INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH FOR INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND EXCELLENCE (IMJRISE)
Online ISSN: 3028-032X | Print ISSN: 3028-0370
PUBLISHED BY: RISEJOURNALS.ORG
Volume 2, Issue no. 5 | **866**

Readiness and Support on Modular Distance Learning

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15545283

Catherine B. Obordo
Teacher 3, La Castellana Elementary School, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8858-1602

Gregorio C. Moyani Jr.
Chief, School Governance and Operation Division, DepEd-Bacolod, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8823-5783

Abstract:

This study aimed to determine the level of teachers' readiness and support on modular distance learning in the identified District for the School Year 2020-2021. The areas of the study included Preparation, Distribution and Collection and Assessments. The level of teachers' readiness in modular learning modality as assessed by School Heads and teachers themselves was very high in the area of distribution and collection and its lowest was on module preparation. The level of teachers' support in modular learning modality as assessed by School Heads and teachers themselves was high on module distribution and collection, also on assessments and was lowest module preparation. There was no significant difference in the level of teachers' readiness in modular learning modality as assessed by School Heads and teachers themselves; and there was no significant difference in the level of teachers' readiness in modular learning modality as assessed by School Heads and teachers themselves.

Keywords: Instructional Support, learning modality assessment, modular distance learning, module preparation and distribution, teachers' readiness and support

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

In the midst of various learning modalities, teachers were tasked with readying themselves to be able to provide quality education to learners (Anoba and Cahapay, 2020). The readiness of teachers in the utilization of modular learning modality is sensitive to contextual issues. Some studies pointed to other factors like teachers' skills, school infrastructure, budget allocation, technical support, and many others that affect teachers' readiness (Dayagbil, 2021). Furthermore, teacher support is significantly important in the new normal because the utilization of technology-based learning is a necessity beyond simple needs. With this trend, teacher support, particularly with trainings and IT-based education, is highly needed (Carreon, 2021).

Teachers' readiness has dramatically improved compared to when the new normal first started. However, when it comes to support to improve teachers' competence in the utilization of various learning modalities, it appeared that most of the teachers are left on their own to study because of the lack of purposive training sessions. With the rise of technology-driven education, the researcher observed that many teachers were challenged due to the lack of information and communication technology support, lack of resources and facilities to ready them fully to take on the challenges of the new normal.

This study aims to determine teachers' readiness and evaluate the kind of support they are getting to improve competence in using modular learning modality.

Current State of Knowledge

This chapter presents a synthesis of local and international literature relevant to the study, offering a foundation for understanding teacher preparedness and the implementation of Modular Distance Learning (MDL). Reviewed sources include research aligned with the study's focus on methodology, participants, and context, helping to ground the investigation in established academic perspectives and best practices. The integration of these references not only contextualizes the study but also reinforces its significance in addressing educational challenges during emergencies like the COVID-19 pandemic.

Teacher preparedness, closely tied to teacher education, is essential for effective instruction, particularly in digital and distance learning settings. Martin et al. (2019) emphasized the need for educators to develop skills in planning, organizing, and delivering online content effectively. As technology reshapes education, faculty members must adapt to online modalities, demanding training in digital tools and pedagogical strategies. UNESCO (2020) supported this

by highlighting the importance of equipping teachers with relevant training to help them innovate and respond to student needs, particularly in crisis situations where face-to-face learning is disrupted.

The shift to modular remote learning during the pandemic required educators to adapt quickly to ensure learning continuity. The Department of Education (2020) spearheaded the distribution of self-learning modules (SLMs), with teachers relying on tools such as study guides and activity sheets to support learners. Phan and Dang (2017), as cited by Tayer and Agdana (2022), identified key factors influencing teacher readiness—ranging from teaching methodology to technical skills and psychological resilience. Toquero (2020) further noted the emotional toll of transitioning from traditional to modular teaching, emphasizing the need for institutional support and mental health considerations for educators.

Effective support for students and parents was also seen as critical to MDL success. Dangle and Sumaoang (2020) identified strategies such as regular communication through text, calls, and social media, home visits, and use of the vernacular in feedback as key interventions. For parents, teacher engagement included offering guidance, encouragement, and updates via digital platforms. These practices aimed to bridge the learning gap and maintain strong school-home collaboration during remote learning.

