

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2026, Vol. 7, No. 10, 4609 – 4639

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.07.10.26>

Research Article

Perceptions and Challenges of Learning Facilitators in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning: Bases for an Action Plan

Rose Ann. M. Molina^{1*}, Elisa A. Menor²

¹Graduate Student, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales

²Graduate School Lecturer, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales

Article history:

Submission 30 September 2026

Revised 13 October 2026

Accepted 23 October 2026

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

roseann.mendigorin@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study determined the perceptions and challenges of 125 learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales for School Year 2021-2022 geared towards the implementation of the proposed action plan to sustain and cope with the challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning. This study utilized the quantitative descriptive method of research. Findings revealed that a majority of the learning facilitators belonged to the age bracket of 30-39 years old, a majority of them were female, and a majority of them were high school graduate. They perceived that the modular printed learning was *fully implemented* in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support. They perceived that the implementation of modular printed learning was *quite challenging* in terms of availability of learning materials, contents of learning materials, and capabilities of learning facilitators. There was a *significant difference* between the perceptions of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support and their profile in terms of age and sex. The computed F statistics were greater than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis was *rejected*. There was a *significant difference* between the challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials, contents of learning materials, and their capabilities and their profile in terms of highest educational attainment. The computed F statistic was greater than the computed significant value; thus, the null hypothesis was *rejected*. There was a *positively very low non-significant correlation* between the perceptions of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support and their challenges in the implementation of

How to cite:

Molina, R. A. M & Menor, E. A. (2026). Perceptions and Challenges of Learning Facilitators in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning: Bases for an Action Plan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 7(10), 4609 – 4639. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.07.10.26

modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials, contents of learning materials, and their capabilities. The computed significant values were *not significant* at 5% level; thus, the null hypothesis was *accepted*. Hence, there is a need to sustain and cope with the challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning by implementing the proposed action plan.

Keywords: *Action plan, Elementary education, Facilitator capabilities, Implementation Challenges, Learning facilitation, Learning facilitators, Learning implementation, Learning materials, Learning material content, Learning process, Learning support, Modular distance learning, Modular printed learning, Subic district, Schools Division of Zambales, Teaching process*

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic brought substantial changes to the delivery of basic education as schools sought ways to continue instruction while protecting learners and teachers from health risks. In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) adopted the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan and implemented various alternative learning delivery modalities, including modular distance learning, to ensure that learning opportunities remained accessible despite the suspension of regular face-to-face classes (Department of Education, 2010). Printed self-learning modules became particularly important in communities where learners had limited access to internet connectivity, digital devices, or electricity (Department of Education, 2020).

Modular printed learning required teachers and learning facilitators to assume expanded responsibilities beyond conventional classroom instruction. Learning facilitators were expected to assist learners in understanding modules, monitor their progress, provide learning support, communicate with parents or guardians, and facilitate the distribution and retrieval of learning materials. The implementation of this modality, however, presented difficulties related to the preparation, distribution, monitoring, assessment, and retrieval of learning modules (Pamogas, 2022). (Castroverde & Acala, 2021) reported that teachers experienced challenges in planning and preparing modules, monitoring learners, checking outputs, and providing feedback.

Similarly, (Roman, 2021) found that communication, mobility, module content, monitoring of learning, and delayed submission of outputs were among the concerns encountered during modular distance learning.

The challenges were not limited to teachers. Parents and household members also assumed important roles in guiding learners at home. (Bautista, 2021) reported concerns among parents regarding the amount of activities in the modules, limited time, and difficulty understanding some lessons. These concerns emphasized the need for stronger coordination among schools, learning facilitators, parents, and learners.

Despite these challenges, modular printed learning provided an alternative means of sustaining education during an unprecedented period. Studies have emphasized the importance of training, instructional support, monitoring mechanisms, adequate learning materials, and stakeholder collaboration in improving its implementation (Cabardo et al., 2022; Correos & Huelma, 2022). Therefore, examining the perceptions and challenges encountered by learning facilitators remains important for identifying areas that require support and improvement.

In this context, the present study determined the perceptions and challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning at Agusuhin Elementary School–Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales, during School Year 2021–2022. The findings served as a basis for developing a

proposed action plan aimed at sustaining effective practices and addressing the challenges encountered in the implementation of modular printed learning.

Problem Statement

This study determined the perceptions and challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales for School Year 2021-2022.

Specifically, it aimed to answer these questions:

1. How may the profile of the respondents be described in terms of:
 - 1.1. age;
 - 1.2. sex; and
 - 1.3. highest educational attainment?
2. How may the perceptions of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning be described in terms of:
 - 2.1. teaching process;
 - 2.2. learning process; and
 - 2.3. learning support?
3. How may the challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning be described in terms of:
 - 3.1. availability of learning materials;
 - 3.2. contents of learning materials; and
 - 3.3. capabilities of learning facilitators?

4. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning and their profile when grouped accordingly?
5. Is there a significant difference between the challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning and their profile when grouped accordingly?
6. Is there a significant correlation between the perceptions and challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning?
7. What action plan can be proposed to sustain and cope with the challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning?

Objectives

This action plan aims to:

1. sustain the implementation of modular printed learning;
2. explain the teaching process to the parents and learning facilitators;
3. discuss the learning process to the learners;
4. provide learning support to the learners;
5. cope with the challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning;
6. ensure the availability of learning materials;
7. check the contents of learning materials; and
8. enhance the capabilities of learning facilitators through orientations.

Objectives	Activities / Strategies	Persons Involved	Time Frame	Success Indicator
Sustain the implementation of modular printed learning	Determine the weakest areas in the implementation of modular printed learning. Address the weakest areas and continue to implement the modular printed learning	School Head, Teachers, Learning Facilitators, Community Leaders	July 2022 to July 2024	School heads and teachers sustained the implementation of modular printed learning.
Explain the teaching process to the parents and	Gather all parents and learning facilitators. Inform them the	School Head, Teachers, Learning Facilitators,	July 2022 to July 2024	School heads and teachers explained the teaching process

Objectives	Activities / Strategies	Persons Involved	Time Frame	Success Indicator
learning facilitators	process in teaching under modular printed learning. Answer their queries. Monitor, evaluate, and gather feedback on the teaching process of learning facilitators.	Community Leaders		to the parents and learning facilitators.
Discuss the learning process to the learners	Gather the learners in an open space. Present the learning process under modular printed learning. Answer the queries of the learners. Monitor, evaluate, and gather feedback on the learning process.	School Head, Teachers, Learning Facilitators, Community Leaders	July 2022 to July 2024	Teachers, parents, and learning facilitators discussed the learning process to the learners.
Provide learning support to the learners	Communi-cate to the community leaders on providing learning support to the learners. Have MOA or MOU with the community leaders. Monitor the learning support or assistance given to the learners.	School Head, Teachers, Learning Facilitators, Community Leaders	July 2022 to July 2024	School heads, teachers, learning facilitators, and community leaders provided learning support to the learners.
Cope with the challenges in the implementa-tion of modular printed learning	Determine the challenges in the imple-mentation of modular printed learning. Address the challenges of the learning facilitators. Help the learning facilitators to cope with their challenges.	School Head, Teachers, Learning Facilitators, Community Leaders	July 2022 to July 2024	Parents and learning facilitators coped with the challenges in the imple-mentation of modular printed learning.
Ensure the availability of learning materials	Conduct inventory of available learning materials. Produce additional copies of learning	School Head, Teachers, Learning Facilitators,	July 2022 to July 2024	School heads, teachers, and learning facilitators ensured the

Objectives	Activities / Strategies	Persons Involved	Time Frame	Success Indicator
	materials. Ensure that there is 1:1 learner and learning modules ratio. Inspect the distribution lists of the learning materials.	Community Leaders		availability of learning materials.
Check the contents of learning materials	Create the quality assurance team for the school. Let the quality assurance team check the contents of learning materials. Inform the parents, learning facilitators, and teachers on the corrections made.	School Head, Teachers, Learning Facilitators, Community Leaders	July 2022 to July 2024	School heads and teachers checked the contents of learning materials.
Enhance the capabilities of learning facilitators through orientations	Determine the strengths and weaknesses of the learning facilitators. Conduct orientations and training on the contents of the learning materials. Monitor and evaluate the activities of the learning facilitators.	School Head, Teachers, Learning Facilitators, Community Leaders	July 2022 to July 2024	School heads and teachers enhanced the capabilities of learning facilitators through orientations.

Scopes and Limitations

This study was delimited on the perceptions and challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales for School Year 2021-2022. Further delimitation included the following: profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, and highest educational attainment; perceptions of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support; and challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms

of availability of learning materials, contents of

learning materials, and capabilities of learning facilitators.

The study covered a total of 125 learning facilitators in Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales. They were the recognized learning facilitators of the grades 3 and 4 learners.

The data were gathered through the researcher-made questionnaire answered by the learning facilitators.

The quantitative descriptive method of research was employed, and the identified appropriate and fitted statistical tools were applied to treat the data gathered in this study.

