Comparative Analysis of Students' Perceptions in Modular Distance Learning Approach Versus Face-to-Face Learning Approach of Mindanao State University – Sulu

Altamir A. Salamuddin[1]*

[1] Instructor 1, Mindanao State University-Sulu 7400, Jolo, Sulu, Philippines

A B S T R A C T

Teaching approach gives significant to the teaching-learning process for both teachers and students. Thus, the students' learning depends on what the school's application of most effective and attainable teaching approach especially in the time of covid-19 pandemic. With the implementation of the new normal education, the difficulties encountered among stakeholders because of an alternative learning delivery – modular distance learning being applied in order to facilitate and to continue to serve the good education in different schools in the country Philippines. With this, the study sought to determine the perceptions of the students in Mindanao State University – Sulu regarding their experiences during face-to-face learning approach and modular distance learning approach, to ascertain the factors that can affect face-to-face learning and modular learning as perceived by the students of Mindanao State University-Sulu. This also aimed to find out the significant difference of students' perceptions in the two learning approach. This study utilized random sampling technique through launching a survey questionnaire in assessing the perceptions of the students in Mindanao State University –Sulu by at least ten percent of the total number of enrollees from the seven departments existing in the university campus academic year 2020-2021. The findings of this study revealed that students agreed that face-to-face learning approach gives significant and had much contribution to their learning while they have disagreed on modular distance learning approach. They also believed that there are factors can affect their learning either in face-to-face and during modular learning. There is a significant difference of students' perceptions in face-to-face learning approach and modular distance learning approach that resulted to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This study recommended that principal/director should encourage and motivate the subordinates to achieve a certain task for the good of their school. He/she should conduct an orientation program to inform parents that they are partners of teachers in education in time of crisis. Principal/director should also be responsible for interacting with teachers, representative of other school, and other stakeholders to acquire the various materials and resources for the teachers and students. There should be a training/seminar programs for the benefits of his/her subordinates in achieving school's goals. He/she should also give clear instructions to the teachers, parents that their primary role during Modular is to establish a connection and guide the students. Lastly, he/she should encourage teachers to adopt modular even during face-to-face classes.

1. Introduction

Education plays a big role in the lives of the people. It holds the important characteristics in shaping the future and it serves as a key for all Filipinos to become full-pledged, productive members of society. In the school, education is a learning process where the students can learn and acquire knowledge from their

395

teachers and their fellow learners. According to Prof. H. Mahmud Yunus, education is a total effort that is deliberately chosen to influence and assist children with the aim of improving knowledge, physical and moral that can gradually deliver the child to the highest goal.

But because of today's crisis however, the Covid-19 pandemic has brought extraordinary challenges to the people around the world and has affected the educational sectors in different societies. Every country is presently implementing plans and procedures on how to control the virus. In fact, in the Philippines educational context, to be able to sustain and provide quality education despite the lockdown and community quarantine, the new normal education has been taken into consideration in the planning and implementation of the so called "the new normal educational policy". The Department of Education (DepEd) provides Self-Learning Modules (SLMs) with the alternative learning delivery modalities to be offered for various types of learners across the Philippines.

The integration of SLMs with the alternative learning delivery modalities (modular, television-based, radio-based instruction, blended and online) is to ensure that all learners have access to quality basic education for SY 2020-2021 with face-to-face classes still prohibited due to the public health situation.

The SLMs and other alternative learning delivery modalities are in place to address, situations, and resources of each and every learner and will cover all the bases in ensuring that basic education will be accessible amid the present crisis posted by covid-19 (DepEd Secretary Leonor Briones, https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/07).

Moreover, Mindanao State University –Sulu is one of the institutions applying the SLMs specifically the modular distance learning approach to provide and ensure all the students have access in their academe. However, students in both modular and in face-to-face environment have seemingly numerous ways of their

learning outcomes. Thus, the researcher aimed to compare the students' perception based on the abovementioned approaches. The researcher came up with his title "Comparative Analysis of Students' Perceptions on Modular Distance Learning Approach versus Face-to-Face Learning Approach of Mindanao State University –Sulu".

