Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)
Volume 12, Issue 7, July 2021: 5166- 5181

Research Article

Faculty Performance in the Delivery of Modular Teaching during the CoViD-19 Pandemic

Veronica C. Balbin[1], Romiro G. Bautista [2], Magdalena L. Guinumtad [3], Arben Gibson G. Camayang [4]

Abstract

Determining faculty performances in this time of pandemic is paramount to assuring quality teaching and learning in the academe. This study is designed to determine the students' satisfaction along the quality of the modules prepared by their teachers at Quirino State University and their teachers' support to their learning under the modular teaching modality. It also aimed at documenting the experiences of students in undergoing modular teaching modality. Using the Mixed-method design, particularly the cross-sectional survey design and narratology as points of inquiry, the following are known: (1) the prepared modules are *good*; however, the informants claimed that they found difficulty in processing the modules because of the intricacies of the concepts and tasks; (2) the teachers' support is *good*. The informants claimed that teachers provided GCs that helped them connect and curate their learning conditions as they exchange discussions with their teachers and classmates. However, the informants found difficulty in connecting to the internet; (3) students are *very satisfied* on the quality of the module and teachers support; however, teachers may consider conducting '*kumustahan sessions'* with their students – a session designed in building rapport, provision of counseling activities, and establishment of acquaintances among teachers and students. It is suggested that the teachers may revisit their modules to simplify their presentations and make things guided to fully attain that modules are self-paced learning kits. Teachers may also consider recording videos to model difficult topics so students can view them how to resolve and process as the face-to-face modality is not yet permitted.

Keywords: *teaching performance, students' satisfaction, modular teaching, pandemic.*

Introduction

In an evolving educational system, gauging the quality of effective teaching has a long and well-studied background (Lyde et al., 2016). Faculty performance evaluation has been a worldwide basis to improve the teaching quality in an institution and one of the most common bases is the

[1] Office of the Director for Instruction, Quirino State University-Maddela Campus, veronica.balbin@qsu.edu.ph, (0000-0002-7463-2006)
[2] Office of the University Director for Instruction, Quirino State University-Main Campus, romiro.bautista@qsu.edu.ph, (0000-0003-0875-5478)
[3] Office of the Director for Instruction, Quirino State University-Cabarroguis Campus, magdalena.guinumtad@qsu.edu.ph, (0000-0002-7851-7670)
[4] Office of the University Director for Instruction, Quirino State University-Main Campus, arbengibson.camayang@qsu.edu.ph, (0000-0001-8060-2930)

student's feedback (Husain & Khan, 2016). On a comprehensive understanding, teaching effectiveness is reckoned with the teacher's ability to deliver knowledge and student's grasping of knowledge along with the process of improving those (Lyde et al., 2016; Almutairi & Shraid, 2021).

As the Philippines gets pass its first year under the CoViD-19 pandemic, shift in learning modalities becomes more evident and modular learning approach is one of the modalities that are being widely used due to the internet connectivity problems in some areas (Samoy et al., 2021). Modular learning is believed as an amplifier to a student's responsible learning due to its self-study manner. It enables students to advance on their own since it requires zero to no help from others (Nardo, 2017). In the teaching-learning process under the modular learning approach, a teacher's role is to design the subject to meet the needs of the students and to assure that learning takes place by guiding them in their course (Isman et al., 2004). With the current situation of the educational system, there is a need to unravel the effects of the sudden shift in the learning modality to cater the learning needs of the students.

Feedback plays a key role in an institution's academic growth. On a learning environment, there is a regular exchange of feedbacks concerning school requirements and teaching performances (Jeffs et al., 2021). The main goal of feedback is to improve the learning process between students and teachers and lower the percentage of errors and gaps (Tan et al., 2020). Bergil and Atlib (2012) claimed that feedback manifests on learners and educators as they perform the giving and receiving of feedback. Furthermore, feedback aids learners and educators to become innovative and more competent leading to less repetitive mistakes while learning takes place (Tan et al., 2020; Bergil & Atlib, 2012). Apropos of, feedbacks aide teachers to discover areas to improve or maintain based on the teaching strategies they have presented (Neumann, 2000).

This research tries to fill the gap on aiding teachers to become more effective educators based on the student feedbacks regarding teaching effectiveness with the modular learning method in this time of pandemic.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

This study is designed to determine the students' satisfaction along the quality of the modules prepared by the teachers at Quirino State University and their teachers' support to their learning under the modular teaching modality during the CoViD-19 pandemic. Moreover, it also aimed at documenting the experiences of the students in undergoing modular teaching modality during the CoViD-19 pandemic.

