

**USING INQUIRY BASE INSTRUCTION IN ENHANCING
STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN SCIENCE**

A Thesis Presented to
the College of Education
Misamis University
Ozamiz City

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Secondary Education
Major in Science

by

GINO P. SANOY
GRACE A. FLORES

May 2025

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis entitled **“USING INQUIRY-BASED INSTRUCTION IN ENHANCING STUDENTS’ PERFORMANCE IN SCIENCE”** prepared and submitted by **Gino P. Sanoy and Grace A. Flores**, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree **Bachelor of Secondary Education**, major in **Science Education**, has been examined and is recommended for acceptance and approval for oral examination.

JAME S BAZAR, MaEd
Adviser

Approved by the Thesis Committee on Oral Examination with a grade of _____.

GENELYN R. BALUYOS, EdD
Chairman

YUNALYN L. VILLANTES PhD
Member

MAY NOREN D. NANUD
Member

Approved and accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree **Bachelor in Secondary Education** major in **Science**.

Date of Thesis Proposal: February 25, 2025

Date of Oral Defense: May 19, 2025

GENELYN R. BALUYOS, EdD
Dean, College of Education

Date: *May 2025*

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher extends heartfelt gratitude to the following individuals and entities whose support, guidance, and contributions were vital in completing this research endeavor:

The Almighty Father, for the gift of wisdom, strength, and all the blessings bestowed throughout this research journey;

Dr. Genelyn R. Baluyos, Dean of the College of Education and research instructor, for her invaluable guidance, patience, and encouragement in leading the researcher step by step through the process of this study;

Mr. Jame S. Bazar, the research adviser, for his insightful feedback and generous sharing of knowledge, which significantly enriched and refined the study;

Dr. Analyn S. Clarin, Dr. Genelyn R. Baluyos, and Ms. Winlab Jobelle Generalao, for their constructive comments, suggestions, and recommendations during the research final defense

Ms. Myrose Jumawan, the statistician, for her dedication, time, and expertise in the statistical treatment and analysis of the data;

Mrs. Emily C. Cadelina, for graciously permitting the conduct of the intervention in her class and for her support throughout the study;

To the respondents, for their cooperation, time, and willingness to participate in the classes and assessments involved in the research;

DEDICATION

We would like to dedicate this piece of academic work

To our Parents,

Mr & Mrs. Sanoy

Mr & Mrs. Flores

&

Cebedo Family

who has been my great motivators,

for their sacrifices, unconditional love,

and moral support extended to me;

To my fellow researchers' who guided me in this endeavor;

To Misamis University, which provided me with the knowledge

and skills in doing this research;

To the College of education Misamis University faculty

and staff who made my research

study experience worth investing in; and

To all students who sought knowledge and excellence in their education.

Gino and Grace

Abstract

This study evaluated the effectiveness of Inquiry-Based Instruction (IBI) in enhancing college students' science performance and scientific inquiry skills using a one-group pretest-posttest design, revealing statistically significant improvements in both areas after the intervention. The findings highlight the potential of IBI to foster deeper conceptual understanding and engagement, supporting its broader application in science education to promote meaningful, skill-based learning.

Keywords: *Active Learning Strategies, Higher-Order Thinking Skills, Science Achievement.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE	i
APPROVAL SHEET	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURE	ix

Burt of Appaldus

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.	1
Theoretical Framework	5
Conceptual Framework	6
Schematic Diagram of the Study	8
Objectives of the study	9
Significance of the study	9
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
Research Design	10
Research Setting	10
Respondents of the Study.	11

Research Instruments		.11
Data Gathering Procedure		.14
Ethical Considerations		.15
Data Analysis		.16

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Learners Performance Before the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction		.17
Learners Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills Before the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction.		.18
Learners Performance After the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction		.20
Learners Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills After the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction.		. 22
Significant Difference Between Learners Performance Before and After the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction		.24
Significant Difference Between Students' Learners Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills Before and After the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction.		.26

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS29-32

REFERENCES 33-34

APPENDICES

Appendix A Inquiry Based Assessment		.35
Appendix B Lesson Plan		.49
Appendix C Learner's Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills Questionnaire		.61
Appendix D Sample of Filled out Questionnaire		.63
Appendix E Sampling Computation		.71

Appendix F Inform Consent Form	.	.	.	.	.72
Appendix G Approval Letter of Consent	.	.	.	.	.73
Appendix H Statistical Computation	.	.	.	.	.74
Appendix I Documantation	.	.	.	.	.78
CURRICULUM VITAE	.	.	.	.	.79-80

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Learners Performance Before the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction	.22
2. Learners Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills Before the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction. . . .	.23
3. Learners Performance After the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction	.25
4. Learners Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills After the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction. . . .	. 27
5. Significant Difference Between Learners Performance Before and After the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction	.29
6. Significant Difference Between Students' Learners Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills Before and After the Implementation of Inquiry Based-Instruction. . . .	.31

LIST OF FIGURE

Figure		Page
1	Schematic Diagram of the Study	11

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

An overview of the state of science education in the Philippines is provided in this paper. This also includes the government's mandates and efforts to maintain its science education program in light of the 21st century's changes. The Philippines' science curriculum was put in place to create scientifically literate people who can make responsible decisions and use scientific knowledge to solve community issues. However, among participating nations where science was one of the disciplines assessed, the Philippines came in last in the most recent results of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2018 (De La Cruz, 2022).

Instead of having students learn science directly from teachers, inquiry-based science instruction helps them learn science indirectly by having them carry out their own scientific investigations (Jerrim et al., 2022). It has been said that one of the most effective ways to teach science is through inquiry-based learning (García-Carmona, 2020). Students have been encouraged to learn science through the use of inquiry method. For student-centered inquiry instruction to be successfully implemented in the classroom, teachers' formative assessment practices must be developed (Correia & Harrison, 2020).

Research skills and scientific knowledge construction are made possible by the application of the inquiry-based educational strategy. This method, when combined with good teaching techniques, makes science more approachable by enabling the modeling of theories and laws in the actual world. Teaching science has a propensity to employ constructivism teaching approaches, have high standards based on evidence, and use scientific reasoning to attain learning. It is stressed that teachers must receive ongoing

training in order to comprehend scientific knowledge and become proficient in open inquiry implementation techniques (Urdanivia et al., 2023).

Creating effective learning materials based on the inquiry learning model and incorporating scientific literacy has become a popular approach in education to promote active learning. Developing critical thinking skills is essential for helping students gain the competencies needed for problem-solving and discovery in science education (Sutiani, 2021). Inquiry-based science education has been shown to have positive effects on students' attitudes or self-efficacy, teaching proficiency, and scientific comprehension (Strat et al., 2024). Students' scientific process abilities, including problem definition, hypothesis formulation, observation, and interpretation, were enhanced via inquiry-based learning activities. Furthermore, students' abilities to use scientific terminology, create understandable scientific illustrations, and provide scientific justifications increased (Mutlu, 2020).

Addressed inadequate science proficiency brought on by poor educational methods. After employing inquiry-based materials, students' integrated science process abilities significantly improved. Students' comprehension and performance in science are successfully improved by inquiry-based tools (Ederon & Aliazas, 2024). By empowering students to take control of their education and encouraging active inquiry, critical thinking, and problem-solving, inquiry-based science teaching transforms conventional classroom settings. This method fosters a lifetime love of research and advances scientific understanding (Guerrero & Bautista, 2023). It is essential to exhibit higher order thinking abilities in order to succeed in a complicated, ambiguous, unpredictable, and volatile environment. Inquiry-based learning is becoming more widely acknowledged

as a powerful strategy for fostering students' higher-order thinking abilities in science classes. To improve their teaching methods and help students develop their higher-order thinking abilities, science instructors are also urged to adopt inquiry-based approaches (Antonio & Prudente, 2024).

Students' attitudes toward science were more positively predicted by inquiry-based teaching methods than by teacher-directed methods. Contrary to the widely held notion that inquiry-based science instructional techniques enhance student science achievement, there is an adverse relationship between inquiry-based science instructional practices and science achievement (Liou, 2021). The way that students view science courses, particularly chemistry, has been ascribed to the application of inquiry-based education. The students' academic success is significantly predicted by attitudes (Nzomo et al., 2023). The possibilities of inquiry-based teaching as an effective teaching strategy to encourage science learning. This method, which highlights compared to conventional approaches, student-centered exploration and discovery seems to promote a deeper comprehension of scientific concepts. Incorporating inquiry-based methods into scientific curricula have the power to dramatically raise student engagement and achievement (Edillor, 2024).

