

Learning Module 03: Topic Feasibility and Working Topic

Learner or research group: _____ Section: _____ Date: _____

Status and Destination

- **Primary role:** Independent application
- **Task labels:** Parts A–C are **Practice - not graded**. Part D is a **Progress Check - feedback only**. Parts E–F are a **Graded-Outcome Component - Topic Feasibility and Title Decision Brief** that is still developing.
- **Graded outcome: Topic Feasibility and Title Decision Brief.** The feasibility decision from this module continues into the title decision in Learning Module 04. This module is not an additional separately graded output.
- **Planned independent time:** 60 minutes
- **Use in the next lesson:** The lesson **Research Title Development and Topic Lock** will use the retained feasible topic to construct, compare, and defend working-title options.

Use the Included Support Materials

- **Annex A: Feasibility, Ethics, and Topic-Revision Casebook**

Read the relevant annex when a task or help step calls for it. The annexes are reference and recovery support within the planned 60 minutes; they are not extra worksheets or additional graded submissions. If your own study evidence is unavailable, use the clearly labeled practice case to rehearse and mark your actual-study decision pending. A practice case does not establish approval, fieldwork or findings for your study.

What You Already Learned

Your 60-Minute Route

Work	Suggested independent time
Read the model and list three short topic directions in Part A	15 minutes
Rate the three directions in Part B and screen the strongest in Part C	20 minutes
Repair the strongest direction in Part D	10 minutes
Summarize the decision in Parts E–F and check your work	15 minutes

Use short phrases, not essays. Topic Direction 1 may come from Learning Module 02; the other two can be manageable alternatives, such as a narrower population or a different measurable focus. Reuse your existing notes in Parts E–F rather than copying every answer. No online search or data collection is required.

An area of interest such as social media, internet access, stress, attendance, or work immersion is not yet a research problem. A researchable topic identifies a specific concern, measurable variable or descriptive focus, reachable population, possible source of evidence, and a purpose small enough to complete responsibly.

RETRIEVAL

Transfer the strongest alignment chain from Learning Module 02.

- **Field or area:** _____
- **Specific concern:** _____
- **Variable or descriptive focus 1:** _____
- **Variable, grouping factor, or focus 2, if needed:** _____
- **Possible population:** _____
- **Possible source of evidence:** _____

What You Will Produce

A topic-feasibility record containing:

- three possible topic directions;
- a complete feasibility check for each;
- one documented revision based on evidence rather than preference;
- one retained working topic; and
- the topic information needed in the next lesson to develop accurate title options.

Why This Matters to Your Study

A very broad, sensitive, expensive, inaccessible, or causally overclaimed topic can block every later chapter. Checking feasibility now protects your time and helps your group choose a study that can actually collect evidence and reach a defensible conclusion within the term.

Study This Model

MODEL

Broad area: Internet access

Specific concern: Some learners may have unstable home internet and may differ in completing online learning tasks on time.

Initial topic: The effect of internet on students

Problems with the initial topic: “Internet” and “students” are too broad; “effect” promises causation; the measurable outcome and population are unclear.

Revised working topic: Home internet stability and reported on-time completion of online learning tasks among Grade 12 learners

Possible variables: home internet stability; reported on-time task completion

Possible population: Grade 12 learners in one reachable school

Possible data source: short anonymous questionnaire; approved anonymized records only if permission is obtained

Possible purpose: examine a relationship or describe patterns without claiming cause

Feasibility decision: Revise, then retain. The revised topic is measurable and locally bounded, but the group must define the indicators, protect privacy, and avoid claiming that internet stability alone caused task completion.

Follow These Steps

1. Generate three topic directions from a real concern; do not write decorative titles yet.
2. Identify the possible variables or descriptive focus and population for each.
3. Check measurability, reachability, manageability, ethics, usefulness, and claim strength.
4. Mark every topic **Retain**, **Revise**, or **Do Not Proceed Yet**.
5. Revise the strongest topic using the exact failed feasibility criterion.
6. Compare the original and revised versions.
7. Retain one working topic for the next lesson or state one specific blocking issue requiring a conference.

Begin Here: First-Step Rehearsal

TRY

Complete this modeled row during Session 4 of the current lesson before evaluating your own topic.

Candidate topic: Home internet stability and reported on-time completion of online learning tasks among Grade 12 learners

Measurable?

Reachable?

Manageable?

Ethical?

Useful?

Claim fits possible evidence?

Decision and exact reason

Complete Your Work

Part A. Generate Three Topic Directions

Use the progression area -> specific concern -> measurable focus -> population -> possible evidence.