1.2 Hypotheses of the Study

This study worked on three hypotheses:

Ho 1. The learning modules are comparatively perceived with quality.

Ho 2. The teachers' support is comparably perceived with quality.

Ho 3. The over-all satisfaction of the students on the performances of their teachers are comparable.

Methodology

This study employed the Mixed-method design particularly the cross-sectional survey design and narratology as points of inquiry. Cross-sectional survey is necessary when the researchers need to collect information from a sample that has been drawn from a predetermined population. On the

other hand, narratology is employed in determining the foci of the experiences of the respondents along with the performances of the teachers while executing their functions during the CoViD-19 pandemic. Moreover, narratology is described as a theory, method, and a discipline (Prince, 2003; Kindlt & Muller, 2003; Fludemik & Margollin, 2004)

Appositely, the Explicative-Reductive Method was employed in this study focused on the determinant of the respondents' evaluation on the quality of the modules prepared by the teachers and the teachers' support on student learning during these times of pandemic, as well as the over-all satisfaction of the students on the performances of their teachers. The Explicative Method was used to account a context encompassing variables and qualities attributed to the problem which include the respondents' sex, age, curriculum year, program of studies, and the campus that they enrolled in. This paved for the determinant of the variable related to the respondents' satisfaction on the performances of their teachers. On the other hand, the Reductive Method was used to elicit potential variables of the identified context for enrichment and further analysis.

This study made use of a validated questionnaire. It has four parts: Part I deals on the profile of the respondents. Part II deals on the quality of the modules developed by the teachers and the teachers' support to students during the pandemic. This made use of 4-point Likert scale along the quality of the modules developed by the teachers and the teachers' support to students: 4-Very good, 3-Good, 2-Average, and 1-Poor. Part III deals on the over-all satisfaction of the student-respondents along their modules and the teachers' support to their learning. The Likert used in evaluating the over-all satisfaction of the respondents is as follows: 4-very satisfied, 3-Satisfied, 2-Dissatisfied, 1-Very Dissatisfied. In the current study, the questionnaire has a reliability of .93, .96, and .79, for Part I, II and III, respectively through Cronbach's alpha. According to Taber (2018), an alpha of at least .70 suggests reliability; hence, the questionnaire used in this study is valid and reliable.

A total of 1,401 student-respondents participated in the survey who came from the three campuses of the university: 714, 476, and 211 from Diffun, Cabarroguis, and Maddela Campus, respectively. This number constitute 25% on the total number of students enrolled during the first semester, SY 2020-2021. The number of respondents was limited to the students who were available during the lockdown, sometime in April 2021, as many of them were living in the forest region where internet connectivity is a problem. From this number, samples from those who signified their intentions to participate in the interview for the qualitative aspect of this study were taken as informants for the qualitative aspect. The informants described and narrated their claims. The informants explained their experiences including a configural mode of understanding and principles – the meanings of their stories and experiences as part of an identity development (Hoshmand, 2005). They eloquently elucidated their experiences in a Focus Group Discussion (FGD).

Two of the proponents interviewed the informants to gather the needed data in the study. Before the interview was conducted, the interviewers briefed the informants that their participation in the interview is voluntary and they can terminate it anytime. A consent form was signed by the informants. Transcripts of the interview were carefully transcribed and coded which were validated by a researcher whose credibility is beyond compare. Audit trail was employed in routing the transcripts of the interview to the informants in ascertaining the veracity of the claims. Audit trail is an in-depth approach to illustrating that the transcripts are based on the participants'

narratives. It also involved a description on how the data were gathered and analyzed (Leung, 2015; Malterud, 2001; Samoy et al., 2021). The transcribed data were routed back among the informants after the transcription process to ascertain the veracity of their claims during the interview and FGD sessions – 100% of the transcripts were documented and processed via audit trail. Moreover, the informants agreed on the transcriptions and vouched for the veracity of the content presented therein to be analogous to what they intend to express. Henceforth, the data are considered verified and valid.

The following were employed to analyze the gathered quantitative data: frequency, mean, ANOVA, and Scheffe test. All calculations are set at .05 level of significance. On the other hand, thematic analysis was employed to analyze the qualitative data derived from the narrations of the informants. The thematic analysis done in this research includes familiarization and organization, coding and recoding, and summarizing and interpreting (Nowel et al., 2017; Bautista, 2021).