An appeal for students to comprehend more deeply so that they are able to comprehend and apply what they've learned to real-world scenarios has had an impact on science education in the Philippines. Teachers, educators, and legislators have responded by adopting contextualization as a constructivist method for establishing a connection between ideas and actual experiences (Picardal & Sanchez, 2022). Students with varying levels of academic success in science might benefit from a guided inquiry learning

environment by being encouraged to participate fully in science inquiry (Wen et al., 2020). This study aims to determine the effectiveness of using inquiry-based instruction in improving students' performance and scientific inquiry skills in science. It focuses on measuring students' learning before and after the implementation of this teaching approach. The researchers believe that applying inquiry-based learning allows students to explore, investigate, and discover scientific concepts on their own, which may result in better understanding and retention of knowledge. This approach is also expected to strengthen students' critical thinking, problem-solving abilities, and engagement in science-related activities.

Inquiry-based instruction has been widely studied for its impact on science learning, student engagement, and the development of critical thinking skills. However, most previous studies have focused on general educational settings or were conducted outside the Philippine context. There is a noticeable lack of localized research that explores how inquiry-based instruction directly affects students' performance and scientific inquiry skills within the Philippine basic education curriculum. Additionally, limited attention has been given to how this approach can address the declining science proficiency among Filipino students as shown in international assessments like PISA. Hence, this study fills a crucial gap by providing empirical evidence on the use of inquiry-based instruction in improving the science performance of Filipino learners, particularly in secondary schools. This unexplored area has drawn growing interest due to recent shifts in educational priorities, making it relevant for further investigation (Miles, 2017).

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on three foundational learning theories: the Constructivist Learning Theory by Jean Piaget (1952) and Lev Vygotsky (1978), the Discovery Learning Theory by Jerome Bruner (1961), and the Experiential Learning Theory by David Kolb (1984).

Piaget and Vygotsky emphasized that learners actively construct knowledge through interaction with their environment and social context. This constructivist approach underlies the shift in Philippine science education from rote memorization to deeper understanding and contextualized learning, especially in response to the nation's poor performance in international assessments like PISA 2018 (De La Cruz, 2022). In this context, inquiry-based instruction emerges as a student-centered approach that allows learners to explore and make sense of scientific concepts independently (Jerrim, 2022).

The implementation of inquiry-based teaching also aligns with Bruner's Discovery Learning Theory, which asserts that students learn more effectively when they discover knowledge for themselves through guided activities and problem-solving. This method fosters scientific reasoning and critical thinking, particularly when supported by well-designed instructional strategies and teacher guidance (García-Carmona, 2020; Correia, 2020).

Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory, which outlines a cycle of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation, further supports the inquiry-based approach. In inquiry-based classrooms, students engage in hands-on investigations, reflect on their observations, derive scientific concepts, and apply them to real-world scenarios—consistent with Kolb's model of deep learning (Urdanivia, 2023). Studies have shown that inquiry-based instruction improves students'

scientific process skills, such as hypothesis formulation and data interpretation (Mutlu, 2020), enhances scientific comprehension and academic performance (Ederon & Aliazas, 2024), and fosters higher-order thinking skills necessary in today's complex world (Antonio & Prudente, 2024). It positively shapes student attitudes toward science (Nzomo, 2023) and increases engagement, especially when instruction is contextualized and aligned with students' lived experiences (Picardal & Sanchez, 2022).

Despite these advantages, there remains a gap in localized research that examines the direct effects of inquiry-based instruction on Filipino students' performance and inquiry skills in science. Thus, this study aims to determine the effectiveness of using inquiry-based instruction in improving learners' understanding and competence in scientific inquiry. Rooted in constructivist, discovery, and experiential learning theories, the study hypothesizes that such an approach fosters active exploration, critical thinking, and meaningful knowledge retention—key goals of science education in the 21st century.

Conceptual Framework

The present study is grounded on the growing need to reform science education in the Philippines, as revealed by the country's poor performance in international assessments like PISA 2018 (De La Cruz, 2022). This underperformance is largely attributed to traditional, teacher-centered methods that limit student engagement and critical thinking. Drawing from the constructivist learning theory, inquiry-based instruction (IBI) positions learners as active participants who construct knowledge through exploration and investigation (García-Carmona, 2020; Urdanivia et al., 2023). Instead of passively receiving information, students are encouraged to ask questions,

formulate hypotheses, carry out experiments, and draw conclusions (Jerrim et al., 2022; Mutlu, 2020). This active process develops their scientific inquiry skills—such as observation, interpretation, and evidence-based reasoning—and nurtures critical and higher-order thinking abilities (Sutiani, 2021; Antonio & Prudente, 2024).

Studies suggest that when properly implemented, IBI improves science performance, fosters scientific attitudes, and increases student engagement (Ederon & Aliazas, 2024; Strat et al., 2024; Guerrero & Bautista, 2023). However, localized evidence, particularly in the Philippine secondary education context, remains limited (Miles, 2017). The contextualization of science content and adoption of inquiry-driven activities could address existing gaps and promote deeper learning, especially when aligned with national curriculum reforms (Picardal & Sanchez, 2022). This study investigates the effectiveness of inquiry-based instruction in enhancing science performance and scientific inquiry skills among college students in the Philippines.




Fig. 1. Schematic Diagram of the Study

Statement of the Problem

This study investigated the effectiveness of inquiry-based instruction (IBI) in enhancing students' science performance during the second semester of the 2024–2025 academic year. This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the learners' performance before the implementation of inquiry-based instruction?
2. What is the learners' level of scientific inquiry skills before the implementation of inquiry-based instruction?
3. What is the learners' performance after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction?
4. What is the learners' level of scientific inquiry skills after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction?
5. Is there a significant difference between the learners' performance in science before and after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction?
6. Is there a significant difference between the learners' level of scientific inquiry skills before and after the implementation of Inquiry based instruction?

Null Hypotheses

Ho: There is no significant difference between using inquiry-based instructions enhancing students' performance in science

Ha: There is a significant difference between using inquiry-based instructions enhancing students' performance in science

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This quantitative approach used a one-group pretest-posttest design to assess the effectiveness of Inquiry-Based Instruction (IBI) on the academic performance of students taking a science-related course. This pre-experimental approach introduced an intervention or manipulation of the independent variable, analyzed a group of respondents by means of a pretest, and subsequently evaluated the outcomes by means of a posttest (Marcos et al., 2024).

In this study, 25 students taking a science-related course were tested using a one-group pretest-posttest design. This method enabled the assessment of learning improvements within the same group. This design assessed whether Inquiry-Based Instruction effectively improved students' scientific reasoning, problem-solving, and scientific inquiry skills by comparing pretest and posttest results.

Research Setting

This study was conducted at one of the higher education institutions in Ozamiz City, Misamis Occidental, known for its comprehensive educational programs from early childhood to senior high school. The setting aligned with the science curriculum and offered a diverse student sample. With specialized tracks like STEM and HUMSS, the institution prepared students for higher education and the workforce. Its commitment to quality education and openness to innovative teaching methods, such as inquiry-based

instruction, made it an ideal setting for assessing the impact on student performance through pre- and post-testing. The College of Education program was selected for data collection, as future educators were developing critical thinking and higher-order thinking skills, making them ideal for assessing the effectiveness of these methods.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of this study were 25 students enrolled in a science-related course at one of the higher education institutions in Ozamiz City, Misamis Occidental. They were chosen using purposive non-random sampling. They were selected based on specific criteria to ensure the validity of the results. The selection criteria included the following: students must have been currently enrolled in a subject where Inquiry-Based Instruction (IBI) could be implemented; they must have been available to take both the pretest and post-test; and they must have had regular attendance in class to ensure consistent exposure to the intervention. Respondents must agree and sign the informed consent form and be available for surveys, interviews, or other data collection methods during the research period.

Research Instrument

This study used the following questionnaire as the data-gathering instrument:

A. Inquiry-Based Learning Assessment (Appendix A)

The researcher-designed Inquiry-Based Learning (IBL) Assessment, embedded within the lesson plan, measured students' academic performance and engagement in an inquiry-based learning environment over a span of four sessions. Each 60-minute session

consisted of a 10-minute pretest, a 40-minute student-led investigation and discussion, and ended with a 10-minute posttest to track learning progress.

The IBL Assessment focused on key scientific and mathematical concepts aligned with the curriculum, covering topics such as scientific inquiry, hypothesis testing, experimental design, data analysis, and problem-solving strategies. Each test session consisted of application-based and conceptual questions, scored on a 30-point scale.

The content validity, construct validity, and reliability of the IBL assessment were established through expert validation, pilot testing, and statistical analysis, including Cronbach's alpha. Subject matter experts and experienced educators reviewed the test items to ensure alignment with the learning competencies and inquiry-based pedagogy. The instrument also underwent student and teacher feedback to confirm clarity and relevance.