2. Literature Review

Modules are increasingly being used in many countries as a way of organizing a language curriculum. As a consequence, many course books are now structured on the basis of "modules" rather than "units". The concept of "module" is strictly linked to the idea of a flexible language curriculum. Taneja (1989) defined module as a unit of work in a course of instruction that is virtually self-contained and a method of teaching that is based on the concept of building up skills and knowledge in discrete. A module is a set of learning opportunities organized around a well - defined topic which contains the elements of ordinate dictation, categorical objectives, edifying cognition activities, and evaluation utilizing criterion - referenced measures (UNESCO, 1988).

Modular teaching is one of the most widespread and recognizes teaching learning techniques in many countries including other Western countries and Asian region. Modular approach is used almost in all subjects like natural science, specifically in biology and medical education and even in social sciences as well as in computers education (Manlove and David, 1985). It is considering the individual differences among the learners which necessitate the planning for adoption of the most appropriate teaching techniques in order to help the individual grow and develop at her/his own pace (Kandarp Sejpal, 2013).

Distance education is an increasingly common educational alternative as well as a key contributor to the newly competitive landscape in higher education. Once regarded as an experimental alternative outside

the mainstream university education, distance education has attained new levels of legitimacy and expansion and has grown into a higher education industry of its own (Merisotis & Phipps, 1999).

Joy and Garcia (2000) suggested that studies comparing delivery media should consider the following variables in the research: sampling, size of sample, prior knowledge, ability, learning styles, media familiarity of the participants, teacher effects, time on task, and instructional method. The challenge of this study then was to design it in such a way as to address some of the criticisms of prior studies and at the same time provide a series of effective learning activities and assessment methodologies, identical for both sections, using a convenience sample of self-selected students for both groups. This study was conducted by the author, who taught two sections of a Principles of Management undergraduate course, one section online and the other FTF. This course was selected because it attracts both business and non-business students, is a 200-level course, some learning outcomes are measurable by standardized means, and the FTF section is offered in the evening, the perfect section for working adults, as was the online section. Metrics included test grades, final grades, level of participation, number of discussion postings, and quality of assignments, student ratings of effectiveness to learning, learning preferences and styles, and media knowledge.

Modularization of courses involved the packaging of course content, either theory or practical, into shorter, logically self-contained units which together cover the content which would be covered by a conventional, longer course. To its proponents this presents the ideal of being able to assess learning and performance before moving onto a new topic or unit for which the initial module is prerequisite knowledge. When failures occur in modular courses, those who have failed will not be required to waste time covering units which they have already passed, as happens with more traditional courses. Instead they can

concentrate upon those modules in which they have not been able to demonstrate competence (Finch & Crunkilton, 1984).

According to Ainley (1993) the modular approach lends itself particularly well to short courses and courses which have been developed for specific training purposes such as to provide specific training in skills relating to specific occupations or industries, for the most part being driven by local demand. In such cases, the course content tends to be clearly defined and is used to provide a specific service rather than to be part of long-term training for broader professional development. That is to say, it tends to be used to effectively 'top up' already existing skills and knowledge. Currently, however, there is ample evidence that modular courses are being widely used to develop skill and knowledge bases. With block-release and students in distance education, modularization often has been used in the recent past.

Hazem M El-Bakry, Nikos Mastorakis (2009) said distance learning is one of the important fields in which computers and Internet applications are widely used and playing a great role in that trend. Distance education program does not make the learning process related to a specific building or a classroom. It extends the learning process to be available at homes, offices and in any other place in the world. The distances are not frustrating anymore if the virtual classes are used. With the efficient use of advanced technologies, teaching and studying at distances can be effective as the traditional instruction method. Therefore, there is a motivation for developing E-learning system. In this paper, a new approach for evaluating e-learning is presented. Learning is a modular network relation: it is a transaction, an exchange between class web as one person teaches and another learns; it is a shared experience as colleagues explore a new area together, define terms and create common ground; and it is a common experience as students attend classes and lectures together gaining a similar view of subject areas. A modular network approach provides methods

and measures to allow examination of what is exchanged, shared, delivered and received among members of a network, and to examine outcomes such as interpersonal ties, common knowledge, and community.