Findings

1. Perceived Quality of the Modules Prepared by the Teachers

Table 1. Perceived Quality of the Modules Prepared by the Teachers

On the Quality of the Prepared Modules		Frequency				Mean	Des Int
		4	3	2	1		
1.	The language used in the module is						
	1.1 Clear	504	779	111	7	3.27	Very Good
	1.2 Simple	378	845	168	10	3.14	Good
	1.3 Comprehensive	419	839	135	8	3.19	Good
2.	The content provided in the module is:						
	2.1 clear	453	787	154	7	3.20	Good
	2.2 comprehensive	415	835	148	3	3.19	Good
	2.3 sufficient	373	826	191	11	3.11	Good
3	The exercises/enrichment activities are congruent with the skills/competencies to be developed	515	753	125	8	3.27	Very Good
4	The modules are well-packaged	551	658	170	22	3.24	Good
Average						3.21	Good

Legend: 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-average, 1-poor

Presented in Table 1 is the perceived quality of the prepared modules by the teachers for the modular learning and teaching for the First Semester, SY 2020-2021. As it can be gleaned on the table, responses are skewed to the right which signifies positive responses: 1% for *poor*, 11% for *average*, 56% for *good*, and 32% for *very good. Moreover, i*t also shows that the prepared modules are perceived to be of *good* quality as suggested by the grand mean *3.21*. Furthermore, the data presented in the table show positive skewness which further suggests that the modules are prepared with quality.

However, it may be noted that the sufficiency of the content and the simplicity of the language of the modules are lowly perceived when compared to the rest of the criteria, 3.11 and 3.14, respectively. This implies that there is a need to revisit the modules along these considerations to better the quality of the modules.

Ho 1. The learning modules are comparably perceived with quality.

Table 2. Perceived Quality of the Modules Prepared by the Teachers when Respondents are Grouped by Campus

On the Quality of the Prepared Modules		Campus			F-value	p-value
		DiffunA	CabarroguisB	MaddelaC		
1.	The language used in the module is	3.16AB	3.22BC	3.30BC	5.833	.003*
	1.1 Clear	3.21A	3.29B	3.43C	10.036	.000*
	1.2 Simple	3.11	3.16	3.17	1.588	.211
	1.3 Comprehensive	3.15AB	3.20BC	3.29BC	4.287	.014*
2.	The content provided in the module is:	3.12AB	3.19BC	3.28BC	6.553	.001*
	2.1 clear	3.17AB	3.21AB	3.32C	4.916	.007*
	2.2 comprehensive	3.14AB	3.21AB	3.28C	4.463	.010*
	2.3 sufficient	3.06A	3.15BC	3.22BC	6.288	.002*
3	The exercises/enrichment activities are congruent with the skills/competencies to be developed	3.25	3.29	3.29	.745	.475
4	The modules are well-packaged	3.18AB	3.23AB	3.47C	14.157	.000*
Average		3.18AB	3.23AB	3.33C	8.765	.000*

Legend: Same letters within rows are comparable at .05 level of significance; Post hoc is calculated thru Scheffe Test

Presented in Table 2 are the perceived quality of the modules when grouped by campus. In general, the modules are perceived incomparably with the students from the three campuses of the university: students from Diffun and Cabarroguis campuses (3.18 and 3.23, respectively, are interpreted as *good)* are comparable while students from Maddela are incomparable with the two other campuses (3.33, interpreted as *very good).* These concordances of the respondents led to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

On the other hand, this study failed to reject the null hypothesis for the indicators on the simplicity of the language used and on the congruency of the exercises or enrichment activities with the skills and competencies to be developed. This means that the vouched perception is comparable with each other.

Table 3. Perceived Quality of the Modules Prepared by the Teachers when Respondents are Grouped by Curriculum Year Level

On the Quality of the Prepared Modules		Year Level				F-value	p-value
		IA	IIB	IIIC	IVD		
1.	The language used in the module is	3.21	3.17	3.18	3.27	1.532	.204
	1.1 Clear	3.27	3.26	3.25	3.35	1.037	.375
	1.2 Simple	3.17	3.08	3.12	3.21	2.108	.097
	1.3 Comprehensive	3.20	3.17	3.18	3.25	.842	.471

2.	The content provided in the module is:	3.21	3.12	3.14	3.23	2.538	.055
	2.1 clear	3.25AD	3.16B	3.14C	3.29AD	3.609	.013*
	2.2 comprehensive	3.22	3.15	3.18	3.20	1.013	.386
	2.3 sufficient	3.14	3.06	3.09	3.19	2.163	.091
3	The exercises/enrichment activities are congruent with the skills/competencies to be developed	3.32	3.22	3.24	3.27	2.001	.112
4	The modules are well-packaged	3.31AD	3.20BCD	3.17BCD	3.27BCD	2.955	.032*
Average		3.26AD	3.18BC	3.18BC	3.26AD	3.114	.025*