To determine students' academic performance, the study uses the following scale

Scale	Interpretation
47-50	Outstanding
44-46	Very Satisfactory
42-43	Satisfactory
40-41	Fairly
38-39	Poor
37 and below	Very Poor

B. Lesson plan (Appendix B). In this study, Inquiry-Based Instruction (IBI) was integrated into the science curriculum with an emphasis on scientific inquiry, experimental design, and data analysis. Each of the four sessions began with a pretest to assess students' prior knowledge, followed by a teacher-guided inquiry activity in which students explored scientific concepts through hands-on experiments and problem-solving

tasks. After each activity, a posttest was administered to evaluate learning gains and the impact of IBI on students' scientific reasoning and critical thinking skills. The study compared pretest and posttest scores to determine the effectiveness of IBI in enhancing students' abilities to analyze data, formulate hypotheses, and apply scientific concepts to real-world scenarios over a four-week period.

C. Learners' Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills (Appendix C), a researcher-made instrument, was designed to assess students' level of scientific inquiry skills using a 4-point Likert scale, with responses scored as (4) Always, (3) Often, (2) Sometimes, and (1) Never. The instrument comprised 25 items, grouped into five constructs: Defining Problems (5 items), Carrying Out Investigations (5 items), Analyzing Data (5 items), Constructing Explanations (5 items), and Communicating Findings (5 items). This questionnaire was relevant to the study as it specifically targeted the learners' scientific inquiry skills in science. It was administered as both a pre-assessment (before the intervention) and a post-assessment (after the completion of the sessions) to measure changes in inquiry skills as a result of the Inquiry-Based Assessment (IBA) intervention. To determine the learners' level of critical thinking skills toward the implementation of problem-based assessment, the study used the following continuum:

Responses	Continuum	Interpretation
4-Always	3.25-4.0	Very Good
3-Often	2.5-3.24	Good
2-Sometimes	1.75-2.49	Poor
1-Never	1.0-1.74	Very Poor

Data Gathering Procedure

Before the data collection process, the researcher obtained formal approval from the Dean of the College of Education. After institutional approvals, informed consent forms were distributed. The study was conducted with the College of Nursing students to examine the impact of Inquiry-Based Learning (IBL) on their academic performance. The data collection spanned one month and consisted of four sessions. Each session followed a structured quantitative assessment process to measure students' performance improvements. At the beginning of the study, a researcher-made pretest was administered to assess students' baseline knowledge of the selected topics in science. The pretest consisted of 50 multiple-choice questions, aligned with the curriculum and validated by subject matter experts.

During the intervention, each session began with a 10-minute pretest, followed by a 40-minute inquiry-based learning activity, and concluded with a 10-minute quiz. The posttest, like the pretest, contained concept-based multiple-choice questions that directly measured knowledge acquisition from the session. While the format remained consistent, the test content varied according to the lesson topic. To further assess the effectiveness of Inquiry-Based Learning, a 25-item Likert-scale survey questionnaire was administered before and after the study. The survey measured students' critical thinking skills, problem-solving abilities, and engagement. Responses were recorded on a 4-point scale, with options ranging from (4) Always to (1) Never.

To ensure the reliability and validity of the data collection instruments, the pretest and posttest underwent pilot testing, and internal consistency was measured using Cronbach's Alpha. After the final session, descriptive and inferential statistical analyses

were conducted, including paired t-tests to compare pretest and posttest scores and determine the effectiveness of Inquiry-Based Learning. The Likert-scale responses were analyzed using mean scores and standard deviation to identify significant changes in student engagement and problem-solving skills.

Ethical Considerations

Prior to conducting the study, the researcher ensured that all ethical concerns were addressed to protect the participants' rights and well-being, ensuring adherence to ethical guidelines for research involving human participants. The study adhered to Kang's (2021) principles as well as the ethical standards established by Republic Act No. 10173 (Data Privacy Act of 2012) to protect participant privacy and prevent any potential risks associated with the study. To maintain ethical integrity, strict informed consent and assent procedures were implemented prior to data collection. All participants were fully informed of the study's purpose, procedures, potential risks, and benefits.

Participation in the study was entirely voluntary, and respondents were allowed to withdraw at any time without penalty. The study also adhered to the principles of confidentiality and anonymity by ensuring that all collected data were free of identifiable information. Data were securely stored, with access restricted to authorized researchers only. All findings were reported in aggregate form, so that individual responses could not be linked to specific participants. Furthermore, to maintain research integrity, the researcher strictly followed the principles of nonmaleficence, beneficence, and justice. The ethical measures used in this study were designed to protect participants' rights, privacy, and dignity while also ensuring the credibility and integrity of the research.

Data Analysis

This study used Jamovi, a statistical software, to analyze the quantitative data collected. The following statistical tools were used to effectively interpret the results:

Frequency and percentage were used to compare the performance of students before and after the Inquiry-Based Instruction (IBI) intervention. The study identified changes in students' performance and evaluated the intervention's impact by calculating the frequency and percentage distribution of scores.

Mean and standard deviation were used to assess the central tendency and variability of learners' scores on both the pretest and posttest. The mean revealed overall performance improvements in science-related subjects and scientific inquiry skills, whereas the standard deviation demonstrated the consistency of student responses across assessments.

A paired t-test was used to compare pretest and posttest scores and determine the statistical significance of changes in students' scientific reasoning, critical thinking, and conceptual understanding. This test determined whether Inquiry-Based Instruction had a significant impact on student learning outcomes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Learners' Performance Before the Implementation of Inquiry-Based

Instruction.

Table 1 presents the performance levels of the participants based on the predefined scale. The overall performance score was categorized as very poor ($M = 22.40$), indicating that participants, on average, performed well below the satisfactory threshold. Notably, the entire sample of respondents ($n = 25$, 100%) fell under the very poor performance category, highlighting a uniform trend of low performance across all individuals assessed.

Table 1.

Learners' Performance Before the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Performance	Frequency	Percentage
Very Poor	25	100
Overall Performance	22.40	

Note: Scale: 47-50 (Outstanding); 44-46 (Very Satisfactory); 42-43 (Satisfactory); 40-41 (Fair); 38-39 (Poor); 37 and below (Very Poor)

The data reveal a concerning uniformity in the performance levels of the participants, with all scoring within the *very poor* category. The mean score ($M = 22.40$) is significantly lower than the minimum threshold for the *poor* category (38), suggesting not just marginal underperformance but a substantial gap from the expected competencies. Such results may reflect systemic issues in instructional delivery, student engagement, or understanding of the subject matter. The lack of variance in the scores (100% in one

category) could also imply that external factors influencing performance—such as teaching strategies, access to resources, or assessment alignment—are uniformly affecting all students in a negative manner.

The findings suggest a critical need for immediate intervention by school administrators, curriculum developers, and teaching personnel. Given the uniformly poor performance, targeted activities should be implemented to bridge learning gaps. These could include remedial classes, individualized learning plans, and more engaging, inquiry-based teaching strategies. Regular formative assessments should also be administered to monitor progress and inform instruction. Professional development for teachers focused on differentiated instruction and effective assessment design may also help enhance student performance. Overall, a collaborative and responsive approach is necessary to improve learning outcomes and prevent long-term academic failure among students.

Learners' Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills Before the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Table 2 presents the learners' level of scientific inquiry skills before the implementation of inquiry-based instruction. The overall mean score ($M = 2.3536$, $SD = 0.2635$) indicates a low level of scientific inquiry skills among the learners. Among the five indicators, the highest mean score was recorded in Planning and Carrying Out Investigations ($M = 2.7440$, $SD = 0.2973$), though still within the low category. This was followed by Constructing Explanations ($M = 2.4400$, $SD = 0.3055$), Asking Questions and Defining Problems ($M = 2.2800$, $SD = 0.2236$), Communicating Findings ($M =$

2.1840, SD = 0.2996), and the lowest in Collecting and Analyzing Data (M = 2.1200, SD = 0.1915).

Table 2.