Despite the practical benefits of MDL, some concerns have been raised. Cornford (2018) argued that while modular courses align with competency-based education and offer flexibility, they may fall short in promoting deeper learning. Still, they remain widely used due to their logistical advantages. In a localized study, Dargo and Dimas (2021) examined the experiences of 15 secondary school teachers in Puerto Princesa City and reported best practices such as using social media to distribute educational materials, which fostered critical thinking and engagement. These findings illustrate how MDL, though imperfect, can be adapted to support meaningful learning when implemented with thoughtful strategies.

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is grounded in three key theoretical frameworks: Thorndike's (1949) Law of Readiness, and Kort–Butler's (2017) theory of Social Support. The Law of Readiness emphasizes that learning is most effective when individuals are mentally and emotionally prepared; otherwise, it results in frustration (Kolpin et al., 2018). This is highly relevant to teachers adapting to new instructional modalities, as readiness impacts their ability to deliver quality education. Olson (2015) further highlights the significance of recognizing "teachable moments," reinforcing that preparedness enhances both teaching and learning outcomes.

The theory of Optimal Challenges by Yerkes and Dodson (1908) suggests that learning is most effective at a balanced level of challenge—too little leads to boredom, while too much causes anxiety. Applied to this study, the theory helps explain the diverse challenges teachers face in delivering modular and distance learning under pandemic conditions. Teachers must strike a balance between expectations and students' capabilities while managing their own adaptation to new teaching methods. The theory supports the need for continuous, appropriately scaled challenges to keep both teachers and learners engaged and effective in their roles.

Lastly, Kort–Butler's (2017) theory of Social Support underscores the role of relationships in maintaining well-being, particularly in high-stress environments such as education during a pandemic. This theory is crucial for understanding the importance of assistance from school heads, parents, and the community in easing teachers' burdens, especially in modular learning contexts. Social support, whether emotional or practical, enhances teachers' resilience and capacity to manage tasks like module distribution, assessment, and communication with learners, ultimately supporting the overall success of the learning process.

Objectives of the Study

This paper aimed to determine the level of teachers' readiness and support on modular distance learning at La Castellana District 1, in the Division of Negros Occidental for the School Year 2020-2021. More specifically, this paper sought to determine 1) teachers' readiness in modular learning modality as assessed by School Heads and teachers in areas of Preparation, Distribution and Collection, and Assessments; 2) the level of support in modular learning modality as assessed by School Heads and teachers according to the aforementioned variables; 3) the significant difference in the level of teachers' readiness in modular learning modality as assessed by School Heads and teachers when they are grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables; and 4) the significant difference in the level of support in modular learning modality as assessed by School Heads and teachers when they are grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Methodology:

This section presents the Research Design, Locale of the study, Respondents of the Study, the Data-gathering Instruments, the Validity and Reliability, Data gathering procedure and Statistical Tools for Data Processing and Analysis.

Research Design

This study used the descriptive method of research aiming to determine relationships between variables, explores causes of phenomena, tests hypotheses, and develops generalizations, principles or theories on the basis of its findings at La Castellana District 1, in the Division of Negros Occidental for the School Year 2020-2021. Generally, according to Bueno (2016), this method describes systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately.

Respondents

This paper used stratified sampling using Slovin's formula to determine the study respondents from La Castellana District 1 (N=248; n=168).

Instrument

This study used a self-made data gathering instrument in gathering all the data. The instrument was divided into 2 parts: Part 1 contained information on the respondents' profile such as age, highest educational attainment and length of service; Part 2 contained the questionnaire proper consisting of 30 items on level of readiness, 30 items on level of support and 30 items on the extent of challenges, 10line-item per area. The respondents were asked to rate each item using the five-point Likert's scale which contains the following scores: which is 5 as always; 4 as sometimes, 3 as often; 2 as rarely and 1 as almost never.

Procedures for Data Collection

A formal request was submitted to the Division Superintendent following the completion of the research instrument's validity and reliability tests. Upon approval, a letter request was distributed to the school heads of the said District schools and to the respondents of the reliability test. After securing approval for the second request, questionnaires were administered to target respondents. The data gathered from the responses of the respondents were tallied and tabulated using the appropriate statistical tools. The raw data was transformed into numerical code guided by a coding manual. This allowed computer processing, statistical derivations and tabular presentation. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used in the computer processing of the encoded data.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective 1 used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean as a statistical tool to determine the level of teachers' readiness on modular distance learning as assessed by School Heads and teachers themselves in the following areas: preparation, distribution and collection and assessments.

Objective 2 used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean as a statistical tool to determine the level of teachers support on modular distance learning as assessed by School Heads and teachers themselves according to the variables.