Methodology Research Design

This study utilized the quantitative descriptive method of research. It was quantitative descriptive because it quantified and described the profile of the learning facilitators, and their perceptions and challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning.

Quantitative research is primarily about numbers. It generally involves surveying a large group of people using a structured questionnaire that contains predominantly closed-ended, or forced-choice questions (Mohajan, 2021). Quantitative research is a strategy which involves the collection of numerical data, a deductive view of the relationship between theory and research, a preference for a natural science approach, and an objectivist conception of social reality (Thompson, 2018). Quantitative research can call on surveys or analytics to quantify consumer behaviors, perceptions, attitudes, and interests, giving you the hard numbers needed to back the ideas or theories (Basias & Pollalis, 2018).

Descriptive research is an appropriate choice when the research aim is to identify characteristics, frequencies, trends, and categories. It is useful when not much is known yet about the topic or problem (McCombes, 2020). Descriptive research refers to the scientific methodology in which observation of the sampled population is carried out in its natural surroundings. It intends to find out what is related to a phenomenon (Bhattacharya & Chetty, 2020). Descriptive research is defined as a re-

search method that describes the characteristics of the population or phenomenon that is being studied. It focuses on describing the nature of a demographic segment, without focusing on why a certain phenomenon occurs (Cabot, 2020).

Since the study determined the perceptions and challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales for School Year 2021-2022 wherein data were collected, classified, summarized, presented in percentages, and means, and with the entire population as the total number of the respondents, the quantitative descriptive method of research was the most appropriate method used.

The Respondents

The respondents of the study were the 125 learning facilitators in Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales for School Year 2021-2022.

Table 1 presents the distribution of the respondents by grade level. As can be seen from the table, there were 125 learning facilitators coming from grade 3 and 4 classes of Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales. They were the recognized learning facilitators of the learners based on the submitted reports of the teachers. These learning facilitators were involved in this study as respondents.

Table 1. Distribution of the Respondents by Grade Level

Grade Level	Frequency	Percentage
Gade III	62	49.60
Grade IV	63	50.40
Total	125	100.00

Instrument

This study used a researcher-made questionnaire in gathering the needed data. A questionnaire is an instrument for collecting data, which almost always involves asking a given subject to respond to a set of oral or written questions (Debois, 2019). It is a research instrument consisting of a series of questions and other prompts for the purpose of gathering information from respondents (Ndukwa, 2020). It is a set of questions with a space for answers

used in assembling information from respondents (Bhandari, 2022). Since the researcher of this study determined the perceptions and challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales for School Year 2021-2022, questionnaire was the most appropriate research instrument used in gathering the needed data of this study.

The questionnaire was prepared using Google forms. Google forms is a powerful tool to collect, analyze, and organize information in many ways (Olajide, 2019). It can be used in several ways to increase classroom environment benefits such as surveying learners outside of class to learn about them as individuals, engaging them in class by collecting responses in the moment, and collecting their self-reflections after a lesson (Nguyen, et. al., 2018). It is a fantastic tool for teachers to help enhance the class works. It is a quick and easy way to leverage the form-based system to create quizzes, make grading faster and easier, and more. Since it is all cloud-based, distributing anything created is as simple as sharing a link (Edwards, 2020)

The questionnaire was composed of three (3) parts. Part I was confined with the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, and highest educational attainment. Part II contained the perceptions of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support. Part III elicited the challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials, contents of learning materials, and capabilities of learning facilitators.

Data Analysis

The researcher sought permissions to the Schools Division Superintendent of DepEd-Zambales, coordinating principal, and principal of Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales. After permissions were granted, the researcher sought the help and assistance of the grade 3 and 4 teachers in sending the link of the questionnaire.

Prior to the sending of the link of the questionnaire, informed consent was provided to the respondents. This was given by the researcher to the learning facilitators during the distribution of the learning packets of the learners. When they affixed their signatures, this served as the signal to the researcher to send the link of the questionnaire.

In sending the link of the questionnaires, the researcher coordinated with the school

head, school ICT coordinator, and grade 3 and 4 teachers. The link to the questionnaire was sent to them. They passed this link of the questionnaire to their respective group chats with the instruction of requesting them to accomplish. This was done to ensure the health and safety of everyone amidst COVID-19 pandemic. Likewise, this was the easiest way to gather the responses of the respondents wherever they were.

After all respondents submitted the responses, the researcher generated the excel format of their responses and sent the file to the resident statistician who processed the data using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The interpretations of results were done thereafter with the guidance and assistance of her thesis adviser and in consultation with the resident statistician.

Statistical Tools

The statistical tools were utilized in determining the interpretations of the data, and the testing of the hypotheses. These included Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution, Mean, Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and Shapiro-Wilk Test, One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) or Kruskal-Wallis Test, and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient or Spearman's Rho.

1. Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution were used to categorize the respondents' responses according to their profile. The frequency showed the actual responses of the respondents to the items in the questionnaire.
2. Mean was used to present the responses of the respondents in the different statements stipulated in the questionnaire like their perceptions and challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning.
3. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and Shapiro-Wilk Test, tests of normality were utilized to determine the appropriate statistical tools used in this study.
4. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) or Kruskal-Wallis Test was used to determine the significant difference between the perceptions and challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning when grouped according to their profile.

5. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient or Spearman's Rho was used to determine if there was significant correlation between perceptions and challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning.

Scoring

The Likert Scale below was employed in determining the descriptive rating in the perceptions of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning:

Table 2. Likert Scale in Describing the Perceptions of Learning Facilitators in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning

Score	Limits	Descriptive Rating
4	3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented
3	2.50 – 3.24	Quite Implemented
2	1.75 – 2.49	Slightly Implemented
1	1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented

The scale below was utilized to describe the challenges of learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning:

Table 3. Likert Scale in Describing the Challenges of Learning Facilitators in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning

Score	Limits	Descriptive Rating
4	3.25 – 4.00	Very Challenging
3	2.50 – 3.24	Quite Challenging
2	1.75 – 2.49	Less Challenging
1	1.00 – 1.74	Not Challenging

Finally, the scale below was used in determining the significant correlation between the perceptions and challenges of learning

facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning:

Table 4. Scale in Determining the Significant Correlation Between the Perceptions and Challenges of Learning Facilitators in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning

r Value	Descriptive Rating
± 1.00	Positive/Negative Perfect Correlation
± 0.75 to ± 0.99	Positive/Negative Very High Correlation
± 0.50 to ± 0.74	Positive/Negative High Correlation
± 0.25 to ± 0.49	Positive/Negative Low Correlation
± 0.01 to ± 0.24	Positive/Negative Very Low Correction
0.00	No Correlation

Result and Discussion

Presentation, Analysis, and Interpretation of Data

This part of the research focuses on the results of the study which consisted of several parts: profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, and highest educational attainment; their perceptions in the implementation of

modular printed learning in terms of teaching

process, learning process, and learning support; and their challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials, contents of learning materials, and capabilities of learning facilitators. The computed mean and interpretations are likewise cited.

Profile of the Respondents

A majority of the respondents belonged to the age bracket of 30–39 years old, a majority

of them were female, and a majority of them were high school graduates.

The learning facilitators are in their mid-30s. It is during this time when they become prepared in the performance of their tasks during the pandemic. They need to make sure that they understand their roles as learning facilitators (Bearley, 2021). Likewise, they are expected to perform their assigned roles. They already know how to become committed to their given tasks to ensure the enhancement of the performance of the learners in all aspects. Assigning roles to individuals can be a good way to improve the performance of the learners (De Meyst & Grenier, 2021). Learning facilitators must give their best in the performance of their assigned roles. They need to ensure that they are helping the learners in acquiring the attached knowledge and skills in their learning modules. It is important to make teaching an attractive profession by improving its status, compensation policies, and career progression structures (Evans & Beteille, 2019).

There are more female learning facilitators than male. Women might be more willing to serve as learning facilitators because it is amenable to their needs. They are more likely now than ever before to desire work, yet still tend to bear most of the child-rearing responsibilities (Wong, 2019). Likewise, female learning facilitators are more sensitive to the feelings and condition of the learners. They can easily determine their needs while classes are going on. Women have more active brains than men (Van Mulukom, 2018). The field of teaching requires learning facilitators to have a heart for their learners. They need to understand their situation and conditions in their lives. At the

heart of all learning is meaning-making that involves connecting what learners already know to new information (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019).

The learning facilitators were high school graduates. This is a clear manifestation that they need the support of teachers in the performance of their assigned tasks. Teachers' support enhances their relationship with learning facilitators. They show their care and concern for learning facilitators by providing them with tips and guidelines (Lei & Chiu, 2018). Orientations and training are essential in enhancing the knowledge and skills of learning facilitators. This is the reason why schools provide weekly orientations for learning facilitators to explain the contents of the learning modules. Research found a positive relationship between curriculum orientations and educational attainment (Alsalem, 2018). Every day is an opportunity for individuals to learn. The learning facilitators must take advantage of learning new things based on the execution of their assigned tasks. Learning is an ongoing process that is simultaneously biological and cultural (Templin, 2018).