Learners' Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills Before the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Variables	Mean	SD	Remarks
Asking Questions and Defining Problems	2.28	0.22	Low
Planning and Carrying Out Investigations	2.74	0.39	Low
Collecting and Analyzing Data	2.12	0.19	Low
Constructing Explanations	2.44	0.31	Low
Communicating Findings	2.18	0.30	Low
Overall	2.35	0.26	Low

Note: Scale: 3.25-4.00 (Very High); 2.5-3.24 (High); 1.75-2.49 (Low); 1.0-1.74 (Very Low)

The data reveal that students generally struggled with various components of scientific inquiry prior to the application of inquiry-based instruction. While Planning and Carrying Out Investigations had the relatively highest mean, the skill still did not reach the high category, suggesting limited ability in designing and executing scientific procedures independently. Constructing Explanations fared similarly, which may imply that while learners could begin formulating interpretations, they likely lacked depth and accuracy in doing so. Particularly low scores in Collecting and Analyzing Data and Communicating Findings highlight key weaknesses in the scientific process—namely, the ability to draw insights from data and effectively present results. This under-performance suggests a fragmented understanding of the scientific method, where learners might engage in inquiry superficially without internalizing critical steps.

These findings call for deliberate efforts by science educators and curriculum planners to enhance students' scientific inquiry skills. Teachers should adopt structured, inquiry-based learning strategies that immerse learners in hands-on experimentation, problem-solving, and critical thinking. Specific interventions may include scaffolded laboratory activities that focus on data analysis and interpretation, as well as reflective tasks such as science journaling and peer presentations to improve communication of findings. Additionally, professional development should be provided to equip teachers with techniques to foster question-driven learning environments. By addressing these specific skill gaps, science instruction can better support the development of scientifically literate students capable of meaningful engagement with real-world problems.

Learners' Performance After the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Table 3 presents the learners' performance after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction. The overall mean score ($M = 46.08$) falls under the outstanding category, indicating a substantial improvement in learner performance. The majority of students ($n = 13$, 52.00%) achieved an outstanding rating, followed by those rated as satisfactory ($n = 8$, 32.00%). A smaller proportion of learners fell under the fair ($n = 2$, 8.00%) and poor ($n = 2$, 8.00%) categories. Notably, no learner was categorized as very poor, which marks a significant shift from the previous performance data.

Table 3.

Learners' Performance After the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Performance	Frequency	Percentage
Outstanding	13	52.00

Satisfactory	8	32.00
Fair	2	8.00
Poor	2	8.00
Overall Performance	46.08	Outstanding

Note: Scale: 47-50 (Outstanding); 44-46 (Very Satisfactory); 42-43 (Satisfactory); 40-41 (Fair); 38-39 (Poor); 37 and below (Very Poor)

The results demonstrate a marked improvement in learners' performance following the application of inquiry-based instruction. A shift from 100% of students rated as very poor in the previous assessment to over half attaining an outstanding rating signifies not only academic progress but also the effectiveness of the instructional strategy. The increase in the number of learners achieving satisfactory and higher categories suggests that inquiry-based learning promoted active engagement, critical thinking, and conceptual understanding. However, the presence of students in the fair and poor categories (16.00% combined) indicates that some learners may still require additional support or that differentiated instruction was not fully optimized during implementation.

The significant improvement in learners' performance implies that inquiry-based instruction can serve as a powerful pedagogical tool in enhancing student learning outcomes in science. School administrators and curriculum developers should consider adopting this approach as a core component of science instruction. To address the remaining performance gaps, educators should implement support mechanisms such as peer mentoring, targeted remediation, and scaffolded learning activities for students still struggling. Moreover, continuous professional development programs focused on inquiry-based methods should be provided to teachers to sustain and further improve

these gains. Monitoring and evaluating student progress through formative assessments can help ensure that all learners benefit equitably from this instructional approach.

Learners' Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills After the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Table 4 presents the learners' level of scientific inquiry skills after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction. The overall mean score ($M = 3.1696$, $SD = 0.2282$) indicates a high level of scientific inquiry skills among learners. Among the five skill areas, the highest mean was in Planning and Carrying Out Investigations ($M = 3.3520$, $SD = 0.2330$), followed by Constructing Explanations ($M = 3.2880$, $SD = 0.2651$), both of which were rated as very high. The remaining skills—Asking Questions and Defining Problems ($M = 3.2480$, $SD = 0.2104$), Collecting and Analyzing Data ($M = 3.0480$, $SD = 0.1939$), and Communicating Findings ($M = 2.9120$, $SD = 0.2386$)—were all rated as high.

Table 4.

Learners' Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills After the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Variables	Mean	SD	Remarks
Asking Questions and Defining Problems	3.2480	0.2104	High
Planning and Carrying Out Investigations	3.3520	0.2330	Very High
Collecting and Analyzing Data	3.0480	0.1939	High
Constructing Explanations	3.2880	0.2651	Very High
Communicating Findings	2.9120	0.2386	High
Overall	3.1696	0.2282	High

Note: Scale: 3.25-4.00 (Very High); 2.5-3.24 (High); 1.75-2.49 (Low); 1.0-1.74 (Very Low)

The data reflect a significant improvement in learners' scientific inquiry skills following the integration of inquiry-based instruction. Notably, Planning and Carrying Out Investigations and Constructing Explanations reached the very high level, suggesting that learners became more adept at designing experiments and articulating evidence-based conclusions. These improvements imply that students engaged more actively in hands-on, reflective, and analytical processes. Skills like Asking Questions and Defining Problems nearly reached the very high threshold, indicating growth in learners' curiosity and problem-identification capacities. While still within the high category, Collecting and Analyzing Data and Communicating Findings scored slightly lower, suggesting these areas may require continued reinforcement to reach the same level of proficiency.

The findings affirm the effectiveness of inquiry-based instruction in developing essential scientific inquiry skills among learners. School leaders and science educators are encouraged to institutionalize this approach within the curriculum to promote deeper scientific understanding. However, the relatively lower scores in Collecting and Analyzing Data and Communicating Findings suggest the need for targeted enrichment activities. Teachers might integrate structured data interpretation exercises, peer-led data discussions, or use visual tools (e.g., graphs and infographics) to strengthen data literacy. Similarly, incorporating more opportunities for oral presentations, science reporting, and collaborative communication projects can enhance students' ability to articulate their findings. Continuous support, reflective learning, and formative feedback will be crucial in sustaining and expanding these gains across all skill domains.

Significant Difference Between Learners' Performance in Science Before and After the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Table 5 presents the statistical analysis of the significant difference in learners' performance in science before and after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction. The comparison examines whether the instructional approach led to measurable improvements in student outcomes.

Table 5.

Significant Difference Between Learners' Performance in Science Before and After the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Variables	M	SD	t-value	p-value	Decision
Before the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction	22.40	6.44	18.20	0.000	Significant
After the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction	46.08	3.52			

*Note: Probability Value Scale: ** $p < 0.01$ (Highly Significant); * $p < 0.05$ (Significant); * $p > 0.05$ (Significant); $p > 0.05$ (Not Significant)*

The results show a statistically significant difference in the learners' performance before and after the intervention. The mean performance score before the implementation was lower ($M = 22.40$, $SD = 6.44$) compared to the mean after implementation ($M = 46.08$, $SD = 3.52$), with a corresponding t-value of 18.20 and a highly significant p-value ($p = 0.000$). This result ($r =$ not specified, $p = 0.000$) indicates a meaningful improvement in performance and leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0), confirming that inquiry-based instruction had a positive effect on learners' academic outcomes. There were no variables reported in Table 5 with p-values greater than 0.05, thus no non-significant findings are present in this analysis.

Given the highly significant result ($p = 0.000$), the data provide strong evidence that inquiry-based instruction substantially improved students' performance in science. The large increase in mean scores, alongside the strong statistical significance, highlights not only the effectiveness of the intervention but also suggests that the traditional teaching methods used previously may have been insufficient in meeting students' learning needs.

The findings have clear implications for educators, school administrators, and curriculum planners. The significant improvement in performance supports the adoption of inquiry-based instruction as a standard practice in science education. School heads are encouraged to provide regular professional development programs to train teachers in implementing inquiry-based learning strategies effectively. Additionally, classroom activities should be designed to promote hands-on experimentation, student-led inquiry, and collaborative problem-solving. Monitoring student progress through both formative and summative assessments will help sustain the gains observed. Finally, school policies should support innovation in pedagogy by allocating resources and time for planning and reflective teaching practices that prioritize student engagement and active learning.

Significant Difference Between Learners' Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills Before and After the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Table 6 shows the results of statistical tests comparing learners' level of scientific inquiry skills before and after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction across five key skill areas. The analysis aimed to determine whether significant differences occurred as a result of the instructional intervention. All variables in the table demonstrated statistically significant improvements after the implementation of inquiry-based

instruction, with Asking Questions and Defining Problems showing a significant difference ($t = 18.00$, $p = 0.000$), Planning and Carrying Out Investigations revealing a significant result ($t = 7.64$, $p = 0.000$), Collecting and Analyzing Data exhibiting a significant improvement ($t = 16.45$, $p = 0.000$), Constructing Explanations yielding a significant difference ($t = 9.62$, $p = 0.000$), and Communicating Findings presenting a significant change ($t = 9.52$, $p = 0.000$); all p-values ($p = 0.000$) are below the 0.01 threshold, indicating highly significant results and leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0) for all skill domains.

