# LEARNING APPROACH AND LEARNERS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Edward V. Anaviso[1], Husna T. Lumapenet[2]

[1] *Teacher II, Department of Education, Kidapawan City National High School, Kidapawan City Division, Kidapawan City, Philippines*
[2] *Associate Professor V, Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology, Dorolumna, Arakan, Cotabato, Philippines*

## ABSTRACT

*The study was conducted to determine the extent of modular distance in terms of self-learning module on paper print and face-to-face learning approach in terms of classroom setting towards learners' achievements as perceived by selected Senior High School Teachers from 3 Congressional Districts of Cotabato. These teachers handle regular students and with special cases and conditions enrolled in their preferred learning modality. Also, it determined the level of learners' achievements in terms of General Point Average in 1st Semester of School Year 2023-2024. It further determined the significant relationship between modular distance and learners' achievements; the significant influence of modular distance on learners' achievements; the significant relationship between face-to-face and learners' achievements; and the significant influence of face-to-face learning approach on learners' achievements. On the extent of modular distance learning approach in terms of self-learning modules on paper print, the respondents agreed with the conditions and practices associated with this approach. Meanwhile, the extent of face-to-face learning approach in terms of classroom setting, the respondents strongly agreed with the statement mentioned concerning this method of learning. On the other hand, the average grades of students in the modular distance and face-to-face learning approach were both deemed very satisfactory. Further, the modular distance learning was highly correlated with learners' achievements. In the same manner, the modular distance learning was highly influenced with students' learning achievements. Furthermore, the face-to-face learning was not correlated with students' learning achievements. Moreover, the face-to-face learning was not influenced with students' learning achievements. Therefore, it was concluded that both methods were effective in facilitating learning and enabling students to attain desirable grades. However, when modular distance learning is utilized, it tends to significantly contribute to students' performance in academics. Meanwhile, the use of face-to-face learning as an instructional approach does not seem to have a substantial impact on students' academic performance, at least within the specific context of the analysis being discussed.*

**Keyword: -** *Learning approach, and learners' academic achievement.*

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Education is extremely important in people's life as it possesses crucial traits that will shape the future and will enable all Filipinos to become full-fledged, productive members of society. In schools, teachers play a crucial role. They have their own stories to tell during crisis situations and emergencies which has significantly impacted education, leading to significant losses and learning inequities. The shift from modular to face-to-face learning has worsened the issue. The rehabilitation process is still ongoing and studies comparing the two methodologies are currently being conducted.

Both teachers and students benefit from a teaching method that emphasizes the teaching-learning process. As a result, students' learning is dependent on the school's use of the most effective and reachable teaching technique, particularly during emergency situations. In fact, in the Philippines, it has implemented modular distance learning to continue providing quality education. A study at Mindanao State University-Sulu found that face-to-face learning compared to modular distance learning provides significant and beneficial contribution to learning. Moreover, a substantial difference was found in the views of the students and teachers (Salamuddin, 2021).

Nardo (2017) highlights the function of modules in cultivating responsibility, self-directed learning, and self-study abilities. Real-world experiences are included into modules, allowing students to learn new information

and think back on their past experiences. In contrary, a study supported by Kim (2015) contends that face-to-face instruction promotes superior comprehension and memory of the material covered in lessons. Despite the efficiency of face-to-face learning, unexpected situations have caused academic institutions to shift away from face-to-face learning and toward modular sessions. Even though it is considered more comfortable, it also requires substantial adjustment (Skill Samurai, 2021).

Furthermore, the National Student Assessment findings demonstrate a constant leveling of modular and face-to-face modalities, although these studies did not assess the quality of both. The gap is that more research is needed to understand the learning mechanisms associated with these two modalities as there has been a vacuum in understanding of their implications for basic education and the role that teachers play in achieving the modality's goals (Secuya, 2022). The situation presents a unique challenge to every educational leader's decision-making process, hence, to sustain the delivery of quality of instruction to every school.

These aforementioned points prompted the researcher to propose the study to suggest an intervention that can help the school in teaching during crisis situations and emergencies. Moreover, the present study was conducted to determine the significant relationship and influence of modular distance and face-to-face learning approach on students' learning achievement to address the challenges on both learning approaches.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

This research utilized a descriptive–correlation research design to analyze from the data from 170 respondents taken through quantitative method The instrument used was a self-made questionnaire to gather the data needed. Results of the validity and reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha was .93 with 10 questions, which meant that the items in the instruments were reliable. Data gathering procedure using communication addressed to the Schools Division Superintendents, and the statistical tools utilized mean. To test the hypotheses, it employed Pearson r and multiple linear regression.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Learning Approach

Table 1 presents the level of learning approach in terms of modular distance and face-to-face learning approach with a grand mean of 4.10, described as **strongly agree.**

The findings imply that, on average, the learning approach meets the expectations and needs of the respondents. This indicates that both learning approaches are effective in promoting understanding, engagement, and academic achievement resulting with improved learning outcomes and student performance.