Fraser & Deane (1998) categorized distance education models in terms of institutional attitudes to distance education. The first model recognises distance education as a mode in its own right. The learning experience is adaptable and learner-controlled. The second model regards distance education as a substitute for conventional education. In this model, students are treated as members of a class, there is a mandatory face-to-face component, and the learning experience is paced and controlled by the institution. In addition to these two models there are many variations that partly resemble either or both of them.

Wenli Chen & Chee-Kit Looi (2007) discussed an innovative blended learning strategy which incorporates online discussion in both in-class face to face, and off-classroom settings. Online discussion in a face to face class is compared with its two counterparts, off-class online discussion as well as in-class, face to face oral discussion, to examine the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed strategy. By integrating online discussion into the flow of the classroom, learners are given dedicated time to foster a habit of critical thinking, reflection and articulating these online, which can subsequently seed further in-class oral discussions, and off-class online discussions. It is found that in-class, online discussion can provide a wider spectrum of discussion perspectives, equalise participation in discussion, and promote cognitive thinking skills and in depth information processing. However, the lack of face to face interactions and the need for sufficient time to do online postings pose challenges in implementing online discussion for face to face classroom learning.

Blended learning

Blended learning systems combine face to face instruction with computer mediated instruction (Graham, 2005). Many researchers share the view that the most common reason for adopting blended learning is that it combines "the best of both worlds". Beyond this general statement, Graham, Allen and Ure (2003) found that people chose blended learning for three reasons: (1) improved pedagogy, (2) increased access or flexibility, and (3) increased cost effectiveness. Some researchers have argued that blended learning approaches increase the level of active learning strategies, peer to peer learning strategies, and learner centered strategies used (Collis, Bruijstens & Veen, 2003; Morgan, 2002). It provides a balance between flexible learning options and the high touch, human interactive experience (e.g., Dziuban, Hartmann, Juge, Moskal & Sorg, 2005; Reynolds & Greiner, 2005).

In addition, blended learning systems provide an opportunity for reaching a large, globally dispersed audience in a short period of time with consistent, semi-personalized content delivery (Bersin & Associates, 2003). Future learning systems will be differentiated not based on whether they blend but rather by how they blend (Ross & Gage, 2005). 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 (Bonk & Graham, 2005). Many researchers are still seeking out best practices for how to combine instructional strategies in face to face and CMC environments that exploit the strengths of each environment and minimize their weaknesses (Osguthorpe & Graham, 2003).

Mode of instruction

The curriculum team responsible for designing this module believes that learning is an individual process

and that collaborative and cooperative learning environments are important means of constructing knowledge. It was decided that this module would use a blended learning approach. The normal mass lectures which use' direct instruction' were cancelled and the content of the lectures was made available in three modes of instruction. The module was conducted using an adopted textbook with a specially designed multimedia CD-ROM, face-to-face tutorials and online discussion.

Learning preferences and styles

Gardner (1995) suggested that, consequently, independent-learning students will find online learning more effective. The NF learning-style person has a built-in desire to communicate in a personal way with others. He/she likes two-way exchanges and likes personal feedback on whatever he/she produces. He/she likes interaction and participation in groups. He/she learns from the discussion method. He/she is especially responsive to learning in small groups, and to courses in which the instructor responds to and accepts the ideas of the class members. Even though there are some inconsistencies between the learning style descriptions and some attributes of online methodology, it appears that NT and NF learning styles may fit well with online learning; consequently, it was hypothesized that the SPor SJ-style person would find the online learning less effective and might not succeed as well. The more successful online students would be more likely to be the NF or NT type rather than the SP or SJ type.

Diaz and Cartnal (1999) suggested that if there are no differences in learning styles, then the learning activities used in the FTF classroom may be just as effective for the online course. Therefore, if it is found in this study that the learning styles are not significantly different between online and FTF groups, then the same learning activities should be effective for both groups as perceived by the students; and, consequently, the hypothesis would be that there is no significant difference in effectiveness of the learning activities between the two groups, and the differences in the outcomes are not a result of the learning styles.