Table 6.

Significant Difference Between Learners' Level of Scientific Inquiry Skills Before and After the Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction

Variables	t-value	p-value	Decision
Pre-Asking Questions and Defining Problems	18.00	0.000	Significant
Post-Asking Questions and Defining Problems			
Pre-Planning and Carrying Out Investigations	7.64	0.000	Significant
Post-Planning and Carrying Out Investigations			
Pre-Collecting and Analyzing Data	16.45	0.000	Significant
Post-Collecting and Analyzing Data			
Pre-Constructing Explanations	9.62	0.000	Significant
Post-Constructing Explanations			
Pre-Communicating Findings	9.52	0.000	Significant
Post-Communicating Findings			

*Note: Probability Value Scale: ** $p < 0.01$ (Highly Significant); * $p < 0.05$ (Significant); $p > 0.05$ (Significant); $p > 0.05$ (Not Significant)*

The consistent statistical significance across all five skill areas suggests that the inquiry-based instruction had a profound and comprehensive impact on students' scientific inquiry abilities. The strongest effects were seen in Asking Questions and Defining Problems and Collecting and Analyzing Data, which are foundational to initiating and sustaining scientific investigations. The results imply that learners became more confident and capable in formulating questions, designing and carrying out investigations, analyzing evidence, constructing logical explanations, and communicating their results effectively. The shift from low to high or very high levels, as previously shown in Tables 2 and 4, aligns well with these significant statistical outcomes.

These findings underscore the value of integrating inquiry-based instruction into science education to foster higher-order thinking and practical inquiry skills. School administrators and curriculum developers should promote and support professional learning communities focused on inquiry-based pedagogy. Teachers can benefit from workshops, lesson study sessions, and instructional coaching that emphasize the use of student-driven investigations and reflective learning practices. To further strengthen students' inquiry competencies, schools may organize science inquiry fairs, data analysis clinics, and peer feedback activities, allowing students to apply and refine their skills in authentic contexts. The alignment between instructional practices and assessment of inquiry skills should also be prioritized to maintain continuous growth and meaningful learning outcomes.

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study determined the use of inquiry-based instruction in enhancing students' performance, critical thinking, and higher-order thinking skills in science among college students taking science related course at one of the higher education institutions in Ozamiz City, Misamis Occidental, during the School Year 2024–2025. It sought to answer the following specific questions: (1) What is the learners' science performance before the implementation of inquiry-based instruction? (2) What is the learners' level of critical thinking and scientific inquiry skills before the implementation of inquiry-based instruction? (3) What is the learners' performance after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction? (4) What is the learners' level of critical thinking and scientific inquiry skills after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction? (5) Is there a significant difference in the learners' performance in science before and after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction? (6) Is there a significant difference in the learners' level of critical thinking and scientific inquiry skills before and after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction?

A one-group pretest-posttest design was employed to evaluate the effects of inquiry-based instruction on students' science performance and scientific inquiry skills. A purposive sampling technique was used to select a single section of college students. The statistical tools used for data analysis were the mean, standard deviation, and t-test.

Findings

The following were the salient findings of this study:

1. Before the implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction (IBI), learners demonstrated very poor performance in science.
2. Learners exhibited a low level of scientific inquiry skills across all areas prior to the intervention.
3. After the use of IBI, most learners achieved an outstanding level of performance in science.
4. Scientific inquiry skills improved from low to high, with certain areas reaching a very high level following the intervention.
5. There was a highly significant improvement in learners' performance in science after the implementation of inquiry-based instruction.
6. Learners' scientific inquiry skills significantly improved across all five indicators—Defining Problems, Carrying Out Investigations, Analyzing Data, Constructing Explanations, and Communicating Findings—after the intervention.

Conclusions

Learners need active and engaging strategies to overcome poor performance in science, as their initial low level of scientific inquiry skills suggests limited opportunities to explore and investigate scientific concepts. Inquiry-based instruction has proven to be effective in elevating learners' academic performance in science by promoting structured, student-centered learning that strengthens the development of scientific inquiry skills.

This approach brings about a substantial and meaningful impact on science achievement, with all aspects of scientific inquiry skills responding positively to inquiry-based learning.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following are recommended:

1. Adopt inquiry-based instructional approaches that encourage exploration, questioning, and hands-on learning to enhance students' conceptual understanding and scientific proficiency.
2. Design classroom activities that develop learners' critical thinking and higher-order thinking skills through inquiry-based tasks that promote analysis, evaluation, and synthesis.
3. Support the integration of inquiry-based learning into the curriculum by developing standards and providing teaching frameworks that emphasize inquiry and investigation.
4. Provide ongoing professional development and training programs to equip science teachers with strategies and resources necessary for the effective implementation of inquiry-based instruction.
5. Integrate discussions on inquiry-based strategies into Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions to promote best practices and foster a culture of reflective teaching.
6. Take active roles in the learning process, participate in scientific inquiries, and engage in self-directed learning to build deeper understanding and lifelong thinking skills.

7. Explore the long-term effects of inquiry-based instruction on student performance across different learning areas and identify other variables that may influence its effectiveness.

References

- Antonio, R. P., & Prudente, M. S. (2024). Effects of Inquiry-Based Approaches on Students' Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Science: A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology*, 12(1), 251-281.
- Correia, C. F., & Harrison, C. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about inquiry-based learning and its impact on formative assessment practice. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, 38(3), 355-376.
- De La Cruz, R. J. D. (2022). Science education in the Philippines. In *Science Education in Countries Along the Belt & Road: Future Insights and New Requirements* (pp. 331-345). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
- Ederon, L., & Aliazas, J. V. (2024). Inquiry-Based Learning Resource Material for Improved Integrated Process Skills in Elementary Science. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(4).
- Edillor, J. A. A. (2024). Inquiry-Based Instruction in Science among Grade 8 Students in Rizal National High School, Surigao City Division. *Inquiry-Based Instruction in Science among Grade 8 Students in Rizal National High School, Surigao City Division*.
- García-Carmona, A. (2020). From inquiry-based science education to the approach based on scientific practices: A critical analysis and suggestions for science teaching. *Science & Education*, 29(2), 443-463.
- Guerrero, J. S., & Bautista, R. G. (2023). Inquiry-Based Teaching in Secondary Science. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 8(2), 146–154.
- Jerrim, J., Oliver, M., & Sims, S. (2022). The relationship between inquiry-based teaching and students' achievement. New evidence from a longitudinal PISA study in England. *Learning and Instruction*, 80, 101310.
- Liou, P. Y. (2021). Students' attitudes toward science and science achievement: An analysis of the differential effects of science instructional practices. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 58(3), 310-334.
- Mutlu, A. (2020). Evaluation of students' scientific process skills through reflective worksheets in the inquiry-based learning environments. *Reflective Practice*, 21(2), 271-286.

- Nzomo, C. M., Rugano, P., & Njoroge, J. M. (2023). Relationship between inquiry-based learning and students' attitudes towards chemistry. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 12(2), 991.
- Picardal, M. T., & Sanchez, J. M. P. (2022). Effectiveness of contextualization in science instruction to enhance science literacy in the Philippines: a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 21(1), 140-156.
- Strat, T. T. S., Henriksen, E. K., & Jegstad, K. M. (2024). Inquiry-based science education in science teacher education: a systematic review. *Studies in Science Education*, 60(2), 191-249.
- Sutiani, A. (2021). Implementation of an inquiry learning model with science literacy to improve student critical thinking skills. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 117-138.
- Urdanivia Alarcon, D. A., Talavera-Mendoza, F., Rucano Paucar, F. H., Cayani Caceres, K. S., & Machaca Viza, R. (2023, May). Science and inquiry-based teaching and learning: a systematic review. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 8, p. 1170487). Frontiers Media SA.
- Wen, C. T., Liu, C. C., Chang, H. Y., Chang, C. J., Chang, M. H., Chiang, S. H. F., ... & Hwang, F. K. (2020). Students' guided inquiry with simulation and its relation to school science achievement and scientific literacy. *Computers & Education*, 149, 103830.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Pretests and Posttests (Inquiry Based-Assessment)

Pre-test (Fungi)

Name:

Course:

School:

Score:

Direction: Please read each question carefully and select the best answer from the given options (A, B, C, or D). Indicate your answer by circling the letter of your answer. Ensure that your answers are clear and avoid erasures. You are given [10-15 minutes] to complete the test. Good luck! □