Table 5 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the profile of the respondents in terms of age. The table shows that of the observed number of the respondents, a majority or 53.60% belonged to the age bracket of 30-39 years old, 31 or 24.80% belonged to the age bracket of 40-49 years old, 12 or 9.60% belonged to the age bracket of 20-29 years old, eight (8) or 6.40% belonged to the age bracket of 50-59 years old, five (5) or four (4)% belonged to the age bracket of 19 years old and below, and two (2) or 1.60% belonged to the age bracket of 60 years old and above.

Table 5. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
60 years old and above	2	1.60
50-59 years old	8	6.40
40-49 years old	31	24.80
30-39 years old	67	53.60
20-29 years old	12	9.60
19 years old and below	5	4.00
Total	125	100.00

Table 6 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the profile of the respondents in terms of sex. The table shows that

of the observed number of the respondents, a majority or 92.80% were female, and nine (9) or 7.20% were male.

Table 6. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	9	7.20
Female	116	92.80
Total	125	100.00

Table 7 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the profile of the respondents in terms of highest educational attainment. The table shows that of the observed

number of the respondents, a majority or 56.80% were high school graduate, 49 or 39.20% were elementary graduate, and five (5) or four (4)% were college graduate.

Table 7. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
College Graduate	5	4.00
High School Graduate	71	56.80
Elementary Graduate	49	39.20
Total	125	100.00

Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning

Teaching Process. The results revealed that the respondents perceived modular printed learning as *fully implemented* in terms of the teaching process. The general mean rating was 3.48. The respondents perceived modular printed learning as *fully implemented* when the teachers explained to their parents their teaching process, discussed with their learners their teaching process, presented the step-by-step teaching process, shared their teaching guides with the parents or learning facilitators, provided guidance and assistance to the parents or learning facilitators, provided their contact details to the parents, learning facilitators, and learners for easy access, provided remedial lessons and activities to their learners, addressed the learning needs of their learners, supported their learners in understanding their lessons, and provided feedback to the parents, learning facilitators, and learners.

The teaching process in modular printed learning focuses on the use of learning modules. Learning modules, as a form of individualized instruction, are one idea of flexible learning. They cover a single element of a topic or subject matter specifically designed to suit the

needs of the learner in every discipline toward meeting the desired learning outcomes. A well-designed learning module effectively facilitates the teaching and learning process toward achievement of program outcomes (Tagano et al., 2022). Usually, learning facilitators serve as the teachers of the learners while studying at home. They are the ones who directly supervise, guide, assist, and help the learners in their studies (Eriales et al., 2022). In teaching the learners, they are guided by their learning guides that are concentrated on the learning tasks. They empower the learners to master each skill or subject of instruction. They need to follow the processes and procedures in their learning tasks for them to accomplish their required learning outputs (Ssebikindu, 2020).

Learning Process. The results revealed that the respondents perceived modular printed learning as *fully implemented* in terms of the learning process. The general mean rating was 3.47. The respondents perceived modular printed learning as *fully implemented* when the teachers conducted orientations regarding the learning process to their learners, explained the process of learning, provided the step-by-step learning process, prepared learning guides for every learner in their class, attended to the

learning needs of their learners, instructed their learners to work alone on their different activities, contacted them if they needed further elaboration regarding their lessons, monitored the learning activities of their learners, sought support from their parents or learning facilitators regarding their lessons, and conducted limited home visitation activities with their learners.

The learning facilitators oversee the learning process of the learners in the implementation of modular printed learning. This directs the procedures on how learning takes place in the learners. Learning can be considered as change that is permanent in nature because change is brought into learners by learning facilitators through techniques like developing specific skills, changing some attitudes, or understanding specific laws operating behind a learning environment (Munna & Kalam, 2021). The learning facilitators need to consider the learning styles of the learners to ensure that they can easily grasp the contents of their lessons. Learning style is the unique way an individual processes and retains new information and skills (Ilcin, 2018). It also matters when the learners are engaged in learning their lessons. Engagement increases learner satisfaction, enhances learner motivation to learn, reduces the sense of isolation, and improves learner performance (Martin & Bolliger, 2018).

Learning Support. The results revealed that the respondents perceived modular printed learning as *fully implemented* in terms of learning support. The general mean rating was 3.52. The respondents perceived modular printed learning as *fully implemented* when the teachers provided guidance and assistance to the studies of their learners, answered the queries of the learners, ensured that their learners were learning their lessons, monitored the learning progress of their learners, the parents provided guidance and assistance to the studies of their children, answered the questions of their children, their children understood the concepts of their lessons, the learning facilitators explained the contents of the learning modules, entertained the questions, and their learners understood the concepts of their lessons.

The learners are receiving support from their teachers, parents, and learning facilitators during the implementation of modular printed learning. Their teachers' priority is their learners' success. This is the reason why they are helping their learners to attain their full potential (Kelly, 2024). Parents are also supporting the studies of their children. They are the ones who oversee their learning progress by asking them relevant questions regarding their lessons. Some parents today feel the need to have a child they can show off and drive them to succeed following the parents' script (Rosemond, 2019). The learning facilitators also support the studies of the learners by providing them guidance and assistance through explaining the instructions, the processes they need to do, and the ways on how to accomplish their tasks. They take an important role as curators, facilitators, moderators, co-creators, and observers who engage and help the learners understand the learning objectives and assist them to achieve these objectives (Sturn & Angelova, 2020).

Table 8 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process. As can be seen from the table, the respondents perceived modular printed learning *fully implemented* when the teachers explained to their parents their teaching process ($\mu = 3.58$), discussed to their learners their teaching process ($\mu = 3.43$), presented the step-by-step teaching process ($\mu = 3.48$), shared their teaching guides to the parents or learning facilitators ($\mu = 3.54$), provided guidance and assistance to the parents or learning facilitators ($\mu = 3.54$), provided their contact details to the parents, learning facilitators, and learners for easy access ($\mu = 3.53$), provided remedial lessons and activities to their learners ($\mu = 3.47$), addressed the learning needs of their learners ($\mu = 3.50$), supported their learners in understanding their lessons ($\mu = 3.38$), and provided feedback to the parents, learning facilitators, and learners ($\mu = 3.39$). In terms of teaching process, the general mean rating of the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning was 3.48, and it was interpreted as *fully implemented*.

Table 8. Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning in Terms of Teaching Process

Item	Descriptor	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	The teachers explain to their parents their teaching process in modular printed learning.	3.58	Fully Implemented
2	The teachers discuss to their learners their teaching process in modular printed learning.	3.43	Fully Implemented
3	The teachers present the step-by-step teaching process.	3.48	Fully Implemented
4	The teachers share their teaching guides to the parents or learning facilitators.	3.54	Fully Implemented
5	The teachers ensure that they provide guidance and assistance to the parents or learning facilitators.	3.54	Fully Implemented
6	The teachers provide their contact details to the parents, learning facilitators, and learners for easy access.	3.53	Fully Implemented
7	The teachers provide remedial lessons and activities to their learners.	3.47	Fully Implemented
8	The teachers find time to address the learning needs of their learners.	3.50	Fully Implemented
9	The teachers provide mechanisms to support their learners in understanding their lessons.	3.38	Fully Implemented
10	The teachers provide feedback to the parents, learning facilitators, and learners.	3.39	Fully Implemented
General Mean Rating		3.48	Fully Implemented

Table 9 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of learning process. As can be seen from the table, the respondents perceived modular printed learning *fully implemented* when the teachers conducted orientations regarding the learning process to their learners ($\mu = 3.49$), explained the process of learning ($\mu = 3.42$), provided the step-by-step learning process ($\mu = 3.54$), prepared learning guides for every learner in their class ($\mu = 3.58$), attended to the learning needs of their learners ($\mu = 3.50$), instructed their learners to work alone

on their different activities ($\mu = 3.26$), contacted them if they needed further elaboration regarding their lessons ($\mu = 3.61$), monitored the learning activities of their learners ($\mu = 3.48$), sought support from their parents or learning facilitators regarding their lessons ($\mu = 3.56$), and conducted limited home visitation activities to their learners ($\mu = 3.29$). In terms of learning process, the general mean rating of the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning was 3.47, and it was interpreted as *fully implemented*.