Legend: Same letters within rows are comparable at .05 level of significance; Post hoc is calculated thru Scheffe Test

Presented in Table 3 is the perceived quality of the modules prepared by the teachers during the pandemic when grouped by year level. It shows that both first year and fourth year students perceived the modules as *very good* while the second year and third year students perceived them as *good.*

In general, the modules prepared by the teachers are incomparably perceived by the respondents (F-value, 3.609, and p-value, .013). Incomparable results are also observed for the indicators on the clarity of the language used and their packaging, F-values, 2.955 and 3.114, and p-values, .032 and .025, respectively; hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

2. Perceived Quality of the Teachers' Support to Students

Table 4. Perceived Quality of the Teachers' Support to Students

On the Quality of the Teachers' Support		Frequency				Mean	Des Int
		4	3	2	1		
1	The teachers communicate the content of the course	465	693	204	39	3.13	Good
2	The teachers communicate the course' objectives, competencies, and requirements	496	692	182	31	3.18	Good
3	The teachers encourage feedback from the class	442	659	245	55	3.06	Good
4	The teachers provide immediate/prompt responses to our queries	418	672	250	61	3.03	Good
5	The teachers provide constructive feedback(s) on our outputs	408	682	244	67	3.02	Good
6	The teachers extend extra efforts to reach out for their students	562	593	198	48	3.19	Good
7	The teacher provides motivating and encouraging climate in the course	517	650	190	44	3.17	Good
8	The teachers handle the class with compassion	486	693	188	34	3.16	Good

9	The teachers are considerate enough in dealing with the students	535	680	150	36	3.22	Good
10	The teachers show genuine concern for all students	578	617	176	30	3.24	Good
11	The teachers manifest enthusiasm about the course	457	746	174	24	3.17	Good
12	The teachers provide a study group chat where we can discuss our concerns	579	627	158	37	3.25	Very Good
13	The teachers provide a mobile number where we can reach them for our personal concerns	476	610	216	99	3.04	Good
14	The teachers provide check-point sessions using online tools	363	692	277	69	2.96	Good
Average						3.13	Good

Legend: 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-average, 1-poor

Presented in Table 4 are the perceived teachers' support to students during the pandemic. It can be averred that the teachers' support is *good.* Also, it can be notably observed that the respondents appreciated the provision of study group chat by the teachers which is perceived as *very good.* Quantitatively, it can be noted that the scores are skewed to the right which signifies positive results: 4% for *poor,* 15% for *average,* 47% for *good,* and 34% for *very good.*

Ho 2. The teachers' support is comparably perceived with quality.

Table 5. Perceived Quality of the Teachers' Support to Students when grouped by Campus

On the Quality of the Prepared Modules		Campus			F-value	p-value
		Diffun	Cabarroguis	Maddela		
1	The teachers communicate the content of the course	3.03A	3.23BC	3.26BC	14.524	.000*
2	The teachers communicate the course' objectives, competencies, and requirements	3.09A	3.25BC	3.31BC	10.840	.000*
3	The teachers encourage feedback from the class	2.96A	3.15BC	3.21BC	12.907	.000*
4	The teachers provide immediate/prompt responses to our queries	2.91A	3.16BC	3.16BC	17.182	.000*
5	The teachers provide constructive feedback(s) on our outputs	2.94A	3.11BC	3.11BC	7.993	.000*
6	The teachers extend extra efforts to reach out for their students	3.11A	3.25BC	3.34BC	9.390	.000*
7	The teacher provides motivating and encouraging climate in the course	3.08A	3.25BC	3.29BC	9.667	.000*
8	The teachers handle the class with compassion	3.06A	3.26BC	3.31BC	14.906	.000*
9	The teachers are considerate enough in dealing with the students	3.12A	3.32BC	3.36BC	15.935	.000*

10	The teachers show genuine concern for all students	3.14A	3.33BC	3.39BC	14.698	.000*
11	The teachers manifest enthusiasm about the course	3.06A	3.29BC	3.27BC	18.049	.000*
12	The teachers provide a study group chat where we can discuss our concerns	3.17A	3.30BC	3.41BC	10.028	.000*
13	The teachers provide a mobile number where we can reach them for our personal concerns	2.93A	3.12BC	3.25BC	13.792	.000*
14	The teachers provide check-point sessions using online tools	2.90A	3.03BC	3.02BC	4.370	.013*
Average		3.03A	3.22BC	3.26BC	17.365	.000*

Legend: Same letters within rows are comparable at .05 level of significance; Post hoc is calculated thru Scheffe Test

Presented in Table 5 are the perceived quality of the teachers' support when grouped by campus. It can be gleaned on the table that respondents from Maddela campus perceived their teachers' support as *very good* while *good* from the respondents from Diffun and Cabarroguis.