Objective 3 used the comparative analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test as a statistical tool to determine the significant difference in the level of teachers' readiness on modular learning as assessed by School Heads and teachers themselves when they grouped and compared according to variables.

Objective 4 used the comparative analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test as a statistical tool to determine the significant difference in the level of support on modular learning as assessed by School Heads and teachers themselves when they are grouped and compared according to variables.

Ethical Considerations

Participants' personal demographic information results were collected and were noted in the data capturing sheet. Informed consent via verbal communication was elicited with the respondents. They read and understand the information provided and can ask questions. Moreover, their participation was voluntary, and they were free to withdraw without giving any reasons. The respondents were assured that there would be no risks of harm we will experience before, during, or after participating in the research. The data and information used in the study were treated with strict confidentiality. No statement regarding the participant's identity was disclosed unnecessarily in this study. After the data gathering, since there was no need, debriefing was not done by the researcher anymore, as cited in the Data Privacy Act.

Results and Discussion:

This section deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered to carry out the objectives of this study. All these were made possible by following certain appropriate procedures so as to give the exact data and solution to each specific problem.

Level of Readiness on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in the Areas of Preparation, Distribution and Collection and Assessments

Table 1
Level of Readiness on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in the Areas of Preparation, Distribution and Collection and Assessments

Items	**Teachers**		**School Heads**	
Preparation	**Mean**	**Interpretation**	**Mean**	**Interpretation**
1. have easy access to DepEd's LRMDS.	3.95	High Level	4.82	Very High Level
2. have enough time to prepare the needs for module printing.	4.24	High Level	4.71	Very High Level
3. am provided with ample supply of coupon bond by the school.	4.30	High Level	5.00	Very High Level
4. can use as much printer ink as needed provided by the school.	4.17	High Level	4.47	High Level
5. have all needed resources and references for module making.	4.13	High Level	4.65	Very High Level
6. am knowledgeable in putting in module contents.	4.18	High Level	4.71	Very High Level
7. have easy access to school internet during preparation of module.	3.15	Moderate Level	4.06	High Level
8. have my own laptop to use in preparing modules.	4.56	Very High Level	4.82	Very High Level
9. am well-trained on how to create modules.	3.49	Moderate Level	4.18	High Level
10. share best module making practices with fellow teachers.	3.77	High Level	4.59	Very High Level
Mean	**3.99**	**High Level**	**4.60**	**Very High Level**
Distribution and Collection				
1. personally observe health protocols during distribution and collection of modules.	4.86	Very High Level	4.71	Very High Level
2. enforce systematic distribution and collection modules.	4.78	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
3. make sure that all parents are compliant with policies such as social distancing, wearing of face masks and handwashing.	4.78	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
4. make an earlier announcement on when and how to claim or return their modules.	4.83	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
5. always follow school schedule in distributing and collecting modules.	4.85	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
6. am seeking the assistance of Barangay officials in giving out modules especially for those who are living from afar.	3.91	High Level	4.94	Very High Level
7. segregate and pack individual modules one day or two ahead.	4.82	Very High Level	4.71	Very High Level
8. allow pre-arranged date for those who can't come on time.	4.64	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
9. make sure that module distribution and collection is always on-time.	4.76	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
10. always give consideration to those who are living in far places by staying for few hours in school.	4.88	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
Mean	**4.71**	**Very High Level**	**4.93**	**Very High Level**
Assessments				
1. always make sure assessments are content-based.	4.74	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
2. always include answer keys to some topics to allow self-check.	4.74	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
3. prepare some exams similar to sample exercises to lighten difficult subjects.	4.60	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level

4. capture assessment scores are basis for further coaching with learners.	4.55	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
5. communicate with parents when assessment scores of their children are low.	4.51	Very High Level	4.82	Very High Level
6. provide feedback through instant messaging regarding the results of their assessments.	4.51	Very High Level	4.53	Very High Level
7. give modular assessments on a regular basis.	4.52	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
8. use standardized tests/assessments.	4.57	Very High Level	4.76	Very High Level
9. make sure that learners are able to achieve target scores.	4.43	High Level	4.82	Very High Level
10. encourage all of my pupils to make good in their assessments.	4.71	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
Mean	**4.59**	**Very High Level**	**4.87**	**Very High Level**
Overall Mean	**4.43**	**High Level**	**4.80**	**Very High Level**

The level of readiness for modular distance learning was assessed across three key areas: preparation, distribution and collection, and assessments, as rated by both teachers and school heads. In preparation, teachers rated their readiness as high (mean = 3.99), while school heads rated it as very high (mean = 4.60). Teachers reported strong access to essential tools like laptops but highlighted limited internet connectivity as a barrier, which school heads also acknowledged. This aligns with Oweis (2018) and Kiamba and Mutua (2017), who noted the critical role of technological access and competence in adapting to educational changes during the pandemic. The internet was not only essential for preparing modules but also for communication with school leaders and downloading teaching resources.