Table 9. Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning in Terms of Learning Process

Item	Descriptor	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	The teachers conduct orientation regarding the learning process to their learners.	3.49	Fully Implemented
2	The teachers explain to the learners the process of learning in modular printed learning.	3.42	Fully Implemented
3	The teachers provide the step-by-step learning process to their learners.	3.54	Fully Implemented

Item	Descriptor	Mean Rating	Interpretation
4	The teachers prepare learning guides for every learner in their class.	3.58	Fully Implemented
5	The teachers ensure that they attend to the learning needs of their learners.	3.50	Fully Implemented
6	The teachers instructed their learners to work alone on their different activities.	3.26	Fully Implemented
7	The teachers inform their learners to contact them if they need further elaboration regarding their lessons.	3.61	Fully Implemented
8	The teachers monitor the learning activities of their learners.	3.48	Fully Implemented
9	The teachers allow their learners to seek support from their parents or learning facilitators regarding their lessons.	3.56	Fully Implemented
10	The teachers find time to conduct limited home visitation activity to their learners.	3.29	Fully Implemented
General Mean Rating		3.47	Fully Implemented

Table 10 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of learning support. As can be seen from the table, the respondents perceived modular printed learning *fully implemented* when the teachers provided guidance and assistance to the studies of their learners ($\mu = 3.43$), answered the queries of the learners ($\mu = 3.52$), ensured that their learners were learning their lessons ($\mu = 3.64$), monitored the learning progress of their learners ($\mu = 3.52$), the parents provided guidance and assistance

to the studies of their children ($\mu = 3.63$), answered the questions of their children ($\mu = 3.59$), their children understood the concepts of their lessons ($\mu = 3.43$), the learning facilitators explained the contents of the learning modules ($\mu = 3.57$), entertained the questions ($\mu = 3.38$), and their learners understood the concepts of their lessons ($\mu = 3.54$). In terms of learning support, the general mean rating of the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning was 3.52, and it was interpreted as *fully implemented*.

Table 10. Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning in Terms of Learning Support

Item	Descriptor	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	The teachers provide guidance and assistance to the studies of the learners.	3.43	Fully Implemented
2	The teachers answer the queries of their learners regarding their lessons.	3.52	Fully Implemented
3	The teachers ensure that their learners are learning their lessons.	3.64	Fully Implemented
4	The teachers monitor the learning progress of their learners.	3.52	Fully Implemented
5	The parents provide guidance and assistance to the studies of their children.	3.63	Fully Implemented
6	The parents answer the questions of their children regarding their lessons.	3.59	Fully Implemented
7	The parents ensure that their children understand the concepts of their lessons.	3.43	Fully Implemented

Item	Descriptor	Mean Rating	Interpretation
8	The learning facilitators explain the contents of the learning modules to their learners.	3.57	Fully Implemented
9	The learning facilitators entertain the questions of their learners regarding their lessons.	3.38	Fully Implemented
10	The learning facilitators see to it that their learners understand the concepts of their lessons.	3.54	Fully Implemented
General Mean Rating		3.52	Fully Implemented

Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning

Availability of Learning Materials. The results revealed that the respondents perceived the implementation of modular printed learning as *quite challenging* in terms of availability of learning materials. The general mean rating was 2.69. The respondents perceived the implementation of modular printed learning as *quite challenging* when the teachers prepared the learning materials for each learner, ensured the availability of learning materials, distributed the copies of the learning materials, ensured that every learner had their own copies of their learning materials, shared the copies of supplementary learning materials, ensured that every learner had their own copies of the supplementary learning materials in accordance with their learning needs, provided copies of the reading materials, ensured that every learner had their own copy of reading materials, provided copies of the numeracy materials, and every learner had their own copies of numeracy materials based on their levels.

Teachers ensure the availability of learning materials for their learners. They are the ones who prepare the learning packets of their learners. Prior to the distribution phase, they ensure that all the learning materials needed by the learners are already placed in their envelope. In fact, teachers are in desperate need of materials to equip all of their learners with distance learning resources so they can continue to participate in school from their homes (Karbowski, 2020). Teachers are the ones who print the learning materials of the learners. There are also instances when they prepare additional learning activities to augment the contents of their learning modules. It is important that they suit the contents of their learning materials with the levels of understanding of their

learners (Hwa, 2020). It is important to ensure that every learner has their own learning materials. This is the best way to ensure that they have access to their learning materials and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills attached for the improvement of their performance (Abubakar, 2020).

Contents of Learning Materials. The results revealed that the respondents perceived the implementation of modular printed learning as *quite challenging* in terms of contents of learning materials. The general mean rating was 2.75. The respondents perceived the implementation of modular printed learning as *quite challenging* when the contents of the learning materials had clear instructions, clear illustrations, were written in simple words, were within the levels of the learners, depicted the current condition of the learners, were encouraging and inspiring, depicted different emotions, were free from errors, and were helpful in enhancing the learning performance of the learners.

The contents of the learning materials are considered as one of the challenges encountered by the learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning. The teachers are printing the modules of the learners through a book-type format to lessen their expenses in school supplies and materials. More and more reams of bond paper are needed as each teacher needs three reams for each subject per month, as estimated (Colcol, 2020). They also need to consider the number of activities stipulated in their learning modules. In fact, teachers are bombarded with many concerns regarding the contents of their learning materials. The learners cannot finish all the activities given for the week (Castroverde & Acala, 2021). Moreover, the contents of the learning materials must be free

from errors. Teachers are advised to go over the contents of their learning materials prior to their distribution schedule so that they can provide an erratum immediately (Hernando, 2021).

Capabilities of Learning Facilitators. The results revealed that the respondents perceived the implementation of modular printed learning as *quite challenging* in terms of capabilities of learning facilitators. The general mean rating was 2.60. The respondents perceived the implementation of modular printed learning as *quite challenging* when they motivated the learners to study their lessons, explained the importance of working on the given learning activities, managed the time allotted in every learning activity, motivated the learners to give their best in doing their learning activities, understood the contents of the learning materials, explained the contents of the learning materials, provided other examples related to the contents of the learning materials, showed the different ways of arriving at the correct answers in the learning activities, explained the correct answers on the mistakes of the learners, and interpreted the scores of their learners in every activity.

The capabilities of the learning facilitators are considered quite challenging because most of them were high school graduates. This simply means that they need the guidance and assistance of the teachers in the execution of their roles with their learners. Understanding the reasons behind teaching practices can help learning facilitators create meaningful and effective at-home learning opportunities during the pandemic (Lee, 2020). They need to be enlightened on the process of teaching and learning for them to fully understand their roles as

learning facilitators. It matters when they are coached on this aspect. Coaching is shown to have a powerful, positive impact on self-confidence, wellness, and work performance (Cooks-Campbell, 2021). What matters most is their willingness to learn for them to become successful in their assigned tasks. In fact, the emphasis is on continuous learning and enhancing skill sets through outcome-based learning (Kumar, 2018).

Table 11 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials. As can be seen from the table, the respondents perceived the implementation of modular printed learning *quite challenging* when the teachers prepared the learning materials for each learner ($\mu = 2.85$), ensured the availability of learning materials ($\mu = 2.74$), distributed the copies of the learning materials ($\mu = 2.62$), ensured that every learner had their own copies of their learning materials ($\mu = 2.62$), shared the copies of supplementary learning materials ($\mu = 2.60$), ensured that every learner has their own copies of the supplementary learning materials in accordance with their learning needs ($\mu = 2.66$), provided copies of the reading materials ($\mu = 2.73$), ensured that every learner had their own copy of reading materials ($\mu = 2.70$), provided copies of the numeracy materials ($\mu = 2.73$), and every learner had their own copies of numeracy materials based on their levels ($\mu = 2.66$). In terms of availability of learning materials, the general mean rating of the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning was 2.69, and it was interpreted as *quite challenging*.

Table 11. Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning in Terms of Availability of Learning Materials

Item	Descriptor	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	The teachers prepare the learning materials for each learner.	2.85	Quite Challenging
2	The teachers ensure the availability of learning materials for their learners.	2.74	Quite Challenging
3	The teachers distribute the copies of the learning materials to their learners.	2.62	Quite Challenging
4	The teachers ensure that every learner has their own copy of the learning materials.	2.62	Quite Challenging

Item	Descriptor	Mean Rating	Interpretation
5	The teachers share the copies of supplementary learning materials to their learners.	2.60	Quite Challenging
6	The teachers ensure that every learner has their own copy of the supplementary learning materials in accordance with their learning needs.	2.66	Quite Challenging
7	The teachers provide copies of the reading materials to their learners.	2.73	Quite Challenging
8	The teachers ensure that every learner has their own copy of reading materials that are suited to their reading levels.	2.70	Quite Challenging
9	The teachers provide copies of the numeracy materials to their learners.	2.73	Quite Challenging
10	The teachers see to it that every learner has their own copy of numeracy materials based on their levels.	2.66	Quite Challenging
General Mean Rating		2.69	Quite Challenging

Table 12 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of contents of learning materials. As can be seen from the table, the respondents perceived the implementation of modular printed learning *quite challenging* when the contents of the learning materials had clear instructions ($\mu = 2.82$), clear illustrations ($\mu = 2.77$), written in simple words ($\mu = 2.73$), within the levels of the learners ($\mu = 2.71$),

depicted the current condition of the learners ($\mu = 2.73$), encouraging ($\mu = 2.75$), inspiring ($\mu = 2.74$), depicted different emotions ($\mu = 2.78$), free from errors ($\mu = 2.69$), and helpful on enhancing the learning performance of the learners ($\mu = 2.64$). In terms of contents of learning materials, the general mean rating of the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning was 2.75, and it was interpreted as *quite challenging*.