**Table 1.**          Overall Mean of Learning Approach

| Learning Approach | Weighted Mean | Description |
|---|---|---|
| Modular Distance Learning Approach | 3.52 | Agree |
| Face-to-Face Learning Approach | 4.68 | Strongly Agree |
| **Grand Mean** | **4.10** | **Strongly Agree** |

### Learners' Achievement

Table 2 discloses the level of students' learning achievement in terms of General Point Average in 1st Semester of School Year 2023-2024. It can be gleaned from the table that the mean grade of students taking face-to-face is 0.98% higher than the mean grade of students in modular distance approach with 88.78 and 87.80 described as **very satisfactory**, respectively. It shows the importance of both learning methods for students, as they can benefit from learning in various ways. Therefore, the effectiveness and feasibility of the teaching approach adopted by the school determine the students' learning outcomes. Aksan (2012) said that both modular and traditional instructional methods effectively facilitate learning integration by parts. While these learning approaches share similarities, they also possess distinct differences that distinguish them from each other. Lumapenet (2022) found out that the utilization of modules has significantly improved the test scores of the students in English. Thus, the Department of Education may continue implementing the modular delivery of instruction for the continuity of students' learning in times of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The result is supported by the study of Salamuddin (2021) stressing that there is a significant difference between modular distance learning and face-to-face classes. He further stated that students favored face-to-face classes, emphasizing their significance and greater contribution to learning due to the direct interaction with teachers in the classroom, as opposed to the modular approach where they learn independently through self-learning modules with delayed feedback.

**Table 2.**     Level of Learners' Achievement when analyzed in terms of **General Point Average** in 1st Semester, School Year 2023-2024

| | Mean | Description |
|---|---|---|
| **Modular Distance Learning Approach** | 87.80 | **Very Satisfactory** |
| **Face-to-Face Learning Approach** | 88.78 | **Very Satisfactory** |

*Scale:*
*90-100     Outstanding*
*85-89      Very Satisfactory*
*80-84      Satisfactory*
*75-79      Very Satisfactory*
*Below 75   Did Not Meet Expectations*

**Learners' Achievement**

Table 3 presents the mean level of learners' achievements in terms of general point average in 1st semester of SY 2023-2024 with a grand mean of 88.29, described as **very satisfactory.** Based on the findings, the results imply that, on average, learners are generally achieving well and meeting the expected standards. This indicates that the educational strategies and resources currently in place are effective in promoting student success. Thus, the teaching methods, curriculum, and educational environment are likely effective. Very satisfactory achievement suggests that instructors are successfully conveying material and engaging students in a manner that facilitates learning.

**Table 3.** Overall Mean of Learners' Achievement

| General Point Average in 1st Semester of SY 2023-2024 | Weighted Mean | Description |
|---|---|---|
| Modular Distance Learning Approach | 87.80 | Very Satisfactory |
| Face-to-Face Learning Approach | 88.78 | Very Satisfactory |
| **Grand Mean** | **88.29** | **Very Satisfactory** |

**Relationship of Learning Approach and Learners' Achievements**

**Self-Learning Module on Paper Print and Learners' Achievement**

Table 4 reveals the correlation matrix showing the relationship between modular distance learning approach and leaners' achievements. It was observed that there is a **significant relationship** between modular distance learning approach and leaners' achievements with a computed p-value of 0.01 lesser than 0.05. Consequently, Spearman ρ value showed significant result at 0.20.

The result implies that modular distance learning approach influenced the quality of performance of the students, in achieving outstanding or low grades. Therefore, it is important to consider other contributing factors and possibly look for ways to enhance the effectiveness of this approach. This indicates a challenge for teachers in accurately assessing students' performance, as some receive learning support while others learn independently.

The result agrees to Castroverde (2021) said that while modules are intended to serve as self-learning guides for students, teachers acknowledge that students still require guidance and direct instruction to grasp certain concepts effectively. Furthermore, they noted that low scores on modules pose challenges for teachers, prompting them to explore supplementary methods to enhance and solidify students' learning achievements.

To further prove the legitimacy and truthfulness of the data presented. It was verbalized by the Key Informant that some of the common challenges encountered in modular distance approach particularly in self-

learning modules on paper print are customization of SLMs to the diverse learning needs and abilities of the students, feedback mechanisms for students' completion SLMS on paper print, limited interaction between both parties, monitoring understanding of students and motivation and engagement with the materials given.

**Table 4.** Correlation Matrix showing the Relationship between Modular Distance Learning Approach and Leaners' Achievement

| **Modular Distance Learning Approach** | | **Students' Learning Achievement** |
|---|---|---|
| **Self-Learning Modules on Paper Print** | Spearman $\rho$ | 0.20** |
| | Probability | .01 |
| | N | 170 |

** = highly significant

**Classroom Setting and Learners' Achievement**

In Table 5, the result reveals the correlation matrix showing the relationship between face-to-face learning approach and learners' achievement. It was observed that there is **no significant relationship** between face-to-face learning approach and learner's achievement with a computed p-value of 0.13 greater than 0.05. Moreover, Spearman $\rho$ value showed no significant result at 0.12.