However, it can be noted that there is an incomparable result on the accorded support by the teachers in all indicators of the study: respondents from Cabarroguis and Maddela campuses vouched incomparable results from the respondents in Diffun. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 6. Perceived Quality of Teachers' Support when Respondents are Grouped by Curriculum Year Level

On the Quality of the Prepared Modules		Year Level				F-value	p-value
		I	II	III	IV		
1	The teachers communicate the content of the course	3.18AD	3.08BC	3.05BC	3.26AD	4.087	.007*
2	The teachers communicate the course' objectives, competencies, and requirements	3.24ACD	3.10BC	3.14ABC	3.29AD	4.204	.006*
3	The teachers encourage feedback from the class	3.08	3.04	2.99	3.19	2.261	.080
4	The teachers provide immediate/prompt responses to our queries	3.06ABCD	3.00ABC	2.96ABC	3.18AD	2.848	.036*
5	The teachers provide constructive feedback(s) on our outputs	3.08ACD	3.00ABCD	2.90ABC	3.13ABD	4.209	.006*

6	The teachers extend extra efforts to reach out for their students	3.23	3.16	3.14	3.25	1.231	.297
7	The teacher provides motivating and encouraging climate in the course	3.19ABCD	3.15ABCA	3.09ABC	3.31AD	3.072	.027*
8	The teachers handle the class with compassion	3.19ABD	3.15ABC	3.09ABC	3.31AD	3.646	.012*
9	The teachers are considerate enough in dealing with the students	3.25	3.21	3.14	3.32	2.553	.054
10	The teachers show genuine concern for all students	3.29ABD	3.23ABCD	3.12BC	3.36ABD	4.799	.002*
11	The teachers manifest enthusiasm about the course	3.20ABD	3.14ABC	3.09BD	3.29AD	3.320	.019*
12	The teachers provide a study group chat where we can discuss our concerns	3.25ABC	3.21ABC	3.22ABC	3.40D	2.584	.052
13	The teachers provide a mobile number where we can reach them for our personal concerns	3.08ABD	3.04ABCD	2.93BC	3.16AD	2.852	.036*
14	The teachers provide check-point sessions using online tools	2.99ABCD	2.93ABC	2.88ABC	3.11AD	3.071	.027*
Average		3.17ABD	3.10ABC	3.05BC	3.25AD	4.192	.026*

Legend: Same letters within rows are comparable at .05 level of significance; Post hoc is calculated thru Scheffe Test

Presented in Table 6 is the perceived quality of teachers' support when grouped by curriculum year. As it can be gleaned on the table, the first-, second-, and third-year respondents perceived it as *good* while the fourth-year students perceived it as *very good*. All other indicators, except indicators 3, 6, 9, and 12, yielded significant results which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

3. Over-all Satisfaction of the Students on the Quality of the Modules and the Teachers' Support

Table 7. Over-all Satisfaction of the Students

Over-all Satisfaction of Students	Frequency				Mean	Des Int
	4	3	2	1		

1	I am satisfied with the modules provided by the teachers for the courses that I enrolled in	441	899	54	7	3.27	Very satisfied
2	I am satisfied on the support that my teachers provide in the courses that I enrolled in.	460	839	86	16	3.25	Very satisfied
Average						3.26	Very satisfied

Legend: 4-very satisfied, 3-satisfied, 2-dissatisfied, 1-very dissatisfied

As it can be gleaned in Table 7, the respondents are *very satisfied* on the modules and teachers' support in their studies during the implementation of modular learning modality during the pandemic: 3.27 and 3.25, respectively. Moreover, it can also be averred that 32% of the respondents vouched *very satisfied*, 62% for *satisfied,* 5% for *dissatisfied*, and 1% for very dissatisfied.

Ho 3. The over-all satisfaction of the students on the performances of their teachers are comparable.

Table 8. Over-all Satisfaction of the Students when grouped by Campus

Over-all Satisfaction of Students		Campus			F-value	p-value
		Diffun	Cabarroguis	Maddela		
1	I am satisfied with the modules provided by the teachers for the courses that I enrolled in	3.22A	3.30BC	3.36BC	6.595	.001*
2	I am satisfied on the support that my teachers provide in the courses that I enrolled in.	3.18A	3.30BC	3.33BC	8.322	.000*
Average		3.20A	3.30BC	3.34BC	8.880	.000*

Legend: Same letters within rows are comparable at .05 level of significance; Post hoc is calculated thru Scheffe Test