Table 12. Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning in Terms of Contents of Learning Materials

Item	Descriptor	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	The contents of the learning materials have clear instructions.	2.82	Quite Challenging
2	The contents of the learning materials have clear illustrations.	2.77	Quite Challenging
3	The contents of the learning materials are written in simple words.	2.73	Quite Challenging
4	The contents of the learning materials are within the levels of the learners.	2.71	Quite Challenging
5	The contents of the learning materials depict the current condition of the learners.	2.73	Quite Challenging
6	The contents of the learning materials are encouraging.	2.75	Quite Challenging
7	The contents of the learning materials are inspiring.	2.74	Quite Challenging
8	The contents of the learning materials depict different emotions.	2.78	Quite Challenging
9	The contents of the learning materials are free from errors.	2.69	Quite Challenging
10	The contents of the learning materials are helpful in enhancing the learning performance of the learners.	2.64	Quite Challenging
General Mean Rating		2.75	Quite Challenging

Table 13 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of capabilities of learning facilitators. As can be seen from the table, the respondents perceived the implementation of modular printed learning *less challenging* when they interpreted the score of their learners in every activity ($\mu = 2.47$). However, they perceived *quite challenging* when they motivated the learners to study their lessons ($\mu = 2.51$), explained the importance of working on the given learning activities ($\mu = 2.61$), managed the time allotted in every learning activity ($\mu = 2.62$), motivated the learners to give their best

in doing their learning activities ($\mu = 2.62$), understood the contents of the learning materials ($\mu = 2.67$), explained the contents of the learning materials ($\mu = 2.59$), provided other examples related to the contents of the learning materials ($\mu = 2.65$), showed the difference ways in arriving at the correct answers in the learning activities ($\mu = 2.64$), and explained the correct answers on the mistakes of the learners ($\mu = 2.62$). In terms of capabilities of learning facilitators, the general mean rating of the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning was 2.60, and it was interpreted as *quite challenging*.

Table 13. Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning in Terms of Capabilities of Learning Facilitators

Item	Descriptor	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	I can motivate the learners to study their lessons.	2.51	Quite Challenging
2	I can explain the importance of working on the given learning activities.	2.61	Quite Challenging
3	I can manage the time allotted in every learning activity of the learners.	2.62	Quite Challenging
4	I can motivate the learners to give their best in doing their learning activities.	2.62	Quite Challenging
5	I can understand the contents of the learning materials of the learners.	2.67	Quite Challenging
6	I can explain the contents of the learning materials of the learners.	2.59	Quite Challenging
7	I can provide other examples related to the contents of the learning materials of the learners.	2.65	Quite Challenging
8	I can show the different ways in arriving at the correct answers in the learning activities of the learners.	2.64	Quite Challenging
9	I can explain the correct answer on the mistakes of the learners.	2.62	Quite Challenging
10	I can interpret the scores of the learners in every activity.	2.47	Less Challenging
General Mean Rating		2.60	Quite Challenging

Test of Normality

Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning. The computed significant values were greater than the 0.05 level of significance; thus, the test of normality followed the normal distribution. This implied that the parametric test or Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was utilized in determining the difference in the perceptions of the

respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning and their profile.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is an analysis tool used in statistics that splits an observed aggregate variability found inside a data set into two parts: systematic factors and random factors. The systematic factors have a statistical influence on the given data set, while the random factors do not (Kenton, 2022). ANOVA is a

statistical technique that is used to check if the means of two or more groups are significantly different from each other. It checks the impact of one or more factors by comparing the means of different samples (Singh, 2018). ANOVA determines whether the groups created by the levels of the independent variable are statistically different by calculating whether the means of the treatment levels are different from the overall mean of the dependent variable (Bevans, 2022).

Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning. The computed significant values were greater than the 0.05 level of significance; thus, the test of normality followed the normal distribution. This implied that the parametric test or Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was utilized in determining the difference in the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning and their profile.

An ANOVA test is a way to find out if survey or experiment results are significant. It helps researchers determine if they need to reject the null hypothesis or accept the alternative hypothesis. It tests groups to see if there is a difference between them (Glen, 2022). ANOVA is preferred in the case of comparing three or more groups. Its result is based on the F-ratio—

a measure of comparison between the variation between the groups and variations within groups. Higher F-ratio values indicate that the variation between groups is larger than the individual variation of groups, which indicates that the mean of the groups is different (Yildirim, 2021). In ANOVA, when using one categorical independent variable, it is called one-way ANOVA, whereas for two categorical independent variables, it is called two-way ANOVA (Mishra et al., 2019).

Table 14 presents the test of normality in terms of perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and Shapiro-Wilk Test. As can be seen from the table, the computed significant values in the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process (KS = 0.200, SW = 0.556), learning process (KS = 0.200, SW = 0.850), and learning support (KS = 0.200, SW = 0.850) were greater than the 0.05 level of significance; thus, the test of normality follows the normal distribution. Therefore, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used in testing the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning.

Table 14. Test of Normality in Terms of Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning

Modular Printed Learning	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Teaching Process	.279	125	.200	.923	125	.556
Learning Process	.195	125	.200	.971	125	.850
Learning Support	.192	125	.200	.971	125	.850

Table 15 presents the test of normality in terms of challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and Shapiro-Wilk Test. As can be seen from the table, the computed significant values in the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials (KS = 0.200, SW =

0.513), contents of learning materials (KS = 0.200, SW = 0.389), and capabilities of learning facilitators (KS = 0.200, KS = 0.084) were greater than the 0.05 level of significance; thus, the test of normality follows the normal distribution. Therefore, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used in testing the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning.

Table 15. Test of Normality in Terms of Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning

Modular Printed Learning	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Availability of Learning Materials	.252	125	.200	.916	125	.513
Contents of Learning Materials	.273	125	.200	.891	125	.389
Capabilities of Learning Facilitators	.374	125	.200	.789	125	.084

Difference between the Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning and their Profile When Grouped Accordingly

Age. There was a *significant difference* between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support and their profile in terms of age. The computed F statistics were greater than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis was *rejected*. This implied that the respondents had the tendency of having different perceptions in the implementation of modular printed learning because of their differences in their age brackets.

The learning facilitators have different perceptions in the implementation of modular printed learning. This can be attributed to their individual differences because they belong in different age brackets. Individual differences are the ways in which people differ from each other. Every learning facilitator has its own way of behavior. It is important to understand individual differences because it influences the feelings, thoughts, and behavior (Gouch, 2021). Individuals vary in their cognitive performance. Researchers consider the distinct challenges in quantifying individual differences in cognition and provide concrete methodological recommendations. They consider how neutral, genetic, developmental, and behavioral factors may generate individual differences in cognition (Boogert et al., 2018). Teachers and parents must strive to know the learning facilitators at a personal and professional level, allowing them to understand, accept, and manage individual differences. It is important to know them by heart and understand their strengths and weaknesses in all aspects (Harris, 2018).

Sex. There was a *significant difference* between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed

learning in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support and their profile in terms of sex. The computed F statistics were greater than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis was *rejected*. This implied that both male and female respondents had the tendency of having different perceptions in the implementation of modular printed learning.

The female learning facilitators tend to have focus in the execution of their assigned tasks to the learners. They manage their time to attend to all queries of their learners. Time management is a big concern for them to attend to all their assigned tasks (Scott, 2020). They ensure that their learners understand the contents of their learning modules by letting them answer the different activities. In cases that they do not understand the instructions, they explain to the learners based on the concepts that they can understand easily. They teach them to be patient in understanding their lessons because this can really help them (Macadangang & Sanchez, 2018). They accompanied them all throughout their sessions. They ensure that at the end of their sessions, they already accomplished their required learning outputs. Modular learning encourages learners to fully absorb and understand what they are learning (Atha, 2021).

Highest Educational Attainment. There was a *significant difference* between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process and learning process and their profile in terms of highest educational attainment. The computed F statistics were greater than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis was *rejected*. This implied that the respondents had the tendency of having different perceptions in the implementation of modular printed learning because of their differences in highest educational attainment. However,

there was *no significant difference* between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of learning support and their profile in terms of highest educational attainment. The computed *F* statistic was less than the computed significant value; thus, the null hypothesis was *accepted*. This implied that the respondents had the tendency of having the same perceptions in the implementation of modular printed learning even though they differ in their highest educational attainment.

The learning facilitators establish differences in their perceptions on teaching and learning process in the implementation of modular printed learning because of their differences in their highest educational attainment. Those who are high school graduates need to have guidance from the teachers especially in the performance of their tasks. Learner-learning facilitator relationships are a powerful predictor of learner academic, personal, and social success in school at all ages (Meyer, 2019). This can lead to the learners engaging in their studies. Engagement is about how interested and

active a learner is in any given lesson. It is an important concept that when accomplished, works wonders for both the learners and the classroom (Fulton, 2018). It is also important if they are given orientations from time-to-time to ensure that they have sufficient information regarding the contents of the learning modules. This is helpful to boost the morale and confidence of the learning facilitators that they can perform well their assigned work Meador, 2018).

Table 16 presents the difference between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning and their profile in terms of age by using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

The computed *F*-statistics for teaching process ($F=1.216, p=0.306$), learning process ($F=0.925, p=0.467$), and learning support ($F=0.943, p=0.456$) yielded significance values greater than the 0.05 alpha level. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted, indicating no significant difference in the perceptions of respondents across age groups.