In the area of module distribution and collection, both teachers (mean = 4.71) and school heads (mean = 4.93) indicated a very high level of readiness. Teachers ensured accessibility for learners in remote areas by staying in school for extended hours, while school heads emphasized compliance with safety protocols and timely module handling. However, the lowest teacher scores reflected challenges in securing assistance from barangay officials and inconsistent adherence to health protocols by parents—an issue that also posed health risks (Melorin, 2021). These challenges highlighted a gap in local community support, emphasizing the need for stronger collaboration among stakeholders to support safe and efficient module management during crises.

Assessment readiness was also rated very high by teachers (mean = 4.59) and school heads (mean = 4.87). Teachers consistently developed content-based assessments and provided regular evaluations, but the main challenge lay in achieving target scores and delivering feedback—largely due to learners' limited access to communication tools and varying literacy and numeracy skills. This concern was echoed by the University of Sheffield (2020), which noted that limited communication capabilities delayed feedback and interventions for struggling students. The overall readiness rating averaged 4.43 for teachers (high) and 4.80 for school heads (very high), aligning with Kariyev et al. (2018), who stressed the need for adaptable, multi-competent educators capable of navigating the evolving demands of 21st-century education, particularly in crisis contexts.

Level of Support on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in the Areas of Preparation, Distribution and Collection and Assessments

Table 2
Level of Support on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads and Teachers in the Areas of Preparation, Distribution and Collection and Assessments

Items	**Teachers**		**School Heads**	
Preparation	**Mean**	**Interpretation**	**Mean**	**Interpretation**
1. am assisted by the school on how prepare self-learning modules.	4.45	High Level	5.00	Very High Level
2. am supported by our school's IT group during preparation stage.	4.37	High Level	5.00	Very High Level
3. have easy access to the school's internet connection.	3.13	Moderate Level	4.41	High Level
4. can easily use School laptop if mine is not working.	3.45	Moderate Level	4.35	High Level
5. can make use of the school's MOOE for module preparation.	4.59	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
6. can use the school's printer in case mine is not working.	4.50	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
7. counter check module contents with co-teachers.	4.46	High Level	4.59	Very High Level

8. extend and receive same amount of support to and from co-teachers in module making.	4.49	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
9. receive all kinds of support from my school head in making modules.	4.52	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
10. allow my peers to quickly review the modules I prepared.	4.44	High Level	4.65	Very High Level
Mean	**4.24**	**High Level**	**4.78**	**Very High Level**
Distribution and Collection				
1. receive school support during distribution and collection of modules.	4.77	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
2. have a designated area for module release and collection.	4.85	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
3. follow the date and time set by the school in the distribution and return the modules.	4.85	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
4. allow ample time for parents who are unable to receive and return their children's modules.	4.80	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
5. am assisted by co-teachers in distributing modules to those who are not easily reached.	4.70	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
6. follow all school directions on the release and return of modules.	4.82	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
7. appreciate the school's initiative in cascading distribution and return schedules of modules.	4.80	Very High Level	4.76	Very High Level
8. emphasize the importance of following the instructions to parents on how to get and return modules for an orderly process.	4.83	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
9. help the school in the over-all disinfection process before, during and after module distribution and collection.	4.79	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
10. ensure that every parent is assisted and properly informed on school process of releasing and retrieving modules.	4.80	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
Mean	**4.80**	**Very High Level**	**4.95**	**Very High Level**
Assessments				
1. share within the same Grade level best assessment practices.	4.59	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
2. always make sure that assessments are peer-reviewed before printing them.	4.52	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
3. cooperate with co-teachers in checking assessment results.	4.61	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
4. always make sure that assessments are administered on time through proper module distribution.	4.67	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
5. make it a point that the integrity of every assessments is well-maintained.	4.64	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
6. maintain that periodic/summative tests are well-referenced to support learners' needs.	4.73	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
7. make sure that exam results are being used by teachers to provide support for learners.	4.67	Very High Level	4.88	Very High Level
8. talk to the parents of learners with low exam scores.	4.45	High Level	4.88	Very High Level
9. make sure that goals toward self-paced assessments are clearly explained to parents and learners.	4.69	Very High Level	4.94	Very High Level
10. have a free-hand in providing individual feedback on assessment results to parents and learners'	4.61	Very High Level	5.00	Very High Level
Mean	**4.62**	**Very High Level**	**4.96**	**Very High Level**
Overall Mean	**4.55**	**Very High Level**	**4.90**	**Very High Level**