1. What is the Latin origin of the word "fungi"?
 - A) Fungour (to decay)
 - B) Fungour (to flourish)
 - C) Fungour (to divide)
 - D) Fungour (to absorb)
2. What is the singular form of "fungi"?
 - A) Fungae
 - B) Fungus
 - C) Fungaeum
 - D) Fungiorum
3. The study of fungi is called:
 - A) Bacteriology
 - B) Botany
 - C) Mycology
 - D) Zoology
4. A scientist who studies fungi is called a:
 - A) Mycologist
 - B) Microbiologist
 - C) Botanist

D) Pathologist

5. Fungi are classified as:
 - A) Prokaryotic
 - B) Eukaryotic
 - C) Both prokaryotic and eukaryotic
 - D) Neither prokaryotic nor eukaryotic
6. What structure encloses the nucleus in fungal cells?
 - A) Cell wall
 - B) Nuclear membrane
 - C) Cytoplasm
 - D) Ribosome
7. The fungal cell wall is primarily made of:
 - A) Cellulose
 - B) Lignin
 - C) Chitin
 - D) Peptidoglycan
8. Fungi obtain nutrients through:
 - A) Photosynthesis
 - B) Absorbing organic material
 - C) Chewing their food
 - D) Producing their own food
9. Which type of fungi feeds on dead organic material?
 - A) Parasitic
 - B) Mutualistic
 - C) Saprophytic
 - D) Autotrophic
10. Fungi that form beneficial relationships with other organisms are called:
 - A) Parasitic
 - B) Saprophytic
 - C) Mutualistic
 - D) Predatory
11. Thread-like structures forming the fungal body are called:
 - A) Spores
 - B) Hyphae
 - C) Mycelium
 - D) Basidium

12. A network of hyphae is known as:
 - A) Mycelium
 - B) Sporangium
 - C) Basidium
 - D) Ascus
13. Yeasts reproduce mainly by:
 - A) Fragmentation
 - B) Spore formation
 - C) Budding
 - D) Binary fission
14. Fungal reproduction occurs:
 - A) Only asexually
 - B) Only sexually
 - C) Both sexually and asexually
 - D) Only by budding
15. Fungal spores are responsible for:
 - A) Nutrient absorption
 - B) Reproduction and dispersal
 - C) Photosynthesis
 - D) Water transport
16. Fungi can be found in:
 - A) Soil
 - B) Water
 - C) Living organisms
 - D) All of the above
17. Some fungi form resistant spores to:
 - A) Move faster
 - B) Survive extreme conditions
 - C) Absorb more nutrients
 - D) Attract insects
18. Which fungi form symbiotic relationships with plant roots?
 - A) Zygomycota
 - B) Mycorrhizal fungi
 - C) Chytrids
 - D) Deuteromycota
19. Which of the following is an example of a symbiotic fungal relationship?
 - A) Athlete's foot
 - B) Lichen
 - C) Ringworm

D) Rust infection

20. The main role of decomposer fungi in the ecosystem is to:

- A) Produce antibiotics
- B) Cause disease
- C) Break down organic matter
- D) Grow inside plants

21. Fungi are used in the production of:

- A) Bread
- B) Cheese
- C) Antibiotics
- D) All of the above

22. Which fungus is used to produce penicillin?

- A) Saccharomyces
- B) Rhizopus
- C) Penicillium
- D) Candida

23. Which industry relies heavily on yeast?

- A) Agriculture
- B) Food and beverage
- C) Textile
- D) Construction

24. Which fungal group includes edible mushrooms?

- A) Basidiomycota
- B) Zygomycota
- C) Chytridiomycota
- D) Deuteromycota

25. Which fungus is responsible for athlete's foot?

- A) Rhizopus
- B) Aspergillus
- C) Trichophyton
- D) Saccharomyces

26. Bread mold belongs to which fungal group?

- A) Ascomycota
- B) Basidiomycota
- C) Zygomycota
- D) Deuteromycota

27. Which fungal group includes yeast?

- A) Ascomycota

- B) Basidiomycota
- C) Zygomycota
- D) Chytridiomycota

28. What reproductive structure is unique to Basidiomycota?
- A) Ascus
 - B) Basidium
 - C) Mycelium
 - D) Sporangium
29. Which fungi reproduce using zoospores?
- A) Zygomycota
 - B) Chytridiomycota
 - C) Ascomycota
 - D) Basidiomycota
30. Deuteromycota are called “imperfect fungi” because:
- A) They do not have cell walls
 - B) They do not reproduce asexually
 - C) They do not have a known sexual stage
 - D) They are not true fungi
31. Fungi that cause disease in plants and animals are called:
- A) Symbionts
 - B) Pathogens
 - C) Saprophytes
 - D) Mutualists
32. Rusts and smuts are examples of:
- A) Edible fungi
 - B) Industrial fungi
 - C) Plant pathogens
 - D) Mycorrhizae
33. Which of the following fungi is beneficial in plant growth?
- A) Aspergillus
 - B) Candida
 - C) Glomus
 - D) Alternaria
34. Chytrids are unique among fungi because they have:
- A) Mycelium
 - B) Flagellated spores
 - C) Asexual reproduction
 - D) Hyphae

35. Glomeromycota play a major role in:
- A) Infecting animals
 - B) Plant root symbiosis
 - C) Decomposing plastic
 - D) Producing antibiotics
36. What is the function of conidia?
- A) Water absorption
 - B) Asexual reproduction
 - C) Photosynthesis
 - D) Sexual reproduction
37. What is the reproductive structure of Ascomycota?
- A) Basidium
 - B) Ascus
 - C) Sporangium
 - D) Zygosporangium
38. Which of the following fungi can survive extreme conditions?
- A) Mycorrhizae
 - B) Zygomycota
 - C) Some fungi with resistant spores
 - D) Basidiomycota
39. Which fungus is involved in fermentation?
- A) Trichophyton
 - B) *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*
 - C) *Aspergillus*
 - D) *Glomus*
40. Which fungal group includes species that produce truffles and morels?
- A) Zygomycota
 - B) Basidiomycota
 - C) Ascomycota
 - D) Deuteromycota
41. What term describes the ability of fungi to break down complex organic substances into simpler compounds?
- A) Photosynthesis
 - B) Fermentation
 - C) Decomposition
 - D) Parasitism
42. What is the main function of fungal hyphae?
- A) Absorb nutrients
 - B) Produce light

- C) Store water
 - D) Conduct photosynthesis
43. Which fungal group is commonly used in food production, such as brewing and baking?
- A) Basidiomycota
 - B) Ascomycota
 - C) Zygomycota
 - D) Deuteromycota
44. What is the primary ecological role of fungi in nature?
- A) Pollination
 - B) Decomposition
 - C) Nitrogen fixation
 - D) Oxygen production
45. Which fungal group contains the most species?
- A) Zygomycota
 - B) Basidiomycota
 - C) Ascomycota
 - D) Deuteromycota
46. Which fungal structure produces spores during sexual reproduction in Basidiomycota?
- A) Ascus
 - B) Basidium
 - C) Sporangium
 - D) Mycelium
47. Which fungal phylum includes many species that cause diseases in humans, such as ringworm and athlete's foot?
- A) Chytridiomycota
 - B) Zygomycota
 - C) Deuteromycota
 - D) Glomeromycota
48. How do fungi contribute to medicine?
- A) Producing antibiotics like penicillin
 - B) Acting as probiotics
 - C) Increasing white blood cell production
 - D) Acting as pain relievers
49. What characteristic makes chytrids unique among fungi?
- A) They have a flagellated stage
 - B) They perform photosynthesis
 - C) They do not reproduce

D) They have no spores

50. Which type of fungi forms a mutualistic relationship with algae to create lichens?

- A) Zygomycota
- B) Basidiomycota
- C) Ascomycota
- D) Chytridiomycota

Session 2 (Quiz)

1. What type of cells do fungi have?
 - A. Prokaryotic
 - B. Eukaryotic
 - C. Viral
 - D. Unicellular
2. What is a key difference between fungal cells and bacterial cells?
 - A. Fungi have no DNA
 - B. Fungi are prokaryotic
 - C. Fungi have a nucleus
 - D. Bacteria have mitochondria
3. What are fungi classified as based on how they obtain food?
 - A. Autotrophs
 - B. Heterotrophs
 - C. Photosynthesizers
 - D. Producers
4. How do fungi absorb nutrients from their environment?
 - A. Through photosynthesis
 - B. By engulfing food particles
 - C. By releasing enzymes to break down material
 - D. By direct contact with sunlight
5. What type of fungi feeds on dead material?
 - A. Saprophytes
 - B. Parasites
 - C. Mutualists
 - D. Autotrophs
6. Which of the following is an example of a mutualistic relationship involving fungi?
 - A. Fungi eating plants
 - B. Fungi decaying dead animals
 - C. Fungi helping plants absorb nutrients
 - D. Fungi causing disease
7. What is the tough substance found in fungal cell walls?
 - A. Cellulose
 - B. Keratin
 - C. Collagen
 - D. Chitin