Topic Direction 1

- Area of interest: _____
- Specific concern: _____
- Variable or descriptive focus 1: _____
- Variable, group, or focus 2, if needed: _____
- Possible population: _____
- Possible evidence source: _____
- Working topic statement: _____
- Why it may matter: _____

Topic Direction 2

- Area of interest: _____
- Specific concern: _____
- Variable or descriptive focus 1: _____
- Variable, group, or focus 2, if needed: _____
- Possible population: _____
- Possible evidence source: _____
- Working topic statement: _____
- Why it may matter: _____

Topic Direction 3

- Area of interest: _____
- Specific concern: _____
- Variable or descriptive focus 1: _____
- Variable, group, or focus 2, if needed: _____
- Possible population: _____

- **Possible evidence source:** _____
- **Working topic statement:** _____
- **Why it may matter:** _____

CAUTION

Do not conduct interviews, distribute questionnaires, request private records, or collect personal information for this module. You are planning possible evidence, not yet collecting it.

Part B. Apply the Feasibility Gate

Use the following meanings:

- **Measurable:** the topic can produce numerical or countable information that answers a clear question.
- **Reachable:** the respondents, records, tools, and permissions can reasonably be obtained.
- **Manageable:** the scope, time, skills, cost, and expected analysis fit a Grade 12 term.
- **Ethical:** the study minimizes harm, protects privacy, avoids unnecessary sensitive data, and can follow school requirements.
- **Useful:** the result could help explain a real concern or inform a responsible beneficiary or actor.
- **Claim fit:** the wording does not promise cause, impact, effectiveness, diagnosis, or generalization that the likely design cannot support.

Rate each criterion as **Ready**, **Revise**, or **Blocking Issue**. Give evidence for the rating.

- **Ready:** You can explain a reasonable plan for this criterion. Example: “One Grade 12 group is identified; permission still needs confirmation.” This is planning readiness, not approval to collect data.
- **Revise:** You can name a fix. Example: “All Filipino students is too broad; narrow to one reachable school group.”
- **Blocking Issue:** You cannot responsibly continue without resolving a serious condition. Example: “The topic requires private records that we are not allowed to access.”

For each cell, write **rating + reason**, not just a check mark. If access or permission is unknown, say so; do not label it confirmed. Use **Revise** when a safer or reachable alternative is clear, or **Blocking Issue** when no acceptable route is available yet.

For the **Overall decision** row, use **Retain**, **Revise**, or **Do Not Proceed Yet**. Do not add the ratings into a score: a serious ethics or access problem cannot be cancelled out by several good ratings. See the completed rating in Annex A.

Topic 1 rating and evidence

Measurable

Reachable respondents or records

Manageable time, scope, cost, and skill

Ethical and privacy-conscious

Useful to an identifiable beneficiary

Claim fits likely evidence

Overall decision

Topic 2 rating and evidence

Measurable

Reachable respondents or records

Manageable time, scope, cost, and skill

Ethical and privacy-conscious

Useful to an identifiable beneficiary

Claim fits likely evidence

Overall decision

Topic 3 rating and evidence

Measurable

Reachable respondents or records

Manageable time, scope, cost, and skill

Ethical and privacy-conscious

Useful to an identifiable beneficiary

Claim fits likely evidence

Overall decision

Part C. Sensitivity and Ethics Screen

Answer for the strongest candidate topic.

1. Does the topic request or imply information about mental-health diagnosis, family income, abuse, illegal behavior, sexual behavior, medical conditions, political preference, religious conflict, teacher performance, or personally identifiable records?

1. Yes / No / Uncertain

2. If yes or uncertain, is the sensitive information essential to the research question?

3. Can the concern be studied through a safer, non-diagnostic, less identifying, or more accessible variable?

3. Original sensitive or difficult term: _____

3. Safer measurable alternative: _____

4. What personal information does the study **not** need to collect?

5. What permission or school rule may affect the proposed evidence source?

REMEMBER

A concern can be important and still be unsuitable for a small Grade 12 study. Choosing a safer and more focused variable does not mean the original concern is unimportant.

Part D. Revise From the Failed Criterion

Select the most promising topic. Do not revise every word. Revise the part that caused the weakest feasibility rating.

- **Original topic statement:** _____
- **Weakest criterion:** measurable / reachable / manageable / ethical / useful / claim fit
- **Evidence of the problem:** _____
- **Exact change made:** _____
- **Revised working topic:** _____
- **What became clearer or safer:** _____
- **What the revised topic deliberately excludes:** _____

Part E. Graded-Outcome Component: Compare and Retain One Working Topic

Summarize Part B in short phrases; do not conduct a second feasibility investigation. If you revised a candidate in Part D, use its revised form here and keep the original in Part D so the change is visible.