Table 2 presents the level of support for modular distance learning in the areas of preparation, distribution and collection, and assessments as evaluated by both teachers and school heads. In the area of preparation, teachers rated the support they received as high (mean = 4.24), while school heads rated it very high (mean = 4.78). Teachers appreciated being able to utilize the MOOE funds and the assistance provided by IT staff and co-teachers. However, they noted moderate access to school internet and occasional difficulty using school equipment when personal devices

failed. These challenges contradict DepEd's (2020) claim of consistent support and access to resources for module preparation. Tayer and Agdana (2022) emphasized that even experienced educators require continuous technical support and training, which remains a gap in some schools.

In distribution and collection, support was assessed at a very high level by both groups (teachers = 4.80, school heads = 4.95). Schools had designated areas and strict schedules for module distribution and retrieval, and teachers ensured access for learners in remote areas. However, cooperation among teachers and recognition from parents remained weak points. Some teachers faced logistical and time-related challenges due to personal conflicts and inconsistent support systems. Malaya (2020) supported these findings, noting that while the modular format allows flexibility and individualized learning, its success depends on collaboration and sufficient infrastructure. Tyer also mentioned that teacher concerns stem not from a lack of preparedness but from financial stress and exposure to health risks during module delivery.

Support for assessments was similarly rated very high (teachers = 4.62, school heads = 4.96). Teachers provided content-based and periodic assessments aligned with student needs. Still, communication challenges emerged, as some parents and learners were unreachable, preventing timely feedback. This aligns with Melorin (2021), who identified poor connectivity and lack of devices as barriers to effective assessment and communication. Despite interventions like DepEd's BE-LCP and localized solutions in areas like San Juan City, the national implementation faced inconsistencies. Agayon et al. (2022) and Castroverde & Acala (2020) noted that support in the form of health protection, logistics, and functional communication systems remains crucial, especially in regions where mobile access is unreliable and contact information is outdated.

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Readiness on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads in the Areas of Preparation, Distribution, and Collection and Assessments when Grouped and Compared According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, and Length of Service

Table 3
Difference in the Level of Readiness on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads in the Area of Preparation According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	5	4.56	26.50	0.709		Not Significant
	Older	12	4.62				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	7	4.70	22.50	0.218	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	10	4.53				
Length of Service	Shorter	7	4.67	25.00	0.324		Not Significant
	Longer	10	4.55				

Table 3 shows the comparative analysis of the level of readiness for modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the preparation area according to variables.

When grouped according to age, the Mann-Whitney U test was 26.00, and the *p*-value was 0.079. As to the highest educational attainment, the Mann-Whitney U test was 22.50, and the *p*-value was 0.218. As to length of Service, the Mann-Whitney U test was 25.00, and the *p*-value was 0.324, greater than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "not significant."
Thus, the hypothesishypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of readiness on modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of preparation according to variables" was accepted.

The result implies that age, highest educational attainment, and length of service do not significantly impact readiness for modular distance learning preparation. This aligns with Martin et al. (2019), who emphasized that readiness for modular distance learning preparation is more influenced by institutional support and professional development opportunities than demographic factors such as age, educational attainment, or length of service.

Table 4
Difference in the Level of Readiness on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads in the Area of Distribution and Collection According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	5	4.94	28.00	0.810		Not Significant
	Older	12	4.93				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	7	4.96	26.00	0.318	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	10	4.91				
Length of Service	Shorter	7	4.96	26.00	0.318		Not Significant
	Longer	10	4.91				

Table 4 shows the comparative analysis of the level of readiness for modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in distribution and collection according to variables.

When grouped according to age, the Mann-Whitney U test was 28.00, and the *p*-value was 0.810. As to the highest educational attainment, the Mann-Whitney U test was 26.00, and the *p*-value was 0.318. As to length of Service, the Mann-Whitney U test was 26.00, and the *p*-value was 0.318, greater than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "not significant."

Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of readiness on modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of distribution and collection according to variables" was accepted.