In the previous studies and scholars in the field of education indicated that student-centered activities should be incorporated into modularized programs more to enable students to be the managers of their own learning (Adesope & Ahiakwo, 2016; Ali et al., 2010; Billing, 1996; Brown & Saunders, 1995; Cornford, 1997), and instructors' role in the modularized classroom should be that of facilitator and a guide. Describing the role of instructors in a modularized curriculum, Goldschmid and Goldschmid (1973) stated that he/she is a diagnostician, prescriber, motivator, and resource person. He/she is no more a disseminator of information.

Malik (2012) also contended that the teaching approach in modularized program should allow students to proceed at their own pace, give opportunity to choose their own learning style, and allow them to identify their strengths and weaknesses.

Moreover, Manlove and David (1985) stressed that modularization should focus on independent learning which would help the individual student in developing many notable and self-reliant characters, and in much more modern ways, learners enjoy periods in which they pursue their interests and satisfy their curiosities. Moreover, as explained by Loughran and Berry (2005), such learning approach permits the student to work at their own pace (Kain, 2003; Nadeem, 2013).

Regarding the practice of continuous assessment, the study found out that instructors frequently use quizzes and tests making students busy and tired all day. Continuous assessment seems perceived as continuous testing. Similar findings were also reported by Getinet (2016) who have reported that continuous assessment is practiced in higher education as continuous testing in which students sat for quizzes and tests continuously. Instructors reported that they tend to prefer quizzes and/or tests over individual

and/or group assignment justifying that academic dishonesty is rampant among undergraduate students. Group assignments are meant for engaging only one or two students whose academic performance is better and other group members did not take individual accountability and/or contributions to complete group assignments. Regarding individual assignments, instructors reported that it is common to find students copying from other students of the same class or different classes. Similar findings have been reported in previous studies (Tadesse & Getachew, 2009, 2010; Imran & Ayobami, 2011; Michelle, Nancy, & Candace, 2012).

It was also found that students were not provided with feedback on their quizzes, assignments, and/or tests. Instructors have justified that large class size is the hindering factor. Students also underlined that instructors are reluctant in marking group assignments and provide timely feedback. This result is in agreement with Hernandez (2012) who reported that large class size and the approach i.e., modularization by itself as barriers for providing feedback to students. This is in contrary to what Goldschmid and Goldschmid (1973) have suggested. They stressed that modular instruction requires instructors to check students' learning progress regularly with feedbacks. They have to provide the student with immediate and continuing feedback. They further underlined that the purpose of assessment in modularized program includes assessment of prerequisite skills, the diagnosis of difficulties, and a confirmation of mastery. Moreover, it should consider individual difference by providing flexibility with respect to the pacing, format, and contents of the instruction (Hernandez, 2012).

Lynnette R Porter (1997), creating the Virtual Classroom gets right down to the real issues of the design and management of distance learning programs-giving practical advice on putting together effective courses and programs. You'll find out how to propose, plan, and fund a distance learning program

for any level from kindergarten through college. You'll learn all of the techniques you'll need to evaluate and advertise your program. There's in-depth coverage of all the latest technologies, including the Internet and the Web, as well as an illuminating chapter on conceptualizing education and training through distance learning. Special appendices offer up-to-date information about newsgroups and mailing lists, instructional Web sites, online resources for grants and proposals, and much more.

Ana-Maria Bliuc, Robert A Ellis, Peter Goodyear, Leanne (2011) presents research on students' experiences of learning through a blend of face-to-face and online discussion. The participants in our study were students enrolled in a foreign policy course at a major Australian university. Students' conceptions of learning through discussion, and their approaches to both face-to-face and online discussion, were elicited through open-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Students' responses to both open-ended questionnaires and interviews were analysed using a phenomenographic framework. Qualitative variations in students' conceptions and approaches were categorized and were found to form a hierarchy. Subsequent quantitative analysis found associations between students' conceptions of learning through discussion, their approaches to both face-to-face and online discussion and their academic performance (as indicated by the final mark for the course). Implications for teaching and further research are discussed.