GRADED OUTCOME**Graded-Outcome Component - Topic Feasibility and Title Decision Brief**

Developing the Topic Feasibility and Title Decision Brief: Parts E and F provide the feasibility evidence for this graded outcome. It is completed only after the title decision in Learning Module 04. Do not submit this module as a second separate graded output.

Decision element

Candidate 1

Clear measurable focus

Reachable population or source

Ethical and manageable scope

Useful purpose

Main revision still needed

Candidate 2

Clear measurable focus

Reachable population or source

Ethical and manageable scope

Useful purpose

Main revision still needed

Candidate 3

Clear measurable focus

Reachable population or source

Ethical and manageable scope

Useful purpose

Main revision still needed

Retained working topic: _____

Reason for retaining it: We retained this topic because it will examine or describe _____
among _____

using possible evidence from _____.

It is more feasible than the alternatives because _____
_____.**Decision status:** Ready for the Next Lesson / Revise While Moving / Conference Needed

Choose **Ready for the Next Lesson** when a usable topic direction is available; **Revise While Moving** when a specific repair can be made during title development; or **Conference Needed** when an unresolved blocker needs teacher help. These are learning-progress labels, not approval for fieldwork. They correspond to the overall decisions Retain, Revise and Do Not Proceed Yet.

If marked Conference Needed, state the one blocking issue:

Part F. Prepare the Topic Information for the Next Lesson

This is not yet the final title. It is the information from which the next lesson will build accurate title options.

Title-building element	Information from the retained topic
Intended purpose: describe, compare, relate, or another bounded purpose	

Title-building element	Information from the retained topic
Variable or central measurable focus 1	
Variable, grouping factor, or focus 2, if needed	
Intended population	
Setting, only if needed to prevent misunderstanding	
Possible source of data	
Wording to avoid because it overclaims	

Draft one plain working-topic phrase. Do not add “A Study of” merely to make it sound formal.

Check Your Work

CHECK

- ☐ I generated three topic directions rather than choosing the first idea immediately.
- ☐ Each topic identifies a measurable variable or descriptive focus.
- ☐ Each topic identifies a possible population and evidence source.
- ☐ I checked reachability, time, cost, scope, permissions, and ethics.
- ☐ I avoided unnecessary personal or sensitive information.
- ☐ I removed or questioned unsupported words such as effect, impact, influence, causes, and effectiveness.
- ☐ My revision responds to a specific failed criterion.
- ☐ My retained topic is useful but small enough to complete within the term.
- ☐ I kept the original and revised versions as evidence of my decision-making.

If You Get Stuck

HELP

Begin with a modest school, strand, work, or community concern that you already understand. Use one of these safe patterns:

- **Descriptive:** Level, frequency, preference, access, or profile of ____ among ____
- **Relationship:** ____ and ____ among ____
- **Comparison:** ____ of Group A and Group B, only when the grouping is justified and respectful

Then ask:

1. What exactly changes or differs?
2. How could it be counted, rated, scored, or classified?
3. Who can answer without unreasonable risk?
4. Can the group reach them and obtain permission?
5. Can the study finish within the term?

If the topic is too broad, narrow the variable, population, location, or period. If it is sensitive, use a safer measurable indicator or choose another concern. Use Annex A: Feasibility, Ethics, and Topic-Revision Casebook in this module first. The separate Reference Reading is optional for fuller explanation. Mark the exact failed criterion and your attempted repair before asking a peer or teacher for help.

Minimum Attempt for the Next Lesson

Before the next lesson, **Research Title Development and Topic Lock**, the minimum reasonable attempt is:

- three topic directions are listed;
- at least one topic has been checked against every feasibility criterion;
- the original and revised versions of the strongest topic are present; and
- one topic is marked Ready for the Next Lesson, Revise While Moving, or Conference Needed with a specific reason.

Learners with an incomplete table may still join the next lesson using their strongest attempted topic or the provided model. A missing perfect answer must not prevent participation in the title-development lesson.

Bring This to the Next Lesson

NEXT

Follow **Your 60-Minute Route** and bring your strongest topic attempt. Mark the feasibility criterion you want help checking. This module contributes to the **Topic Feasibility and Title Decision Brief**; it is not a separate graded submission. Bring your work to **Research Title Development and Topic Lock**, Session 1. If your own topic is incomplete, use **A Completed Feasibility Rating** in **Annex A: Feasibility, Ethics, and Topic-Revision Casebook** to join the discussion, and mark what is still missing from your own decision. The fictional example is not permission to collect data and is not a finding from your study.

