives: "base[d] on the DepEd format that shows time frame, competencies as well as the activities..."

The composition of WHLPs which revolved on MELCs Alignment and SLM Referral is reflected in Teacher-Participant Sam's usage of the Curriculum Guide: "I used MELC[s] as basis in selecting learning activities..." and Teacher-Participant Sub's scanning of SLMs: "I go over the modules and... see to it that the activities are doable..." The teachers' Weekly Home Learning Planning before exposure to Aligned+1 Framework entails simple conformity to the 'minimum' requirement in learning planning; however, the initiation of one's ingenuity in learning planning to upgrade the student's guide is nonexistent.

### **Challenge on the assessment literacy**

The second theme, challenge on the assessment literacy, speaks of the difficulty the teachers encountered in constructing WHLPs. The teachers remarked that assessing the alignment of the learning tasks to the MELCs is difficult. Teacher-Participant Sam shared her problem in “identifying learning activities fitted to the MELC...” especially when she “...could not understand how to make WHLP.” Teacher-Participant Midj also raised a similar concern, “What are the competencies to fit in the week?” Teacher-Participant Jab even contended that some tasks are “...not applicable this time of pandemic specially on the aspects of listening, oral language and fluency.” Teacher-Participant Cory also reported that there are activities in the modules which “did not fit... the learning competencies.” Worse, Teacher-Participant Triumph claimed that there are “too many irrelevant activities.” These encounters demonstrate the teachers’ evaluation on the appropriateness of assessment types along with their application, benefits, and limitations. The reflection that the teachers underwent indicates that Weekly Home Learning Planning is a test of the teachers’ classroom assessment skill and critical understanding of assessment.

The said challenge that the teachers experienced in the conventional Weekly Home Learning Planning is no different to Antari’s (2021) observation of English teachers who also struggled in in their lesson planning, specifically in selecting the type of assessment and assessment techniques based on learning objectives.

### **Multifaceted evaluation**

The third theme which is to be viewed as a vignette of the teachers’ experience in WHLPlanning, multifaceted evaluation,

elaborates the intricate process that the teachers underwent in revising their WHLPs. The teachers' recollection details a step-by-step process in planning. The primary step begins with the instituted MELCs Alignment and SLM Referral as reflected in Teacher-Participant Ban's statement: "You have to review the module first." Teacher-Participant CJ agreed, "You have to revisit the module first." The assessment whether the learning tasks in the SLMs support the mastery of the learning competencies stipulated in the Curriculum Guide is exemplified in these reiterations: "...we check if a learning task in the module is aligned with the MELC" (Teacher-Participant Ina); "...the learning task must be aligned with the learning competency" (Teacher-Participant Gel); "Check if all the activities are aligned to the MELCs" (Teacher-Participant CJ). These accounts all pertain to the complete enumeration of the learning tasks in the SLMs.

Moving from the conventional planning, the teachers proceeded to the examination of instruction specifics, that is, whether a learning task is intended for content instruction or task instruction. The emphasis of input is manifested in this line: "You have to think whether the activity is content or task" (Teacher-Participant Ryan). Teacher-Participant Ina contended that the step aims to "balance" what the learners need to know and what they need to accomplish given what they know. Another step taken in the planning is the lexico-grammatical modification of imperatives. At this point, the teachers reworded the verbs of the imperatives in an attempt to simplify the terms which are comprehensible at the student's cognitive level. Some of the responses which observe the modification are as follow: "You have to search for a synonym in revising an instruction to fit the task's purpose" (Teacher-Participant Cess); "The instruction must be simplified" (Teacher-Participant Ona); "The task must be more specific and appropriate to the student's level" (Teacher-

Participant Ryan); “Pick simple verbs to use” (Teacher-Participant Triumph).

Teacher-Participant Ina described the learning planning “kuti” and Teacher-Participant Ryan labeled the process “lisod”, vernaculars which translate to “complex.” There is a shift from the teachers’ simple conformity to the ‘minimum’ requirement in learning planning to the functional analysis of imperatives. The teachers regarded Weekly Home Learning Planning as a multifaceted evaluation of instructions which goes beyond the MELCs Alignment and SLM Referral.