Presented in Table 8 is the over-all satisfaction of the respondents when grouped by campus. It can be gleaned on the table that respondents from Diffun are *satisfied (3.20)* on the modules and teachers' support while the respondents from Cabarroguis and Maddela are *very satisfied* (3.30 and 3.34, respectively). These concordances of the respondents led to incomparable state; hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 9. Over-all Satisfaction of the Students when grouped by Year Level

Over-all Satisfaction of Students		Year Level				F-value	p-value
		I	II	III	IV		
1	I am satisfied with the modules provided by the teachers for the courses that I enrolled in	3.32ABD	3.27ABD	3.15C	3.29ABD	6.098	.000*
2	I am satisfied on the support that my teachers provide in the courses that I enrolled in.	3.27ABD	3.26ABD	3.15C	3.30ABD	3.052	.028*
Average		3.30ABD	3.27ABD	3.15C	3.29ABD	5.092	.002*

Legend: Same letters within rows are comparable at .05 level of significance; Post hoc is calculated thru Scheffe Test

Presented in Table 9 is the over-all satisfaction of the respondents when grouped by curriculum year. It can be gleaned on the table that the first-, second-, and fourth-year respondents are *very satisfied* (3.30, 3.27, and 3.29, respectively) on the quality of modules and their teachers' support while the third-year students are *satisfied* (3.15). These concordances of the respondents led to an incomparable state; hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

4. Qualitative Analysis on the Perceived Performances of the Teachers during the CoViD-19 Pandemic

4.1 Perceived Performances of the Teachers

Considerate Faculty Members. Faculty members are observed to be considerate by the respondents during the implementation of the modular teaching, First semester, SY 2020-2021. Being compassionate among them is an act of showing care and consideration in these trying times. At times, what the students need is a caring teacher.

The following transcripts on the narration of the informants qualify the claim of this study that the teachers are considerate in this time of pandemic:

Informant 1. My teachers are considerate enough in terms of the deadlines of activities, worksheets, etc.
Informant 2. My teachers consider extending the deadlines because of my situation.
Informant 3. I think my teachers are very much considerate this time as we have many limitations.
Informant 4. My professor is apparently getting considerate.
Informant 5. I must agree that my professors (this time) are considerate.
Informant 6. They are considerate enough.

Faculty Members Reach Students. On the concept that 'no learner left behind' and the inclusivity of education during these trying times, teachers need to reach out for their students. Teachers need to assure that no learner is left behind because of the limitations brought by the pandemic.

The following transcripts on the narration of the informants qualify the claim of this study that the teachers extend time to reach out for their students:

Informant 1. Our teachers extend time in reaching us.
Informant 2. It is good that we can reach our teachers any time through GC.
Informant 3. Yes! Our teachers extend time to reach us.
Informant 4. Indeed, our teachers extend their time just to reach us.
Informant 5. They reach us in all possible means through FB, text message, phone calls.
Informant 6. They reach us through GCs where we can exchange discussions.

Connected through Group Chat. In these trying times where movement is very much limited, teachers must find ways and means to connect with their students. The ultimate reason on having these ways and means is to give supplements and follow-ups on the learning of the students.

The following transcripts on the narration of the informants qualify the claim of this study on the importance of online discussion tools like a Group Chat (GC):

Informant 1. We connect through the group chat. We exchange discussions there with our teachers.
Informant 2. The group chat is nice. I found it helpful.
Informant 3. During these times, the GC is very much helpful. We do connect through it.
Informant 4. We are saved by GCs in FB. It is very helpful.
Informant 5. They reach us in all possible means through FB (groupchat)
Informant 6. They reach us through GCs where we can exchange discussions.

4.2 Problems Encountered

Difficulty in understanding the module. Modular learning is indeed a difficult learning modality unlike the traditional face-to-face teaching and learning. Unlike in a situation where the teacher is present, modular learning depends on the capability of the learner to process learning tasks given by the teachers.

The following transcripts on the narration of the informants qualify the claim of this study on the difficulty of understanding the modules:

Informant 1. I am having difficulty in processing my modules. It is difficult to follow the process. I need to learn it from my teacher
Informant 2. It is difficult to understand the module. The tasks are difficult, it is complicated.
Informant 3. Learning on your own is very difficult. I realize and appreciate the roles of our teachers in teaching us the difficult lessons.
Informant 4. I am burdened by the modules, it is difficult to understand
Informant 5. Having nobody with you is difficult in doing modules.
Informant 6. Module difficulty is mostly observed in Math and Laboratory classes.

Internet connection. Modular learning is a self-paced learning modality. As a consequence, learners need to supplement their learning tasks with research and readings at their own. In these trying times where they cannot visit the library, learners rely in the internet. However, students find difficulty in connecting to the net because of their geographical locations which are not covered by internet providers.