The result implies that face-to-face learning alone does not affect students' performance. This suggests a need to focus on other factors and conditions that might contribute more effectively to learner's success. Teachers may need to employ diverse techniques and strategies to effectively deliver topics inside the classroom. This indicates the importance of using a variety of instructional methods to enhance student learning.

The result agrees to Salamuddin (2021) said that blended learning approaches increase the level of active learning strategies, peer to peer learning strategies, and learner centered strategies used. It provides a balance between flexible learning options and the high touch, human interactive experience. However, how to create effective blended learning experiences is still a challenge for researchers and practitioners. This challenge is highly context dependent with a practically infinite number of possible solutions.

**Table 5.** Correlation Matrix showing the Relationship between Face-to-face Learning Approach and Learners' Achievement

| **Face-to-Face Learning Approach** | | **Learner's Achievement** |
|---|---|---|
| **Classroom Setting** | Spearman $\rho$ | $0.12^{ns}$ |
| | Probability | 0.13 |
| | N | 170 |

ns = not significant

**Significant Difference between the Learners' Achievements**

The fifth research problem focused on significant difference between the learners' achievements as affected by the two learning approaches.

**Learners' Achievements as Affected by two Learning Approaches**

Table 6 shows the significant difference between the learners' achievements as affected by the two learning approaches with p-values of 0.074 and 0.130 respectively.

This result suggests that, based on the data from this particular study, the modular distance learning approach does not have a statistically significant impact on student achievement. It does not necessarily mean that MDLA is ineffective, but rather that its impact was not strong enough to be detected as significant in this study.

Moreover, this result challenges the traditional assumption that face-to-face learning is inherently superior or crucial for student achievement. It suggests that face-to-face instruction alone may not be a strong predictor of academic success. Thus, both approaches can affect learners' achievements on their respective teaching strategies and practices.

Secuya (2022) claimed that educators and policymakers might need to reevaluate how these learning approaches are being implemented by looking at the quality of the modules, the training provided to teachers, and the support systems in place for students. Also, schools and educators may need to reevaluate their reliance on face-to-face instruction as the primary or most effective method for teaching prompting a shift towards more diversified instructional approaches that include a mix of face-to-face, online, and blended learning methods. They further said that schools shoulder a significant burden of duty in adopting deliberate measures to ensure that all learners, notwithstanding various emergencies, receive an education that is of high quality, inclusive, and equitable.

**Table 6**. Relationship between Learners' Achievements as affected by two learning approaches

| Variables | p-values | Remarks | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Learners' achievements** | | | |
| Modular Distance Learning Approach | 0.074 | ns | Not significant |
| Face-to-face Learning Approach | 0.130 | ns | Not significant |

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

The research findings reveal a substantial endorsement of modular distance learning (MDL) by the respondents, particularly the self-learning modules on paper print. This endorsement reflects a consensus on the modules' effectiveness, usability, and suitability, indicating a positive reception towards this facet of the learning approach.

Conversely, respondents participating in face-to-face (F2F) classes exhibited a strong preference for the classroom setting. This preference underscores a collective agreement on the effectiveness and satisfaction derived from the traditional classroom-based learning method.

Academically, students engaged in both MDL and F2F learning modalities achieved very satisfactory grades, suggesting that both approaches are capable of facilitating learning to a degree that allows students to attain commendable academic performance.

Furthermore, the data indicates a strong correlation between MDL and students' learning achievements, implying that MDL significantly enhances students' academic performance. However, the analysis did not find a significant correlation between F2F learning and students' academic achievements, suggesting that within the context of this study, F2F learning does not markedly influence students' performance.

These findings suggest that while both MDL and F2F learning have their merits, MDL has a more pronounced positive impact on students' academic achievements in the studied context.

## 5. REFERENCES

Castroverde, F. (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.

Kim, D. (2015). HISAT: a fast spliced aligner with low memory requirements. Nature Methods, 12, 357-360.

Lumapenet, H. T. (2022). Effectiveness of Self-Learning Modules on Students' Learning in English Amidst Pandemic. *Res Militaris*, *12*(6), 949-953.

Nardo, M. T. B. (2017). Modular Instruction Enhances Learner Autonomy. Sciepub.http://pubs.sciepub.com/education

Salamuddin, A. (2021). Comparative Analysis of Students' Perceptions in Modular Distance Learning Approach Versus Face-to-Face Learning Approach of Mindanao State University – Sulu. Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences, 4(4), 395-407. https://doi.org/10.37275/oaijss.v4i2.57

Secuya, C. L. (2022). Embracing the new normal set-up from modular to face-to-face learning: A grounded theory. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 8250-8264.

Skill Samurai. (2021). The Pros and Cons of Homeschooling.