### **Critical examination of legitimate curriculum**

The fourth theme, critical examination of legitimate curriculum, relates to the teachers’ classroom assessment skill and critical understanding of assessment. The lexico-grammatical modification of imperatives in an attempt to simplify the terms for student comprehensibility is evident in the diverseness of cognitive operation in the Aligned+1 WHLPs which is linked to the rewording of the material process “answer” to more specific actions entailing mental processes compared to the predominance of the material process in the first edition of WHLPs.

As far as critical understanding of assessment is concerned, Teacher-Participant Cess saw the need of modification in some tasks, “You have to search for a synonym in revising an instruction to fit the task’s purpose.” Teacher-Participant Ban gave an example, “I had a hard time distinguishing which term is more appropriate, recall or recollect?” Teacher-Participant Ryan shared her realization, “I found activities which can be omitted.” In contrast, Teacher-Participant Triumph suggested, “We can also see that we can add more appropriate activities compared to those found in the SLMs.”

Others retained a number of imperatives after their evaluation. Teacher-Participant Drake “did not revise any task...” She claimed that “the instructions in our modules for Grade 7... are quite easy for them...”

These initiatives reflect the critical examination of legitimate curriculum; the teachers examine the curriculum (content and task instructions), decide the appropriateness of the assessment, and implement necessary adjustments – to retain, revise, or discard instructions – to supplement the teaching-learning process. The significant role of the teachers’ involvement in the curriculum is exemplified in Teacher-Participant Drake’s point of view: “As a teacher, it is your task to look for another term with the same meaning... students... understand.” Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Planning provided the teachers the avenue to actively situate themselves in the curriculum and inject their principles for a better result.

### **Challenge on the lexico-grammatical competence**

The last theme, challenge on the lexico-grammatical competence, unveils a shift of difficulty in Weekly Home Learning Planning from a pedagogical perspective on assessment literacy to a lexico-grammatical level. The simplification of imperatives to cater student’s cognitive level posed a challenge to the teachers. The teachers claimed that this initiative is difficult: “It is difficult to reconstruct a learning task” (Teacher-Participant Cess); “There is a difficulty in the revision since I am not an English major” (Teacher-Participant Cory); “I had a hard time distinguishing which term is more appropriate, recall or recollect?” (Teacher-Participant Ban) “I really had a hard time comparing instructions...” (Teacher-Participant Ryan); “...language [use is a] barrier” (Teacher-Participant Ona); “I had

difficulty in classifying the abstraction of the verb... If a learner is asked to 'perform', is it material or mental?" (Teacher-Participant Mal).

The teachers' acknowledgment of the level of their grammatical competence shows that Weekly Home Learning Planning is a test of language use. Despite the complexity of the undertaking, the teachers recognized the significance of the lexico-grammatical abstraction for student learning. The teachers associated the WHLP with "comprehensive guide" (Teacher-Participant Triumph), "clear... instruction" (Teacher-Participant Ina), "detailed instruction" (Teacher-Participant Cess and Teacher-Participant AM), and "comprehensive" tool (Teacher-Participant Gel).

The teachers' perceptions of Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Planning as multifaceted evaluation, critical examination of legitimate curriculum, and significant challenge on their lexico-grammatical competence are manifestations of "expert teachers" who, according to Hattie (2012, p.25), "make lessons uniquely their own by changing, combining, and adding to the lessons according to their students' needs and their own teaching goals" and demonstrate self-awareness and self-reflection of their practices.

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Planning empowered the teachers to become critical thinkers. Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Planning provided the teachers the opportunity to test their critical thinking skills which impact student learning positively or negatively.

Based on the limitations of the study and the aforementioned reflection, a recommendation was drawn: The Aligned+1 Framework may be adapted as a teacher's reflective journal which justifies their preferences and initiatives in writing learning guides and/or lesson plans. In connection to the adaptation of the Aligned+1 Framework as a teacher's reflective journal in lesson planning, intensive technical

workshops (even at the school-level) must be conducted regardless of the complexity of an activity (i.e. Weekly Home Learning Planning, Lesson Planning, etc.).