8. How does chitin benefit fungi?
 - A. Provides energy
 - B. Helps in photosynthesis
 - C. Gives structure and protection
 - D. Produces spores
9. What are plant cell walls made of?
 - A. Cellulose
 - B. Chitin
 - C. Starch
 - D. Protein
10. What structure do fungi use to grow and absorb nutrients?
 - A. Roots
 - B. Hyphae
 - C. Leaves
 - D. Cilia
11. What is a mycelium?
 - A. A type of spore
 - B. A reproductive cell
 - C. A network of hyphae
 - D. A fruiting body
12. What is a septate hypha?
 - A. Hypha with no nuclei
 - B. Hypha divided by cross-walls
 - C. Hypha that floats in water
 - D. Hypha made of cellulose
13. What are coenocytic hyphae?
 - A. Hyphae with single cells only
 - B. Hyphae with no enzymes
 - C. Continuous cells with many nuclei
 - D. Hyphae used for photosynthesis
14. Why do fungi grow as thread-like structures?
 - A. To look like roots
 - B. To move faster
 - C. To absorb more nutrients over a large area
 - D. To protect from predators
15. What might happen if fungi didn't have hyphae?
 - A. They would absorb fewer nutrients and grow slower
 - B. They would become autotrophs
 - C. They would turn into bacteria
 - D. They would become plants
16. How do fungi reproduce asexually?
 - A. By budding
 - B. By producing spores through mitosis
 - C. By fertilization
 - D. Through meiosis only

17. What is the advantage of asexual reproduction in fungi?
 - A. Creates genetic variation
 - B. Fast and efficient in stable environments
 - C. Prevents mutations
 - D. Requires two parents
18. What occurs during plasmogamy in fungal sexual reproduction?
 - A. Cytoplasm of two haploid cells fuse
 - B. Spores are released
 - C. Nuclei fuse into diploid
 - D. Hyphae die
19. What happens during karyogamy?
 - A. Hyphae divide
 - B. Two haploid nuclei fuse into one diploid nucleus
 - C. Enzymes break down food
 - D. Spores are scattered
20. How are fungal spores usually dispersed?
 - A. Through roots
 - B. By sinking in water
 - C. By wind, water, insects, or animals
 - D. Through direct sunlight

Session 3 (Quiz)

1. What is another name for Zygomycota?
 - A. Sac fungi
 - B. Zygote fungi
 - C. Club fungi
 - D. Water fungi
2. Where are Zygomycetes commonly found?
 - A. Ocean floor
 - B. Inside plant roots
 - C. Soil and decaying matter
 - D. On animal fur
3. What type of hyphae do Zygomycota have?
 - A. Septate
 - B. Uninucleate
 - C. Coenocytic (non-septate)
 - D. Branched and septate
4. What triggers sexual reproduction in Zygomycota?
 - A. High temperature
 - B. Harsh or unfavorable conditions
 - C. Abundant food
 - D. Daylight
5. What is produced during sexual reproduction in Zygomycota?
 - A. Conidia
 - B. Zygosporangium

- C. Ascus
 - D. Basidium
6. What is the role of the zygosporangium?
 - A. Photosynthesis
 - B. Houses the zygospore
 - C. Produces conidia
 - D. Absorbs water
 7. What is the asexual reproductive structure in Zygomycota?
 - A. Ascus
 - B. Conidiophore
 - C. Sporangium
 - D. Basidium
 8. Which species is known as the common bread mold?
 - A. Mucor
 - B. Rhizopus stolonifer
 - C. Agaricus
 - D. Batrachochytrium
 9. Which Zygomycete grows on dung and shoots spores toward light?
 - A. Mucor
 - B. Rhizopus
 - C. Pilobolus
 - D. Allomyces
 10. What is a key economic use of Zygomycota?
 - A. Production of penicillin
 - B. Organic acid fermentation
 - C. Making cheese
 - D. Wine production
 11. What structure characterizes Ascomycota during sexual reproduction?
 - A. Sporangium
 - B. Ascus
 - C. Basidium
 - D. Conidiophore
 12. Which of the following is not an example of Ascomycota?
 - A. Truffles
 - B. Morels
 - C. Mushrooms
 - D. Powdery mildews
 13. What are asexual spores in Ascomycota called?
 - A. Conidia
 - B. Basidiospores
 - C. Zygospores
 - D. Zoospores
 14. How are Ascomycota asexually reproduced?
 - A. Through budding
 - B. By conidia on conidiophores

- C. By swimming spores
 - D. Binary fission
15. What structure gives Basidiomycota the name "club fungi"?
 - A. Sporangium
 - B. Ascus
 - C. Basidium
 - D. Fruiting body
 16. What part of a mushroom is visible above ground?
 - A. Hyphae
 - B. Fruiting body
 - C. Mycelium
 - D. Sporangium
 17. What is the main function of the mushroom (fruiting body)?
 - A. Absorb nutrients
 - B. Protect the fungus
 - C. Produce and release spores
 - D. Attract animals
 18. What structure produces spores in Basidiomycota?
 - A. Conidiophore
 - B. Basidium
 - C. Zygosporangium
 - D. Zoospore
 19. Which fungal group is considered the most ancient?
 - A. Ascomycota
 - B. Zygomycota
 - C. Basidiomycota
 - D. Chytridiomycota
 20. What makes Chytridiomycota unique among fungi?
 - A. They form conidia
 - B. They produce flagellated (swimming) spores
 - C. They grow only in forests
 - D. They have septate hyphae

Session 4(Quiz)

1. Which of the following environments would most likely support fungal growth?
 - A. Dry and sunny areas
 - B. Moist and shaded areas
 - C. Salty and arid deserts
 - D. Snow-covered regions
2. Which antibiotic is derived from a fungus?
 - A. Tetracycline
 - B. Erythromycin
 - C. Penicillin
 - D. Amoxicillin
3. What is a likely evolutionary advantage of fungi forming both sexual and asexual spores?

- A. It allows them to use chloroplasts during asexual reproduction
 - B. It ensures reproduction can occur under any environmental condition
 - C. It prevents them from forming symbiotic relationships
 - D. It reduces the need for spore dispersal
4. Which structure produces asexual spores in fungi?
 - A. Ascus
 - B. Basidium
 - C. Sporangium
 - D. Zygosporangium
 5. Which of the following fungi has significant economic importance due to its medicinal use?
 - A. Mycorrhiza
 - B. Penicillium
 - C. Mucor
 - D. Rhizopus
 6. Penicillium is best known for its role as a:
 - A. Decomposer and antibiotic source
 - B. Parasitic plant pathogen
 - C. Mycorrhizal fungus
 - D. Pathogen of humans
 7. What is the best explanation for why fungi can rapidly colonize new environments?
 - A. They possess chlorophyll and can photosynthesize
 - B. Their spores are motile and swim toward nutrients
 - C. They produce vast quantities of spores capable of surviving adverse conditions
 - D. They reproduce only through binary fission, which is fast and efficient
 8. Which of the following structures is used for asexual reproduction in fungi?
 - A. Basidiospores
 - B. Ascospore
 - C. Sporangiospores
 - D. Zygosporangium
 9. Which characteristic helps fungi survive in extreme conditions?
 - A. Thick cell walls
 - B. Ability to photosynthesize
 - C. Formation of resistant spores
 - D. Production of toxins
 10. Fungi differ from plants because they:
 - A. Produce their own food
 - B. Lack a cell wall
 - C. Reproduce only sexually
 - D. Absorb nutrients externally
 11. Which of the following fungal roles directly influences nutrient cycling in ecosystems?
 - A. Mycorrhizal symbiosis
 - B. Pathogenic infection

- C. Asexual spore formation
 - D. Saprophytic decomposition
12. Why are sporangiospores considered asexual, despite being involved in reproduction?
- A. They do not increase genetic diversity
 - B. They are produced by meiosis
 - C. They require fusion of two gametes
 - D. They develop inside fruiting bodies
13. Which example illustrates fungi as decomposers?
- A. Athlete's foot
 - B. Lichens on rocks
 - C. Penicillium breaking down organic matter
 - D. Mycorrhizae enhancing plant growth
14. Which of the following is NOT a type of sexual spore in fungi?
- A. Zygosporangium
 - B. Ascospore
 - C. Conidium
 - D. Basidiospore
15. Sexual spores in fungi are formed through the process of:
- A. Mitosis
 - B. Meiosis
 - C. Binary fission
 - D. Budding

Appendix C

Learners 'Scientific Inquiry Skills Questionnaire**SCIENTIFIC INQUIRY SKILLS QUESTIONNAIRE**
(Researcher-Made)

Directions: The following statements describe how you engage in scientific inquiry during learning or experimentation. Please indicate how often each statement applies to you by selecting the most appropriate response. Use the following scale:

4 – Always | 3 – Often | 2 – Sometimes | 1 – Never

Constructs/Indicators	4	3	2	1
A. Asking Questions				
1. I can ask clear and testable scientific questions.				
2. I can identify a problem that needs scientific investigation.				
3. I ask questions that help me explore scientific ideas.				
4. I can tell the difference between a good and poor research question.				
5. I enjoy forming questions about how things work in science.				
B. Carrying Out Investigations				
6. I can design a science experiment to answer a question.				
7. I can identify the tools and materials I need for an experiment.				
8. I follow procedures carefully when conducting an experiment.				
9. I know how to control variables in an investigation.				
10. I can follow safety guidelines during experiments.				
C. Analyzing Data				
11. I can record data accurately using tables or graphs.				