Bring **Fields, Variables, and Measurable Evidence** and **Topic Feasibility and Working Topic** to the next lesson, **Research Title Development and Topic Lock**. Be ready to identify:

- the intended purpose;
- the variable or central measurable focus;
- the population;
- the possible evidence source;
- the term or claim the topic deliberately avoids; and
- the exact feasibility reason for retaining or revising it.

The next lesson will use this information to produce alternative working titles. The graded outcome is finalized after the title decision continues through Learning Module 04.

Annex A: Feasibility, Ethics, and Topic-Revision Casebook

For each candidate, ask: Can we define its evidence? Reach the group lawfully? Finish within the term? Obtain tools and permission? Analyze it with the skills available? Explain whom it may help? Keep its claim inside the design?

Original proposal: Technology and all Filipino students

Failed criterion and visible clue: Scope/reach: all grades and locations

Defensible revision: Reported use of three named learning resources among one reachable Grade 12 group

Remaining condition: Define period, obtain approval, name achieved participants

Original proposal: Effect of internet on success

Failed criterion and visible clue: Claim and measurement: undefined success and causal wording

Defensible revision: Reported connection interruptions and on-time completion of four named tasks

Remaining condition: A relationship study cannot isolate cause

Original proposal: Depression caused by research

Failed criterion and visible clue: Ethics/claim: diagnosis and cause beyond student competence

Defensible revision: Perceived difficulty of specific research tasks, using approved non-diagnostic questions

Remaining condition: Any welfare concern follows the school's support route

Original proposal: Family income and private grade records

Failed criterion and visible clue: Access/privacy: sensitive information not shown necessary

Defensible revision: Access to required learning materials and reported completion of named tasks

Remaining condition: The revised question still needs voluntary participation

Original proposal: Long-term employment after graduation

Failed criterion and visible clue: Time/reach: outcomes occur after the term

Defensible revision: Completion of specified classroom skills during an approved practice task

Remaining condition: It cannot establish later employment

Original proposal: Five predictors of academic success

Failed criterion and visible clue: Workload: many tools and unsupported analysis

Defensible revision: One descriptive focus or one justified pair of variables

Remaining condition: Do not narrow simply to obtain significance

Completed decision: We revised “Technology and all Filipino students” because the population could not be reached and the variable was unclear. We retained reported resource use in one Grade 12 group because the response period and categories can be defined and the data can be summarized through counts. This is a planning decision; no participant access is authorized by this record.

Retain means a feasible direction is available. **Revise** means a specific part can be repaired. **Do Not Proceed Yet** means a blocking permission, privacy, measurement, or design condition remains. A useful topic may still be blocked.

Transfer check: After revising, update the question, variable, population, possible source, purpose, and title-building information. Narrowing the title alone does not repair an oversized study.

Concept source: Unit 1 Reference Reading, sections on researchable problems, feasibility, and common mistakes. All cases are fictional instructional proposals.

A Completed Feasibility Rating

Fictional candidate: Reported on-time completion of four named online tasks among Grade 12 learners in one school during the previous school week.

Criterion	Rating and reason
Measurable	Ready: the proposed count is 0–4, with the same task names and deadlines for all participants.
Reachable	Revise: one school group is identified, but the invitation and permission route still need confirmation.
Manageable	Ready: one short descriptive question can be summarized using counts within the term.
Ethical	Revise: remove names and student numbers; confirm voluntary participation and the school's requirements before collection.
Useful	Ready: the pattern could help the teacher plan task support; it would not by itself identify the causes of missed deadlines.
Claim fit	Ready: “reported completion” describes the planned evidence without promising an effect or cause.
Overall decision	Revise: retain the direction provisionally, confirm access and safeguards, and do not collect data yet.

How the decision was reached: The measurable focus is workable, so the whole idea need not be discarded. Access and privacy still require repair. If permission is refused and no acceptable alternative is available, change the decision to **Do Not Proceed Yet** and seek help or select another topic. Do not change it to Ready simply because the other rows look strong.

From Rating to a Specific Revision

Weak response: “Our topic is difficult, so we will improve it.” This does not name a problem or a fix.

Usable response: “Our original topic covered all senior high school learners in the province. We cannot reach that population within the term. We narrowed the proposal to one school group, subject to permission, and will limit any later conclusions to the participants actually reached.”

For your own Part D, use: “We marked ___ as ___ because ___. We changed ___ to ___. We still need to confirm ___.” You may write this as short phrases in the existing fields; it is not another required paragraph.