Table 16. Difference in the Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning and Their Profile in terms of Age

Sources of Variations		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision/ Interpretation
Teaching Process	Between Groups	1.777	5	.355	1.216	.306	Reject H_0 Significant
	Within Groups	35.365	119	.292			
	Total	37.142	124				
Learning Process	Between Groups	1.177	5	.235	.925	.467	Reject H_0 Significant
	Within Groups	30.798	119	.255			
	Total	31.975	124				
Learning Support	Between Groups	.981	5	.196	.943	.456	Reject H_0 Significant
	Within Groups	25.197	119	.208			
	Total	26.179	124				

Table 17 presents the difference between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning and their profile in terms of sex by using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

For learning support ($F=2.232, p=0.138$), the *p*-value was greater than 0.05; thus, the null

hypothesis was accepted, showing no significant difference between male and female respondents. However, significant differences were observed in teaching process ($p=0.005$) and learning process ($p=0.035$).

Table 17. Difference Between the Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning and Their Profile in terms of Sex

Sources of Variations		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision/ Interpretation
Teaching Process	Between Groups	2.269	1	2.269	8.133	.005	Reject H ₀ Significant
	Within Groups	34.873	123	.279			
	Total	37.142	124				
Learning Process	Between Groups	1.117	1	1.117	4.526	.035	Reject H ₀ Significant
	Within Groups	30.858	123	.247			
	Total	31.975	124				
Learning Support	Between Groups	.459	1	.459	2.232	.138	Reject H ₀ Significant
	Within Groups	25.719	123	.206			
	Total	26.179	124				

Table 18 presents the difference between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning and their profile in terms of highest educational attainment by using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

The computed F statistics for teaching process ($F = 1.246 > \text{Sig.} = 0.296$) and learning process ($F = 0.713 > \text{Sig.} = 0.546$) are greater than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis is *rejected*. However, the computed F statistic for learning support ($F = 0.148 < \text{Sig.} = 0.931$) is less than the computed significant value; thus, the null hypothesis is *accepted*.

Table 18. Difference Between the Perceptions of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning and Their Profile in terms of Highest Educational Attainment

Sources of Variations		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision/ Interpretation
Teaching Process	Between Groups	1.095	3	.365	1.246	.296	Reject H ₀ Significant
	Within Groups	36.047	121	.293			
	Total	37.142	124				
Learning Process	Between Groups	.546	3	.182	.713	.546	Reject H ₀ Significant
	Within Groups	31.429	121	.256			
	Total	31.975	124				
Learning Support	Between Groups	.094	3	.031	.148	.931	Accept H ₀ Not Significant
	Within Groups	26.085	121	.121			
	Total	26.179	124				

Difference between the Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning and their Profile When Grouped Accordingly

Age. There was *no significant difference* between the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials and capabilities of learning facilitators and their profile in terms of age. The computed F statistics were less than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis was *accepted*. This implied that the respondents had the tendency of having the same challenges in the

implementation of modular printed learning even though they differ in their age brackets. However, there was a *significant difference* between the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of contents of learning materials and their profile in terms of age. The computed F statistic was greater than the computed significant value; thus, the null hypothesis was *rejected*. This implied that the respondents had the tendency of having different challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning because of their difference in their age brackets.

The interpretations and understanding of the contents of learning materials vary from one individual with another depending on their age and level of understanding. The learning facilitators must have a broad understanding of the concepts stipulated in the learning materials of their learners. The learning materials that focus on learning interaction to learn new concepts (Lewis, 2019). It is important when the learning facilitators study the contents of the learning materials of their learners. They need to have background knowledge for them to properly explain the contents of the lessons. Learning new concepts, discovering exciting places, and understanding one's perspectives is key to building a well-rounded self-image (Keyser, 2021). Asking the guidance and assistance of teachers regarding the contents of the learning materials is possible, and they are willing to help the learning facilitators to ensure the delivery of instruction to the learners. In fact, recognizing when ones need help, learning how to advocate for oneself, and seeking out the support they need are important parts of becoming mature (Carrane, 2018).

Sex. There was a *significant difference* between the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials and contents of learning materials and their profile in terms of sex. The computed F statistic was greater than the computed significant value; thus, the null hypothesis was *rejected*. This implied that both male and female respondents had the tendency of having different challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning. However, there was *no significant difference* between the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of capabilities of learning facilitators and their profile in terms of sex. The computed F statistics were less than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis was *accepted*. This implied that both male and female respondents had the tendency of having the same challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning.

The male and female learning facilitators have the tendency of encountering different challenges in terms of availability of learning materials and contents of learning materials. It

is important to note their present condition and situation amidst COVID-19 pandemic. The participation in the interaction with teachers paves the way for strengthening mental health (Shabas, 2018). The learning facilitators need to secure the guidance and assistance of the teachers to ensure that every learner has their own learning materials to be used in their studies at home. They need also to attend the orientations regarding the contents of the learning materials to ensure that they are imparting the correct information to the learners. The purpose of education is to impart knowledge about the subject matter they are teaching without much thought to other classes (Kelly, 2019). The availability of learning materials is dependent on the distribution of learning modules to their parents. In many cases, teachers ensure the 1:1 ratio of learning materials for every learner to ensure that they have something to use in their studies (Malaya, 2020).

Highest Educational Attainment. There was a *significant difference* between the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials, contents of learning materials, and capabilities of learning facilitators and their profile in terms of highest educational attainment. The computed F statistic was greater than the computed significant value; thus, the null hypothesis was *rejected*. This implied that the respondents had the tendency of having different challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning because of their differences in highest educational attainment.

The educational levels of the learning facilitators tend to affect the way they encounter challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning. As a matter of fact, their high school level requires them to study and understand the contents of the learning modules of the learners. The contents of the learning module follow a particular learning model that is known to make instruction effective (Regoniel, 2021). The learning facilitators are encouraged to pursue their education for their personal benefits. They need to acquire the needed knowledge and skills that are helpful in the execution of their work. Truly, it is a great

advantage when they finish their college degrees (Williams, 2021). Finishing a college degree is an accomplishment many look forward to earning when they are in elementary school. Achieving that goal will give them confidence and prove to themselves that they can successfully complete anything they work hard for (Goldy-Brown, (2021).

Table 19 presents the difference between the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning and

their profile in terms of age by using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

The computed F statistics for availability of learning materials ($F = 0.444 < \text{Sig.} = 0.817$) and capabilities of learning facilitators ($F = 0.527 < \text{Sig.} = 0.755$) are less than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis is *rejected*. However, the F statistic for contents of learning materials ($F = 1.009 > \text{Sig.} = 0.415$) is greater than the computed significant value; thus, the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

Table 19. Difference Between the Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning and Their Profile in terms of Age

Sources of Variations		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision/ Interpretation
Availability of Learning Materials	Between Groups	1.765	5	.353	.444	.817	Accept H ₀ Not Significant
	Within Groups	96.157	119	.795			
	Total	97.922	124				
Contents of Learning Materials	Between Groups	3.762	5	.752	1.009	.415	Reject H ₀ Significant
	Within Groups	90.197	119	.745			
	Total	93.959	124				
Capabilities of Learning Facilitators	Between Groups	1.831	5	.366	.527	.755	Accept H ₀ Not Significant
	Within Groups	84.077	119	.695			
	Total	85.909	124				

Table 20 presents the difference between the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning and their profile in terms of sex by using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

The computed F statistics for availability of learning materials ($F = 0.509 > \text{Sig.} = 0.477$) and

contents of learning materials ($F = 0.561 > \text{Sig.} = 0.455$) are greater than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis is *rejected*. However, the computed F statistic for capabilities of learning facilitators ($F = 0.155 < \text{Sig.} = 0.695$) is less than the computed significant value; thus, the null hypothesis is *accepted*.

Table 20. Difference Between the Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning and Their Profile in Terms of Sex

Sources of Variations		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision/ Interpretation
Availability of Learning Materials	Between Groups	.397	1	.397	.509	.477	Reject H ₀ Significant
	Within Groups	97.525	123	.780			
	Total	97.922	124				
Contents of Learning Materials	Between Groups	.420	1	.420	.561	.455	Reject H ₀ Significant
	Within Groups	93.540	123	.748			
	Total	93.959	124				
Capabilities of Learning Facilitators	Between Groups	.106	1	.106	.155	.695	Accept H ₀ Not Significant
	Within Groups	85.802	123	.686			
	Total	85.909	124				

Table 21 presents the difference between the challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning and their profile in terms of highest educational attainment by using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

The computed F statistics for availability of learning materials ($F = 2.490 > \text{Sig.} = 0.063$), contents of learning materials ($F = 1.132 > \text{Sig.} = 0.339$), and capabilities of learning facilitators ($F = 3.440 > \text{Sig.} = 0.019$) are greater than the computed significant values; thus, the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

Table 21. Difference Between the Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning and their Profile in Terms of Highest Educational Attainment

Sources of Variations		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision/ Interpretation
Availability of Learning Materials	Between Groups	5.606	3	1.869	2.490	.063	Reject H_0 Significant
	Within Groups	92.316	121	.751			
	Total	97.922	124				
Contents of Learning Materials	Between Groups	2.524	3	.841	1.132	.339	Reject H_0 Significant
	Within Groups	91.435	121	.743			
	Total	93.959	124				
Capabilities of Learning Facilitators	Between Groups	6.650	3	2.217	3.440	.019	Reject H_0 Significant
	Within Groups	79.259	121	.644			
	Total	85.909	124				

Correlation between the Perceptions and Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning

Availability of Learning Materials. There was a *positively very low non-significant correlation* between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support and their challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials. The computed significant values were *not significant* at 5% level; thus, the null hypothesis was *accepted*. This implied that as the respondents fully implemented modular printed learning, the more they can encounter challenges.