The study was part of a broader project on learning through blends of face-to-face and online discussion. More specifically, the project has been exploring students' experiences of learning in which part of the experience was mediated by technology, usually taking part of the experience outside of the classroom. The research pays particular attention to how students conceive of, and engage in learning through discussion. In this study, key aspects of the research are to understand: how students make sense of

various combinations of online and face-to-face discussion; the extent to which they experience these as separate or integrated, and whether there are significant differences between academic disciplines in students' conceptions of, and approaches to learning through online and face-to-face discussion (Ellis & Goodyear, 2010). The current study draws its data from an undergraduate social sciences course in Foreign Policy, taught at a major, research-intensive metropolitan university in Australia. On the course being studied, the blended learning experience consisted of face-to face lectures complemented by tutorials structured into face-to-face and online discussions. A primary motivation underlying the teacher's use of a blend of face-to-face and online discussion was the observation that some of the students taking the course were more reluctant to engage in the face-to-face discussion. One of the central aims of adding the online dimension to the face-to-face discussion was to provide the best context for a broader range of students to participate in discussion. The teacher hoped that the online context with its affordances (more relaxed pace, relative anonymity, increased opportunities for reflection and better organization of arguments, etc.) might help students to participate more fully. The teacher's belief about the pedagogical value of discussion was grounded in a sense of the importance of students having an opportunity to articulate their knowledge.

Scott D Johnson, Steven R Aragon, Najmuddin Shaik (2000) empirical study compared a graduate online course with an equivalent course taught in a traditional face-to-face format on a variety of outcome measures. Comparisons included student ratings of instructor and course quality; assessment of course interaction, structure, and support; and learning outcome measures such as course grades and student self-assessment of their ability to perform various Instructional Systems Design (ISD) tasks. Results revealed that the students in the face-to-face course held slightly more positive perceptions about the instructor and overall course quality although there was no difference between the two course formats in several measures of learning outcomes. The findings have direct implications for the creation, development, and delivery of online instruction.

Moore and Kearsley (1996) maintain distance educators should provide for three types of interaction: a) learner-content; b) learner-instructor; and c) learner-learner. According to interactionist second language acquisition (SLA) theories that reflect Krashen's theory (1994) that comprehensible input is critical for second language acquisition, interaction can enhance second language acquisition and fluency. Effective output is necessary as well. We reviewed the research on distance learning for second language learners and concluded that SLA theories can, and should, be the framework that drives the development of courses for students seeking to learn languages by distance technology. This article delineates issues to consider in support of combining SLA theories and research literature as a guide in creating distance language learning courses.

Research and theory in the areas of the development of expertise, skill learning and cognitive factors affecting learning provide a base from which to judge modular courses, and indicate important principles which need to be adhered to if modular courses are to result in substantial, meaningful learning and the development of problem-solving abilities. Modular courses do have certain strengths, and will continue to be developed and implemented to satisfy specific training needs. In order to ensure that modular courses are as effective as possible there are a number of specific recommendations which need to be observed in constructing and designing modular courses.

Bruner (1971) considered that effective learning is most likely to occur when learners are exposed to subject content numbers of time when the basic skills are returned to with additional complexity as students develop and move through a course or curriculum.

This is the concept underlying the spiral curriculum which was developed in a context of fostering meaningful, real world learning and problem solving. Although originally formulated with reference to cognitive skill acquisition and school learning, it is particularly pertinent for vocational education where effective skilling is the desired objective.

3. Methods

Research design

This research utilized descriptive quantitative method to describe the students' perceptions on modular distance learning approach versus face-to-face learning approach based on their demographic profile. Quantitative research method is an inquiry into a social problem; explain phenomena by gathering numerical data that are analysed using mathematically based methods in particular statistic (Aliaga and Glunderson, 2002).

Locale of the study

This study was conducted in Mindanao State University-Sulu campus. It is located in Capitol Site, Jolo, Sulu. It was founded in 1974 through the Board of Regents resolution no. 860, formerly known as MSU-Sulu Development and Technical College (SDTC).

Respondents of the study

The respondents of this research were the students of Mindanao State University-Sulu of different Colleges. At least 10% of the total number of enrolees of each department was selected randomly regardless of their gender and their year level.

Research instruments

A Likert Scale survey questionnaire was used as a research instrument in the study. Likert Scale is a measure that asks individuals to check their level of agreement with various statements about an attitude or object. (eg. Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, And Strongly Disagree). The survey questionnaire was a closed ended question that consists of two (2) parts. The first part composed of their name, age, gender, address, educational attainment and multiple different statements on the perceptions of the respondent in face-to-face learning approach versus modular distance learning approach. The second part was composed of factors that can affect the two learning approaches as perceived by the students of Mindanao State University –Sulu.