## ACTION PLAN

KEY RESULT/ AREAS/OBJECTIVES	TARGET	STRATEGIES (Programs/Projects)	TIME FRAME	PERSONS INVOLVED	FUNDING SOURCES	EXPECTED OUTCOMES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present the result of the study on Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Planning of teachers;</li> </ul>	Provide transparent update on the improvement of teachers in Weekly Home Learning Planning.	Conduct of conference (online or face-to-face); Circulation of hard and/or soft copies of the findings	January 2022	School Head, School Learning Action Cell Coordinator, Research Proponent, Teachers		Feedback and suggestions from School Head and teachers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct gap analysis specifically in the Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Planning of teachers;</li> </ul>	Obtain objective evaluation on the strengths and shortcomings of the Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Plans.	Gap Analysis of the Teachers' Weekly Home Learning Planning (Floating of Questionnaire, One-on-one Interview, Focused-group Discussion)	January 2022	School Head, School Learning Action Cell Coordinator, Research Proponent, Teachers		Consent and participation in the gap analysis; Qualitative data on the teachers' experiences in and perceptions on Aligned+1 WHLPlanning, Transcriptions of the recorded interview



KEY RESULT/ AREAS/OBJECTIVES	TARGET	STRATEGIES (Programs/Projects)	TIME FRAME	PERSONS INVOLVED	FUNDING SOURCES	EXPECTED OUTCOMES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify the features of the Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Plans constructed by the teachers in terms of instructional imperativeness and instructional abstraction;</li> </ul>	Obtain objective evaluation on the strengths and shortcomings of the Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Plans.	Discourse Analysis of the Weekly Home Learning Plans	January 2022	Research Proponent, Teachers		Qualitative data on the features of the Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Plans constructed by the teachers in terms of instructional imperativeness and instructional abstraction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reequip teachers the technical knowledge in the Weekly Home Learning Planning using Aligned+1 Framework;</li> </ul>	Produce better versions of Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Plans.	Learning Action Cell (LAC) or Conduct of Seminar-Workshop	February 2022	School Head, School Learning Action Cell Coordinator, Research Proponent, Teachers	MOOE	Revised Aligned+1 Weekly Home Learning Plans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate the usefulness of Aligned+1 Framework in Weekly Home Learning</li> </ul>	Improve the serviceability of the framework.	Conduct of conference (online or face-to-face)	February 2022	School Head, PSDS, EPS in English, CID Chief, School	MOOE	Assessment on the serviceability of Aligned+1 Framework; Revised



## REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., & Bloom, B. S. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Ann, F. L. (2017). *Interviewing in social science research: A relational approach*. Routledge.
- Antari, N. L. S. (2021). An analysis of lesson plans for learning English in the senior high school. *Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, 4(1), 81–87.
- Baguio, R. R. (2020, August 4). *Utilization of Weekly Home Learning Plan and Individual Learning Monitoring Plan in the implementation of learning continuity* [Memorandum]. Department of Education, Division of Valencia City.
- Christie, F., & Derewianka, B. (2010). *School discourse: Learning to write across the years of schooling*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Newbury Park: CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Eggins, S. (2005). *An introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Continuum.
- Fielding, M. (2001). Target setting, policy pathology and student perspectives: Learning to labour in new times, in M. Fielding (ed.) *Taking education really seriously: Four years' hard labour*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Gee, J. P. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London, England: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (2006). Is there a role for critical pedagogy in language/culture studies? An interview with Henry A. Giroux. *Language and Intercultural Communication Journal*, 6(2), 163–

175. Retrieved from  
<http://www.henryagiroux.com/RoleOfCritPedagogy.htm>
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- Latifa, I. S. (2016). The analysis of teachers' lesson plan through behavioural objectives theory. In *Ninth International Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 9)*. Atlantis Press.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing translation studies* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Routledge.
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis: An introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Bloomsbury.
- Rodden, J. M. (2014). *Literacy (re) constructed: A critical analysis of textbook and educational policy discourse* (Order No. 3632118). Available from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1566660596). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1566660596/abstract/A068FA1041DC46CBPQ/1?accountid=173015>
- San Antonio, D. M. (2020, July 21). *Suggested strategies in implementing Distance Learning Delivery Modalities (DLDM) for school year 2020–2021* [Memorandum]. Department of Education, Undersecretary for Curriculum and Instruction.