The learning facilitators encounter difficulties in the availability of learning materials due to insufficient funds. The higher officials are proposing to have sharing of modules with other learners (Romero, 2020). The lack of funding will gravely paralyze the learning module production. The remaining budget was not enough to assure a 1:1 ratio of modules to learners. The sharing of modules between learners can help overcome the obstacle of lack of learning module supply (Rosales, 2020). However, other higher officials consider the

possibility of allocating additional funds for the purpose of ensuring that every learner has their own copies of self-learning modules. This becomes possible when they can request for additional funds or realign other budget allocations (Rita, 2020).

Contents of Learning Materials. There was a *positively very low non-significant correlation* between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support and their challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of contents of learning materials. The computed significant values were *not significant* at 5% level; thus, the null hypothesis was *accepted*. This implied that as the respondents fully implemented modular printed learning, the more they can encounter challenges.

The learning facilitators are facing difficulties in understanding the contents of learning materials that are being used in the implementation of modular printed learning. Most of the errors were found in locally developed learning materials, which came from its regional offices, while some errors came from privately developed material, and from unknown sources (De La Cruz, 2021). While there were quality assurance protocols in place for every level of the

self-learning modules, whether locally produced or emanating from the central office, errors still got through. The type of errors includes factual errors, computational errors, format, printing errors and sorting of pages, spelling and punctuation, typographical errors, and grammar and syntax (Magsambol, 2020). However, when the higher officials validated these errors, they have not been found to be used in the DepEd. The teachers are given instructions to go over the contents of learning modules prior to their schedules in distributing these learning materials (Mercado, 2021).

Capabilities of Learning Facilitators. There was a *positively very low non-significant correlation* between the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support and their challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of capabilities of learning facilitators. The computed significant values were *not significant* at 5% level; thus, the null hypothesis was *accepted*. This implied that as the respondents fully implemented modular printed learning, the more they can encounter challenges.

Learning facilitators play a special role during the implementation of modular printed learning. They are the ones who oversee the studies of the learners while staying at home. They are the ones who guide and assist learners in learning for themselves – picking apart

ideas, forming their own thoughts about them, and owning material through self-exploration and dialogue (Mazarin, 2021). The most important party in the success of this process is the learning facilitators themselves. They need to be prepared from various things to carry out their assigned tasks and to ensure their continuous learning (Bin Nordin, 2021). Research determined the difficulties of learning facilitators in terms of balancing responsibilities, learner motivation, accessibility, and learning outcomes. This constitutes that they need to work out these challenges for them to successfully execute their assigned roles to their learners (Garbe et al., 2020).

Table 22 presents the correlation between the perceptions and challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials by using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

It showed that the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process ($r = 0.078$), learning process ($r = 0.074$), and learning support ($r = 0.022$) have *positively very low non-significant correlation* with their challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials. The significant values ($\alpha = 0.386, 0.408, \text{ and } 0.807$) are *not significant* at 5% level; thus, the null hypothesis is *accepted*.

Table 22. *orrelation between the Perceptions and Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning in terms of Availability of Learning Materials*

Perceptions in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning	Correlation Coefficient	Interpretation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision
Teaching Process	.078	Positive Very Low Correlation	.386	Accept H_0 Not Significant
Learning Process	.074	Positive Very Low Correlation	.408	Accept H_0 Not Significant
Learning Support	.022	Positive Very Low Correlation	.807	Accept H_0 Not Significant

Table 23 presents the correlation between the perceptions and challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed

learning in terms of contents of learning materials by using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

It showed that the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process ($r = 0.147$), learning process ($r = 0.096$), and learning support ($r = 0.022$) have *positively very low non-significant correlation* with their

challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials. The significant values ($\alpha = 0.100, 0.248, \text{ and } 0.810$) are *not significant* at 5% level; thus, the null hypothesis is *accepted*.

Table 23. Correlation between the Perceptions and Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning in terms of Contents of Learning Materials

Perceptions in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning	Correlation Coefficient	Interpretation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision
Teaching Process	.147	Positive Very Low Correlation	.100	Accept H_0 Not Significant
Learning Process	.096	Positive Very Low Correlation	.284	Accept H_0 Not Significant
Learning Support	.022	Positive Very Low Correlation	.810	Accept H_0 Not Significant

Table 24 presents the correlation between the perceptions and challenges of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of capabilities of learning facilitators by using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

It showed that the perceptions of the respondents in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of teaching process (r

$= 0.110$), learning process ($r = 0.089$), and learning support ($r = 0.055$) have *positively very low non-significant correlation* with their challenges in the implementation of modular printed learning in terms of availability of learning materials. The significant values ($\alpha = 0.219, 0.319, \text{ and } 0.538$) are *not significant* at 5% level; thus, the null hypothesis is *accepted*.

Table 24. Correlation between the Perceptions and Challenges of the Respondents in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning in terms of Capabilities of Learning Facilitators

Perceptions in the Implementation of Modular Printed Learning	Correlation Coefficient	Interpretation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision
Teaching Process	.110	Positive Very Low Correlation	.219	Accept H_0 Not Significant
Learning Process	.089	Positive Very Low Correlation	.319	Accept H_0 Not Significant
Learning Support	.055	Positive Very Low Correlation	.538	Accept H_0 Not Significant

Summary of Findings

The study determined the perceptions and challenges of 125 learning facilitators in the implementation of modular printed learning at Agusuhin Elementary School–Annex, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales. The respondents were predominantly 30–39 years old, female, and high school graduates.

The learning facilitators perceived that modular printed learning was fully implemented in terms of the teaching process, learning process, and learning support. Among these areas, learning support obtained the highest general mean of 3.52, followed by the teaching process at 3.48 and the learning process at 3.47.

Despite the positive perceptions, the respondents found the implementation quite challenging in terms of the availability of learning materials (2.69), contents of learning materials (2.75), and capabilities of learning facilitators (2.60). These findings indicate that access to adequate materials, quality and suitability of module contents, and the knowledge and skills of learning facilitators were major concerns.

Significant differences were found in the respondents' perceptions when grouped according to age and sex. Highest educational attainment also produced significant differences in perceptions regarding the teaching and learning processes, although no significant difference was found for learning support.

For challenges, significant differences were found according to highest educational attainment across the three challenge areas. Age was significantly associated with challenges concerning the contents of learning materials, while sex was significantly associated with challenges involving the availability and contents of learning materials.

Finally, there was a positively very low, non-significant correlation between the respondents' perceptions of modular printed learning and their challenges in terms of availability of materials, contents of materials, and capabilities of learning facilitators.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the study concluded that modular printed learning was fully implemented in terms of teaching process, learning process, and learning support. However, its implementation remained quite challenging, particularly with regard to the availability and quality of learning materials and the capabilities of learning facilitators.

The study further concluded that respondents' perceptions varied significantly according to age and sex, while educational attainment influenced perceptions of the teaching and learning processes. Differences in educational attainment were also associated with differences in the challenges encountered by learning facilitators.

Moreover, the very low and non-significant correlations indicated that the respondents' positive perceptions of implementation were

not significantly related to the challenges they encountered. Thus, even when modular printed learning was perceived as fully implemented, learning facilitators could still experience difficulties in materials, module contents, and their own capabilities.

The findings provided a basis for the development of an action plan designed to sustain the implementation of modular printed learning and address the challenges encountered by learning facilitators.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Learning facilitators should pursue relevant educational and skills-development opportunities, including TESDA courses, training programs, or further studies, to strengthen their knowledge and competencies in assisting learners.
2. Teachers and school heads should continue providing regular orientations and guidance to learning facilitators, particularly on the teaching process, learning process, and proper use and interpretation of learning modules.
3. The school should ensure the availability of learning materials by conducting regular inventories, maintaining appropriate distribution records, producing additional copies when necessary, and ensuring that learners receive the materials required for their lessons.
4. Teachers should strengthen the quality assurance of learning materials by reviewing modules before distribution, identifying errors or unclear instructions, and immediately communicating necessary corrections to parents, learning facilitators, and learners.
5. Parents and learning facilitators should actively participate in orientations and consultations to improve their understanding of the contents and requirements of modular printed learning.
6. School heads, teachers, learning facilitators, parents, and community leaders should work collaboratively in providing continuous learning support and addressing implementation difficulties.

7. The proposed action plan for sustaining and coping with the challenges of modular printed learning should be implemented, monitored, and evaluated regularly to determine its effectiveness. The action plan specifically addresses sustaining implementation, explaining the teaching and learning processes, providing learning support, ensuring the availability of materials, checking module contents, and enhancing the capabilities of learning facilitators.