The following transcripts on the narration of the informants qualify the claim of this study on the problems on internet connectivity:

Informant 1. I think the problem (this pandemic) is internet connectivity. I needed to go somewhere just to have a connection to do my readings.
Informant 2. My problem is my connection with the internet. I am using my mobile data and it is expensive. Likewise, I need to find a place just to have a good connection so I can research.
Informant 3. Internet connection is my main problem. I need to read something over the net as I do not have references at home.
Informant 4. I am burdened by my internet connectivity. It is a big problem.
Informant 5. Internet is the key. I need to go online for my researches.
Informant 6. Internet cost is a problem by everybody. Most activities are taken online.

Discussion

Learning nowadays is a collaboration of efforts between the teacher and the students (Bautista, 2012). Moreover, teachers must tailor instructional techniques that would suit best the students' ability to uplift and develop their performance in the courses that they enrolled in.

In the current study in the midst of the CoViD-19 pandemic, students rely on the instructional materials provided by their teachers. Instructional materials like modules are imperative in enhancing the positive transfer of learning. Indeed, instructional materials must contain the most effective and constructive ways to develop skills that will enrich the learning of every learner (Nardo, 2017; Isman et al., 2004).

In such scenarios, modules as instructional materials must be made clearer and simpler as learners are helpless due to the limitations of this pandemic. The concept on 'no learner left behind' should become the mantra of inclusiveness of educational institutions – that is, ensuring high-quality of instructional tactics and interventions that enable every learner to master competencies in their core curriculum (Advani & Chadha, 2002; Flem et al., 2004). Likewise, teachers must find ways to supplement the modules that the students are provided with. Aptly, the use of online learning tools is highly wanting.

Online learning tools are paramount to curate and connect teachers with their students. The provisions of online sessions during the implementation of the modular teaching are likened to an assurance that every topic is processed and understood by the students (Almonacid-Fierro et al., 2021; Yudiawan et al., 2021).

At the helm of modular teaching intervened by the CoViD-19 pandemic, teachers, in these most trying times, need to be compassionate enough to students considering their limitations at home like internet connectivity so they can do some readings about the topics that they are studying. Aptly, the mercy and compassion of every teacher is exuded as learners need the most attention and understanding. It must be noted that the learning environment, including the teachers, posts implications to effective learning (Yudiawan et al., 2012; Bhuasiri et al., 2012). Furthermore, it was claimed that a safe, comfortable, and relaxed environment allows better learning (Arzhanik et al., 2015; Minocha & Reeves, 2010).

Conclusion and Future Works

Based on the findings of the study, the following are concluded:

1. The modules are perceived to be *good*; however, the informants claim that they found difficulty in processing the modules because of the intricacies of the concepts and tasks relative thereto. It is suggested that the teachers may revisit their modules to simplify their presentations and make things guided to fully attain that modules are self-paced learning kits.

   Moreover, teachers may also consider recording videos to model difficult topics so students can view them how to resolve and process as face-to-face modality is not yet permitted. Likewise, teachers may present guided procedures on doing tasks deemed difficult;

2. The teachers' support is perceived to be *good*. The informants claimed that the GCs help them connect and curate their learning conditions as they can exchange discussions with their teachers and classmates. However, the informants found difficulty in connecting to the internet.

   Moreover, the teachers need to upload all reading materials to any known online tool (particularly the QSU e-Aral) so students can download them whenever they get internet connection.

3. Students are *very satisfied* on the quality of the module and teachers support; however, teachers may consider conducting '*kumustahan sessions'* with their students – a session designed in building rapport, provision of counseling activities, and establishment of acquaintances among teachers and students. This in return will propagate wings of openness and will lessen the possibility of developing anxieties in the midst of the pandemic.