The result implies that age, highest educational attainment, and length of service do not significantly impact readiness for modular distance learning in terms of distribution and collection. This is consistent with the study by The University of Sheffield (2020), which highlighted that the effectiveness and readiness of distribution and collection processes depend more on the systematic implementation of guidelines and logistical planning than on the demographic profiles of the individuals involved.

Table 5
Difference in the Level of Readiness on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads in the Area of Assessment
According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	5	4.94	16.50	0.135		Not Significant
	Older	12	4.84				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	7	4.84	34.50	0.959	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	10	4.89				
Length of Service	Shorter	7	4.94	15.00	0.041		Significant
	Longer	10	4.82				

Table 5 shows the comparative analysis of the level of readiness for modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of assessment according to variables.

When grouped according to age, the Mann-Whitney U test was 16.50, and the *p*-value was 0.135. As to highest educational attainment, the Mann-Whitney U test was 34.50, and the *p*-value was 0.959, greater than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "not significant."

Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of readiness on modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of assessment according to variables" was accepted.

The result implies that age, highest educational attainment, and length of service do not significantly affect the readiness for modular distance learning in assessment.

As to the length of Service, the Mann-Whitney U test was 15.00, and the *p*-value was 0.041. It is lower than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "significant." Thus, the hypothesis that "there is no significant difference in the level of readiness on modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of assessment according to length of service" was rejected.

The result implies that teachers' opinions on their readiness to administer assessments are influenced by their length of service. More tenured teachers tend to be more confident in administering assessments, as their experience allows them to navigate the process more easily. In contrast, less tenured teachers may feel less confident handling these tasks. This aligns with the research of Bertoch et al. (2014) and San Antonio et al. (2011), who found that teachers with longer years of service often demonstrate greater confidence and readiness when implementing new teaching strategies, such as modular distance learning, particularly in assessment-related tasks. Their studies highlight that seasoned educators are better equipped to manage the complexities of new teaching methods due to their accumulated experience and established routines.

Comparative Analysis of the Level of Support on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads in the Areas of Preparation, Distribution, and Collection and Assessments when Grouped and Compared According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, and Length of Service

Table 6
Difference in the Level of Support on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads in the Area of Preparation According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	5	4.82	24.00	0.511		Not Significant
	Older	12	4.77				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	7	4.71	21.50	0.171	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	10	4.83				
Length of Service	Shorter	7	4.76	30.00	0.612		Not Significant
	Longer	10	4.80				

Table 6 shows the comparative analysis of the level of support for modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of preparation according to variables.

When grouped according to age, the Mann-Whitney U test was 24.00, and the *p*-value was 0.511. As to the highest educational attainment, the Mann-Whitney U test was 21.50, and the *p*-value was 0.171. As to length of Service, the Mann-Whitney U test was 30.00, and the *p*-value was 0.612, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "not significant."

Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of support on modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of preparation according to variables" was therefore accepted.

The result implies that age, highest educational attainment, and length of service do not significantly affect the level of support for modular distance learning in terms of preparation. This is consistent with Larawan (2013), who noted that variables such as age, educational level, and length of service have minimal influence on the level of support in educational management during modular distance learning. Similarly, Lim (2016) found that these factors had little impact on the logistical aspects of distance learning support.

Table 7
Difference in the Level of Support on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads in the Area of Distribution and Collection According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation

Age	Younger	5	4.98	23.00	0.380		Not Significant
	Older	12	4.94				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	7	4.97	30.00	0.561	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	10	4.94				
Length of Service	Shorter	7	4.99	22.00	0.131		Not Significant
	Longer	10	4.93				

Table 7 shows the comparative analysis of the level of support for modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of distribution and collection according to variables.

When grouped according to age, the Mann-Whitney U test was 23.00, and the *p*-value was 0.380. As to the highest educational attainment, the Mann-Whitney U test was 30.00, and the *p*-value was 0.561. As to length of Service, the Mann-Whitney U test was 22.00, and the *p*-value was 0.131, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "not significant."

Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of support on modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of distribution and collection according to variables" was therefore accepted.

The result implies that age, highest educational attainment, and length of service do not significantly affect the support of modular distance learning in terms of distribution and collection. This is supported by Larawan (2013), who found that variables such as age, highest educational attainment, and length of service do not significantly influence the support provided in modular distance learning distribution and collection.