12. I look for patterns in the data I collect.				
13. I can describe what the data means in relation to my question.				
14. I can identify errors or outliers in data.				
15. I can use different tools to analyze scientific data.				
D. Constructing Explanations				
16. I can explain the results of an experiment clearly.				
17. I use evidence from my data to support my conclusions.				
18. I compare my results with my hypothesis or predictions.				
19. I can explain why a scientific result may be different from what I expected.				
20. I can construct logical explanations for scientific phenomena.				
E. Communicating Findings				
21. I can write clear reports about my investigations.				
22. I can present my findings using graphs, tables, or visuals.				
23. I can explain my findings to others verbally.				
24. I can answer questions from others about my experiment.				
25. I use scientific language when sharing my ideas.				

[illegible]

Appendix F

Informed consent form

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1. I volunteer to participate in the research undertaken by Gino P. Sanoy and Grace A. Flores from the College of Education, Misamis University. I understand that the research is designed to gather information about the using inquiry based instruction in enhancing students performance in science. I will be one of the participants who will be surveyed for this research.

2. My participation in this research is voluntary. I understand that I will not be paid for my participation. I may withdraw and discontinue participation at any time without penalty. If I decline to participate or withdraw from the study, no one will be told.

3. This research will involve my participation. I understand that most questions will find the discussion interesting and thought-provoking. If, however, I feel uncomfortable in any way during the survey session, I have the right to decline to answer any question or to end the survey.

4. The survey will last approximately 10-15 minutes.

5. I understand that the information to be gathered will be treated with confidentiality. I will not be identified in the paper. Only the researchers and their adviser will have access to the data of the research.

6. I understand that this research has been reviewed and approved by the DSAS Head of Misamis University.

7. I have read and understood the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

8. I have been given a copy of this consent form.


Participant's Signature

03/10/25
Date

*For further information, please contact:
Gino P. Sanoy (09294866800/ ginsanoy4@gmail.com)
Grace A. Flores (09565289368/ Sevollygrace7@gmail.com)*

Appendix G

Approved Letter of Consent

April 2, 2025

NELPAN, CAPIO
Director, DSAS
Misamis University
Ozamiz City

Dear Mrs Capio:


Greetings!

We are currently pursuing our research study for our subject Sci 4Ed under the program, Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Science in Misamis University, Ozamiz City. Our research is entitled "**Using Inquiry-Based Instruction in Enhancing Students Performance in Science**" was approved by our Research Teacher on February 25, 2025.

This study is designed to determine the students' academic performance in science. Using the questionnaires as instruments, we will collect data from 25 students who has science related subject and are currently enrolled in the 2nd semester, school year 2024-2025. Please be assured that ethical considerations and health protocols will be duly observed and the data will be utilized for this research purpose only.

Your approval to this request will be deeply appreciated.

Respectfully yours,



GINO P. SANOY
Student


GRACE A. FLORES
Student

Noted:


DR. GENELYN R. BALUYOS, EdD
Dean, College of Education

Approved by:


NELPAN CAPIO, MAEd, JD

Appendix H

Statistical Computation

14/05/2025 6:19:08 pm

Welcome to Minitab, press F1 for help.

Tally for Discrete Variables: PRE SCORES

PRE
SCORES Count Percent
1 25 100.00
N= 25

Tally for Discrete Variables: POST SCORES

POST
SCORES Count Percent
2 2 8.00
3 2 8.00
5 8 32.00
6 13 52.00
N= 25

Paired T-Test and CI: PRE, POST

Paired T for PRE - POST

	N	Mean	StDev	SE Mean
PRE	25	22.40	6.44	1.29
POST	25	46.08	3.52	0.70
Difference	25	-23.68	6.50	1.30

95% CI for mean difference: (-26.36, -21.00)

T-Test of mean difference = 0 (vs $\neq$ 0): T-Value = -18.20 P-Value = 0.000

Descriptive Statistics: Asking Quest, Planning and, Collecting a, Constructing, Communicatin

Variable	Mean	StDev
Asking Questions and Def	2.2800	0.2236
Planning and Carrying Ou	2.7440	0.2973
Collecting and Analyzing	2.1200	0.1915
Constructing Explanation	2.4400	0.3055
Communicating Findings	2.1840	0.2996

Descriptive Statistics: Asking Quest, Planning and, Collecting a, Constructing, Communicatin

Variable	Mean	StDev
Asking Questions and Def	3.2480	0.2104
Planning and Carrying Ou	3.3520	0.2330
Collecting and Analyzing	3.0480	0.1939
Constructing Explanation	3.2880	0.2651
Communicating Findings_1	2.9120	0.2386

Paired T-Test and CI: Asking Questions and Defining P, Asking Questions and Defining_1

Paired T for Asking Questions and Defining P - Asking Questions and Defining_1

	N	Mean	StDev	SE Mean
Asking Questions and Def	25	2.2800	0.2236	0.0447
Asking Questions and Def	25	3.2480	0.2104	0.0421
Difference	25	-0.9680	0.2688	0.0538

95% CI for mean difference: (-1.0790, -0.8570)

T-Test of mean difference = 0 (vs $\neq$ 0): T-Value = -18.00 P-Value = 0.000

Paired T-Test and CI: Planning and Carrying Out Inves, Planning and Carrying Out Inv_1

Paired T for Planning and Carrying Out Inves - Planning and Carrying Out Inv_1

	N	Mean	StDev	SE Mean
Planning and Carrying Ou	25	2.7440	0.2973	0.0595
Planning and Carrying Ou	25	3.3520	0.2330	0.0466
Difference	25	-0.6080	0.3978	0.0796

95% CI for mean difference: (-0.7722, -0.4438)

T-Test of mean difference = 0 (vs $\neq$ 0): T-Value = -7.64 P-Value = 0.000

Paired T-Test and CI: Collecting and Analyzing Data, Collecting and Analyzing Data_1

Paired T for Collecting and Analyzing Data - Collecting and Analyzing Data_1

	N	Mean	StDev	SE Mean
Collecting and Analyzing	25	2.1200	0.1915	0.0383
Collecting and Analyzing	25	3.0480	0.1939	0.0388
Difference	25	-0.9280	0.2821	0.0564

95% CI for mean difference: (-1.0445, -0.8115)

T-Test of mean difference = 0 (vs $\neq$ 0): T-Value = -16.45 P-Value = 0.000

Paired T-Test and CI: Constructing Explanations, Constructing Explanations_1

Paired T for Constructing Explanations - Constructing Explanations_1

	N	Mean	StDev	SE Mean
Constructing Explanation	25	2.4400	0.3055	0.0611
Constructing Explanation	25	3.2880	0.2651	0.0530
Difference	25	-0.8480	0.4408	0.0882

95% CI for mean difference: (-1.0299, -0.6661)

T-Test of mean difference = 0 (vs $\neq$ 0): T-Value = -9.62 P-Value = 0.000

Paired T-Test and CI: Communicating Findings, Communicating Findings_1

Paired T for Communicating Findings - Communicating Findings_1

	N	Mean	StDev	SE Mean
Communicating Findings	25	2.1840	0.2996	0.0599
Communicating Findings_1	25	2.9120	0.2386	0.0477
Difference	25	-0.7280	0.3824	0.0765

95% CI for mean difference: (-0.8859, -0.5701)

T-Test of mean difference = 0 (vs $\neq$ 0): T-Value = -9.52 P-Value = 0.000

Appendix I

Documentation