References

1. Almonacid-Fierro, R. Vitoria, R. De Carvalho, and M. Fierro, "Impact on teaching in times of CoViD-19 pandemic: A qualitative study", *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education,* Vol. 10, No. 2, 432-440. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i2.21129
2. Bergil and I. Atlib, "Different perspectives about feedback on teaching", *Procedia,* 46:5833–5839, 2012. https ://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspr o.2012.06.524
3. Flem, T. Moen, and S. Gudmundsdottir, "Towards inclusive schools: A study of inclusive education in practice", Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 85-98, 2004. https://doi.org.10.1080/0885625032000167160
4. Isman, A. Altinay, and F. Altinay, "Roles of the students and teachers in distance education", *The Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education,* Vol. 5, No. 4, 2004.
5. Lyde, D. Grieshaber, G. Byrns, "Faculty teaching performance: Perceptions of a multi-source method for evaluation (MME)", *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 82-94, 2016. DOI: 10.14434/josotl.v16i3.18145
6. Yudiawan, B. Sunarso, Suharmoko, F. Sari, & Ahmadi, "Successful online learning factors in CoViD-19 era: Study of Islamic higher education in West Papua, Indonesia", *International Journal of Evaluation and research in Education,* Vol. 10, No. 1, pp 193-201, 2021. http://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i1.21036
7. Jeffs, N. Nelson, K. A. Grant, L. Nowell, B. Paris & N. Viceer, "Feedback for teaching development: Moving from a fixed to growth mindset", *Professional Development in Education*, 2021. DOI: 10.1080/19415257.2021.1876149
8. F.D. Tan, P.R. Whipp, M. Gagné, and N. Van Quaquebeke, "Expert teacher perceptions of two-way feed-back interaction," *Teach Teach Educ,* Vol 87, pp 1–12. https ://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102930

9. G. Prince, “Surveying Narratology” T. Kindt & H.-H. Müller (eds.). What Is Narratology? Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 1–16, 2003.
10. H. Samoy, F. Gecobe, DC. Cua, R. Bautista, AG. Camayang, J. Saddul, E. Ugot, F. Felipe, "From ladle to chalk and pencil: Parents in the new normal of Philippine education system," *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 504-511, 2021. DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2021.090310.
11. L. Advani and A. Chadha, “The inclusive initiative in India”, *Journal of the International Association of Special Education*, pp 17-22, 2002.
12. K. Malterud, “Qualitative Research: Standards, Challenges, and Guidelines”, The Lancet, Vol. 358, pp. 483-488, 2001. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(01)05627-6.
13. K. Taber, “The use of Cronbach’s Alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education”, *Research in Science Education, Vol.* 48, pp 1273-1296, 2018.
14. L. Hoshmand, “Narratology, cultural psychology, and counselling research”, *Journal of Counselling Psychology,* Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 178-186, 2005. DOI. 10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.178.
15. L. Leung, “Validity, reliability, and generalizability in qualitative research”, *Research and Audit,* Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 324-327, 2015. **DOI:** 10.4103/2249-4863.161306
16. L. Nowell, J. Norris, D. White, and N. Moules, “Thematic analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria”, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* Vol. 11, pp. 248-258, 2017. DOI: 10.1177/1609406917733847.
17. M. B. Arzhanik, E. V. Chernikova, S. I. Karas, and E. Y. Lemeshko, “Differentiated approach to learning in higher education,” *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci*., 2015, pp. 287-291, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.525.
18. M. Husain and S. Khan, “Students' Feedback: An Effective Tool in Teachers' Evaluation System”, *International Journal of Applied & Basic Medical Research*, 6(3), 178–181, 2006. https://doi.org/10.4103/2229-516X.186969
19. M. Fludernik and Uri Margolin, “Introduction,” Special Issue German Narratology I of Style 38, pp. 148–187, 2004.
20. M. Nardo, “Modular instruction enhances learner autonomy”, *American Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 5, No. 10, pp. 1024-1034, 2017. DOI: 10.12691/education-5-10-3
21. R. Bautista, “Paid academic services with mercy and compassion: Phenomenologizing the lived experiences of research mercenaries in the Philippines,” *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education,* Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 5335-5340, 2021.
22. R. Bautista, “The effects of personalized instruction on the academic achievement of students in physics”, *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*¸ Vol. 5, No. 5, pp. 573-583, 2012.
23. R. Neumann (2000). “Communicating Student Evaluation of Teaching Results: Rating Interpretation Guides (RIGs)”, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 25:2, 121-134, DOI: 10.1080/02602930050031289

24. S. Minocha and A. J. Reeves, “Design of learning spaces in 3D virtual worlds: an empirical investigation of Second Life,” *Learn. Media Technol.*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 111–137, Jun. 2010, doi: 10.1080/17439884.2010.494419
25. T. Almutairi and N. Shraid, “Teacher evaluation by different internal evaluators: Head of departments, teachers themselves, peers and students”, *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education,* vol. 10, No. 2, pp588-596, 2021. http://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i2.20838
26. T. Kindt and Hans-Harald Müller, “Narrative Theory and/or/as Theory of Interpretation.” T. Kindt & H.-H. Müller (eds.). What Is Narratology? Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 205–219, 2003.
27. W. Bhuasiri, O. Xaymoungkhoun, H. Zo, J. J. Rho, and A. P. Ciganek, “Critical success factors for e-learning in developing countries: A comparative analysis between ICT experts and faculty,” *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 843–855, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2011.10.010.