Table 8
Difference in the Level of Support on Modular Distance Learning as assessed by the School Heads in the Area of Assessment According to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	Mann Whitney U	*p*-value	*Sig. level*	Interpretation
Age	Younger	5	4.98	25.00	0.511		Not Significant
	Older	12	4.95				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	7	4.97	27.50	0.362	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	10	4.95				
Length of Service	Shorter	7	4.96	35.00	1.000		Not Significant
	Longer	10	4.96				

Table 8 shows the comparative analysis of the level of support for modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of assessment according to variables.

When grouped according to age, the Mann-Whitney U test was 25.00, and the *p*-value was 0.511. As to the highest educational attainment, the Mann-Whitney U test was 27.50, and the *p*-value was 0.362. As to length of Service, the Mann-Whitney U test was 35.00, and the *p*-value was 1.000, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "not significant."

Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of support on modular distance learning as assessed by the school heads in the area of assessment according to variables" was therefore accepted.

The result aligns with the study of Seridon (2022), which concluded that age, highest educational attainment, and length of service do not significantly impact the support for modular distance learning in terms of assessment.

Conclusions:

The study found that most teacher-respondents were younger, had less teaching experience, and did not hold postgraduate degrees, while school head respondents were older, more experienced, and had higher educational

attainment. Teachers and school heads both rated teachers' readiness and support for modular distance learning as generally high, with distribution and collection receiving the highest ratings and module preparation consistently receiving the lowest. While no significant difference was found in readiness based on demographic variables, there was a significant difference in support when grouped by educational attainment, particularly in module preparation and assessment. Conclusions revealed that at the start of modular learning, teachers struggled with limited training, internet issues, and insufficient access to teaching materials. The study recommends enhancing internet access in schools through sustainable projects, providing standardized templates and collaborative module development, and implementing mentorship systems for less experienced teachers. It also encourages formal partnerships with barangays to aid in module logistics, structured schedules and tracking systems for efficient distribution, and the development of contextualized assessments supported by tutoring programs and professional development for new teachers to ensure academic success in a modular setup.

Acknowledgment

The researcher extends her heartfelt gratitude to the Graduate School of STI West Negros University and its esteemed faculty for their dedication to academic excellence and invaluable mentorship throughout this academic journey, to the panelists for their invaluable guidance and mentorship. Gratitude is also extended to the researcher's family and friends, whose unwavering support, encouragement, and faith provided a steady source of strength, particularly during challenging times. Above all, the researcher expresses her deepest gratitude to Almighty God, whose boundless grace, wisdom, and guidance served as the foundation for this accomplishment.

References:

Agayon, A.J., Agayon, A.K., & Pentang, J.T. (2022). *Teachers in The New Normal: Challenges and Coping Mechanisms in Secondary Schools. Journal of Humanities and Education Development (JHED)*. https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/jhed.4.1.8

Anoba, D. J. L., & Cahapay, M. B. (2020). *The Readiness of Teachers on Blended Learning Transition for Post-COVID-19 Period: An Assessment Using Parallel Mixed Method*. PUPIL: International Journal of Teaching, Education and Learning, 4(2), 295–316. https://doi.org/10.20319/pijtel.2020.42.295316

Bertoch, S., Lenz, J., Reardon, R., & Peterson, G. (2014). *Goal instability in relation to career thoughts, decision state, and performance in a career course*. J Career Dev. 2014;41:104–21

Bueno, M. (2016). *Descriptive research methods: Systematic analysis of populations and characteristics*. Journal of Social Science Research, 10(1), 34-47

Cariaga, R. (2023). *The Philippine Education Today and Its Way Forward (Journal of Ongoing Educational Research)*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374750171_The_Philippine_Education_Today_and_Its_Way_Forward_Journal_of_Ongoing_Educational_Research

Carreon, D. (2021). *Teachers' Readiness and Challenges in Modular Distance Learning*. ResearchGate. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3944096

Conford, I. (2018). *Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies as a Basis for Effective Lifelong Learning: How Far Have We Progressed? Lifelong Learning in Australia. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.* https://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2004/cor04942.pdf

Dangle, Y. R. P., & Sumaoang, J. D. (2020). *The Implementation of Modular Distance Learning in the Philippine Secondary Public Schools*. Mokslinės Leidybos Deimantas - Diamond Scientific Publishing. https://www.dpublication.com/abstract-of-3rd-icate/27-427/

Dayagbil, F. T., Palompon, D. R., Garcia, L. L., & Olvido, M. M. J. (2021). *Teaching and Learning Continuity Amid and Beyond the Pandemic. Frontiers in Education, 6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.678692

Department of Education. (2020). *Ed-7 assures safety protocols in modules distribution. Philippine News Agency*. https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1117343

Dargo, J.M., & Dimas, M. (2021) *Modular Distance Learning: Its Effect in the Academic Performance of Learners in the New Normal*. Journal of Education, Teaching, and Learning, 6(2), 204-208.