Future researchers may conduct similar studies involving other schools, districts, or learning delivery modalities and examine additional factors that may influence the perceptions, capabilities, and challenges of learning facilitators.

Acknowledgement

The researcher is very thankful to the following individuals who made significant contributions to this study.

Professor Elisa A. Menor, PhD, for her never-ending encouragement and assistance in finishing her thesis. She never failed to remind her of the next processes she needed to accomplish to finish this study on time. Her persistent support was very much appreciated;

Editha B. Geniza, PhD, Yzagany Ivarra B. Geniza, PECE, MS, and Professor Arturo P. Caseñas Jr. MIT, MHRM, MBA, the panel of examiners, for their insightful comments, suggestions, and recommendations;

Lilia B. Rosete, the caring Coordinating Principal of Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales, together with Ester Agnes C. Edora, Principal I of Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex who provided approval in the conduct of this study, and at the same time, provide guidance in the distribution and retrieval of the research instrument;

All grade 3 and grade 4 learning facilitators in Agusuhin Elementary School – Annex in Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales for their voluntary participation as the respondents of this study;

Lilia B. Rosete, School Principal IV, with the support of Maria Elina Lynn Cayaga, Teacher III, Emma Ruth F. Tiglao, Teacher III, Gener Q. Florita, Teacher II, and Jay-Ar M. Tesoro,

Teacher I in Subic Central School, Subic District, Schools Division of Zambales for having time, rendering assistance, and providing support in the validation of the research instrument used in this study, and the selected learning facilitators who participated in the pilot test;

Norlito Mendigorin, her father, Dolores Tesoro, her mother, and her siblings namely James Teenser T. Mendigorin and Aaron Bactad for their unending support, love, and understanding;

Janmar A. Molina, her husband, and her daughter, Jansiel Reeze M. Molina for inspiring her to pursue her studies, their affection, and understanding to focus on her studies; and

Finally, her gratitude is extended to all the people who have contributed in making her dreams into reality.

She offers all these things to God, the Father Almighty.

References

- Abubakar, D. (2020). *Learning materials and students' academic performance*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Alsalem, M. (2018). *Curriculum orientation and educational attainment*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Atha, R. (2021). *Modular learning and learner engagement*.
- Bautista, M. E. V. (2021). *Parents' struggles on the use of Self-Learning Module for the Modular Distance Learning: Basis for PLAC*. Department of Education Research Portal.
- Bevans, R. (2022). *One-way ANOVA: When and how to use it*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Bin Nordin, H., et al. (2021). *Learning facilitators' preparedness and continuous learning in distance education*.
- Boogert, N. J., Madden, J. R., Morand-Ferron, J., & Thornton, A. (2018). Measuring and understanding individual differences in cognition. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 373(1756), 20170280. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0280>

- Brearley, M. (2021). *The role and responsibilities of learning facilitators*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Cabardo, J. R. O., Cabardo, C. J. O., & Cabardo-Mabida, S. J. (2022). Challenges and mechanisms of teachers in the implementation of modular distance learning in the Philippines: A phenomenological study. *Sapienza: International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 3(1), 169–182. <https://doi.org/10.51798/sijis.v3i1.223>
- Carrane, L. (2018, January 30). *6 tips for asking your teacher for help*. Educational Endeavors.
- Castroverde, F., & Acala, M. (2021). *Challenges encountered by learners and teachers in modular distance learning*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Castroverde, F., & Acala, M. (2021). Modular distance learning modality: Challenges of teachers in teaching amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 10(8), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2021.602>
- Colcol, M. (2020). *Teachers' learning materials and printing requirements during modular learning*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Cooks-Campbell, A. (2021). *The impact of coaching on confidence, wellness, and work performance*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Correos, C. T. C., & Huelma, N. M. (2022). Challenges encountered by teachers in the delivery of curriculum and instruction through modular distance learning. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 5(5).
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- De La Cruz, M. (2021). *Quality and errors in locally developed learning materials*.
- De Meyst, F., & Grenier, J. (2021). *Role assignment and learner performance*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Department of Education. (2020). *Adoption of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan for School Year 2020–2021 in light of the COVID-19 public health emergency* (DepEd Order No. 012, s. 2020). Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2020). *DepEd prepares Self-Learning Modules for education's new normal*. Department of Education.
- Evans, L., & Beteille, T. (2019). *Making teaching an attractive profession: Status, compensation, and career progression*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Friales, W. C., Quemado, L. G., & Bayog, S. B. (2022). Home learning facilitation of parents on their children in the modular learning modality. *International Journal of Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 211–220. <https://doi.org/10.47540/ijqr.v1i3.449>
- Fulton, K. (2018). *Student engagement in the learning process*.
- Garbe, A., Ogurlu, U., Logan, N., & Cook, P. (2020). COVID-19 and remote learning: Experiences of parents with children during the pandemic. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 4(3), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/8471>
- Glen, S. (2022). *ANOVA test: Definition, types, and examples*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Goldy-Brown, S. (2021). *The importance of earning a college degree*.
- Gouch, K. (2021). *Individual differences in behavior and personality*.
- Harris, J. (2018). *Understanding individual differences in learners*.
- Hernando-Malipot, M. (2021). *Teachers urged to check modules for errors before distribution*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Hwa, S. P. (2020). *The effectiveness of learning materials in distance education*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].

- Ilcin, N., et al. (2018). *Learning styles and information processing*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Karbowski, A. (2020). *Distance learning resources and teachers' needs during the pandemic*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Kelly, M. (2019). *Teacher support and student success*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Kelly, M. (2019). *The purpose of education and effective teaching*.
- Kenton, W. (2022). *Analysis of variance (ANOVA): Definition and examples*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Keyser, M. (2021). *Learning, discovery, and the development of self-image*.
- Kumar, R. (2018). *Continuous learning and outcome-based learning*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Lee, S. (2020). *Teaching practices and at-home learning during the pandemic*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Lei, H., Cui, Y., & Chiu, M. M. (2018). The relationship between teacher support and students' academic emotions: A meta-analysis. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Lewis, J. (2019). *Learning materials and interaction in the development of new concepts*.
- Macadangdang, R., & Sanchez, M. (2018). *Patience and learning support in modular instruction*.
- Magsambol, B. (2020). *Mistakes were made: Errors in DepEd distance learning materials*. Rappler.
- Malaya, B. (2020). *Modular distance learning: Here's what you need to know*. WhatALife.
- Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. *Online Learning*, 22(1), 205–222. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i1.1092>
- Mazarin, J. (2021). *The role of learning facilitators in modular learning*.
- Meador, S. (2018). *The importance of orientation and training in education*.
- Mercado, N. A. (2021, June 14). *DepEd finds 155 errors in learning materials from Oct. 2020 to June 2021*. INQUIRER.net.
- Meyer, J. (2019). *Teacher-learner relationships and academic success*.
- Mishra, P., Pandey, C. M., Singh, U., Gupta, A., Sahu, C., & Keshri, A. (2019). Descriptive statistics and normality tests for statistical data. *Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia*, 22(1), 67–72. https://doi.org/10.4103/aca.ACA_157_18
- Munna, A. S., & Kalam, M. A. (2021). Teaching and learning process to enhance teaching effectiveness: A literature review. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation*, 4(1), 1–4.
- Pamogas, M. (2022). Extent of challenges encountered by the Araling Panlipunan and Social Science teachers in facilitating the Modular Distance Learning: Basis for the formulation of learning and development plan. *JPAIR Institutional Research*, 19(1), 87–102.
- Regoniel, P. (2021). *Learning models and effective instruction*.
- Rita, J. (2020, September 15). *Students may have to share copies of modules in blended learning, DepEd says*. GMA News Online.
- Roman, A. (2021). Experiences of teachers on using Modular Distance Learning (MDL) in teaching mathematics during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Southeast Asian Journal of Science and Technology*, 6(2), 24–52.
- Romero, A. (2020). *Learning modules and the challenges of distance learning*.
- Rosales, K. V. (2020, September 22). *Lack of funding for 2021 will gravely affect learning modules distribution*. English Forward.
- Rosemond, J. (2019). *Parenting and children's achievement*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Scott, S. (2020). *Time management strategies for teachers and learning facilitators*.
- Shabas, M. (2018). *Teacher interaction and student mental health*.
- Singh, A. (2018). *Analysis of variance and comparison of means*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Ssebikindu, D. (2020). *Learning guides and learner-centered instruction*. [Publication

- details to be verified from the original source].
- Sturm, S., & Angelova, M. (2020). *The role of facilitators in learner-centered education*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Tagano, G. S., et al. (2022). *Learning modules and flexible learning*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Templin, T. J. (2018). *Learning as a biological and cultural process*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Van Mulukom, V. (2018). *Women have more active brains than men*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Williams, K. (2021). *The benefits of completing a college degree*.
- Wong, J. (2019). *Women, work, and child-rearing responsibilities*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].
- Yildirim, S. (2021). *Analysis of variance and F-ratio*. [Publication details to be verified from the original source].