Dilnoza, M., Maftuna, S., Guzalkhon, S., and Makhliyo,, K. (2019). *Modular Training System as a Factor of Improving Educational Process*. Journal of Critical Reviews. https://www.ijitee.org/wp-content/uploads/papers/v9i1/A9152119119.pdf

Faustino, M. A. L., & Rapada Jr., V. P. (2024). *Taft District Teachers' Experiences and Perceptions on Distance Learning towards Readiness and Challenges in the New Normal*: Basis for Policy Formulation. International Multidisplinary Journal , 19(3), 705-712. https://twistjournal.net/twist/article/view/459

Felisilda, R., Cañedo, L., Bongcawil, A., & Bersa, D. (2024). *Challenges of Teachers on Modular Learning: Basis for Development Plan*. International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE). https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise

Gastardo, J. (2021). *Teacher's Readiness, Competencies and Performance of Kindergarten Pupils in Modular Distance Learning Modality*. International Journal of Advance Multidisciplinary Studies, 1(2). https://ijams-bbp.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/JENNIFER-T.-GASTARDO.pdf

Hidalgo, M. (2022). *Teachers' Experiences in the Implementation of Modular Distance Learning*. ResearchGate. https://www.ajhssr.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/O22606152160.pdf

Kariyev, A. D., Selkebayeva, A. T., Bespayeva , G. K., Baigundinova , B. I., & Kabdualieva, A. G. (2018). *A study of teacher's readiness for teaching students by methods of interactive learning as a condition for developing students' creative abilities*. 39(21). https://www.revistaespacios.com/a18v39n21/a18v39n21p15.pdf

Kiamba, E. W. & Mutua, F. (2017). *A critical review of the effect of teacher preparedness on students' academic achievement: A research agenda. Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4(37), 8790-8798

Larawan, L. A. (2013). *Acceptability of teacher-made modules in production management*. International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research, 1(2), 10-22.

Lim, C. D. (2016). *Exploring educational platforms and community behavior to support DLSU online blended learning initiative*. Educational Leadership. http://xsite.dlsu.edu.ph/conferences/dlsu-research-congress-proceedings/2016/GRC/GRC-LLI-002.pdf

Malaya, B. (2020*). Modular Distance Learning: Here's what you need to know. Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*. https://whatalife.ph/modular-distance-learning-heres-what-you-need-to-know/

Martin, F., Budhrani, K., & Wang, C. (2019). *Examining Faculty Perception of Their Readiness to Teach Online. Online Learning*, 23(3). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v23i3.1555

Melorin, M. M. (2021). *Module Distribution and Retrieval: A Challenge. Depedsanjuancity. Educational Leadership*. https://www.depedsanjuancity.ph/single-post/module-distribution-and-retrieval-a-challenge

Pentang, J. T., Bautista, R. M., Pizaña, A. D., & Egger, S. P. (2020). *Mathematical needs of Laura Vicuña learners*. Western Philippines University Graduate Journal, 5(1), 78-82. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3980365

Phan, T. T. N., & Dang, L. T. T. (2017). *Teacher Readiness for Online Teaching: A Critical Review**. 3(1). https://ijodel.upou.edu.ph/index.php/ijodel/article/download/18/50

San Antonio, D. M., Morales, N. S., & Moral, L. S. (2011). Module-based professional development for teachers: a cost-effective Philippine experiment. Teacher Development, 15(2), 157–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2011.571496

Seridon, M. (2022). *Best Practices in Implementing Modular Distance Learning to Indigenous People (IP) Students in Olongapo City*. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis. https://ijmra.in/v5i5/Doc/9.pdf

Tayer, M. M. O., & Agdana, F. M. L. (2022). *Readiness of English Teachers in Modular Instructional Delivery*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6819701

Toquero, C. M. (2020). *Emergency remote education experiment amid COVID-19 pandemic*. IJERI: International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation, 15, 162–172

UNESCO Report (2020). *COVID-19 Education Response*. https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/globalcoalition

University of Sheffield. (2020). *Coronavirus research: society and wellbeing*. Research Design Review. https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/research/coronavirus-research-society-and-wellbeing

Yu, H., Asistido, M. T., & Bautista, M. (2024). Difficulties Encountered by Vocational Students in the Online-Learning Modality. International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE), 1, 481–489.