Sampling procedure

The researcher of this study utilized random sampling technique. At least 10% of the total number of enrolees from each college of Mindanao State University-Sulu was selected randomly in identifying the perceptions of the respondents.

Data gathering procedure

There were several steps taken by the researcher in gathering all the data needed in this study. First was the presentation of the survey questionnaire to the research adviser for further comments and suggestions. Also, the questionnaire was validated by three (3) experts in research panelling. After validating, the questionnaire was reliably tested by four hundred fourteen (414) students as respondents which is equivalent to at least 10% of the total number officially enrolled in seven (7) colleges of second semester of A.Y. 2020-2021. The participants were expected to answer the question with all honesty. Upon completing the number of respondents needed for this study. Data obtained was analysed with the help of a certain statistician using different treatments.

Statistical treatment of the data

After the collection of the launched questionnaire, the result was subject for tallying, tabulating and encoding by the researcher and statistician utilizing

the Statistical Program for Social Sciences. Weighted mean was utilized as statistical tool to determine the students' perceptions in face-to-face learning approach versus modular distance learning approach and to ascertain the factors affecting the mentioned approaches as perceived by the students of Mindanao State University –Sulu. T-test for dependent samples was employed as statistical tool to find out the significant difference of students' perceptions in the two learning approaches.

4. Results

Table 1. Students' perceptions in face-to-face learning approach versus modular distance learning approach

PERCEPTIONS	Mean for F-t-FLA	Description for F-t-FLA	Mean for MDLA	Description for MDLA
1. Learning resources are available and accessible	3.307	Agree	2.630	Agree
2. Conducive learning environment	3.283	Agree	2.481	Disagree
3. There is an immediate feedback between teacher and student	3.394	Agree	2.341	Disagree
4. Easy to understand the words in the text	3.295	Agree	2.415	Disagree
5. Teamwork/Group discussion is practiced	3.444	Agree	2.208	Disagree
6. Very comfortable in analysing the data/information	3.314	Agree	2.440	Disagree
7. Achievable lesson objectives	3.365	Agree	2.469	Disagree
8. Provides proper Guidance from the teachers	3.394	Agree	2.415	Disagree
9. Can boost ones self-confidence	3.360	Agree	2.377	Disagree
10. Develops Higher Order thinking skills	3.370	Agree	2.448	Disagree
11. Maximizes students' academic performances	3.329	Agree	2.425	Disagree
12. Less expensive way of learning	3.094	Agree	2.374	Disagree
13. Increases vocabulary and knowledge for the specific learning area	3.365	Agree	2.500	Agree
14. Students are motivated to learn new things	3.418	Agree	2.461	Disagree
15. Topics are understandable.	3.425	Agree	2.406	Disagree
TOTAL	**3.3436**	**Agree**	**2.4287**	**Disagree**

Legend: 1-1.49 =Strongly Disagree; 1.5-2.49=Disagree; 2.5-3.49= Agree; 3.5-4=Strongly Agree

Table 1 shows the mean and the description of the students' perceptions in face-to-face learning approach (FTFLA) versus modular distance learning approach (MDLA) at Mindanao State University –Sulu. The students agreed that in face-to-face, they feel motivated while they practice collaborative learning. Thus, it boosts one's self esteem simultaneously develops higher order thinking skills (HOTS) that results in maximizing their academic performance.

The availability and accessibility of learning resources in face-to-face makes it easy to comprehend the topic and text, vocabulary and other knowledge on the specific learning areas and becomes comfortable in analyzing data to meet the objectives of the lesson. Teachers always give guidance during face-to-face to the students with an immediate feedback when it comes to activities and any other related school matters. It is also shown that face-to-face is conducive to learning while it is seen as affordable means of education since it involve both teachers and students' physically in the learning process. The grand mean of the students' perceptions in face-to-face is 3.3436 which means that students believe that traditional

403

face-to-face learning approach gives significant to their learning.

Nevertheless, the result shows that the students disagreed that during modular distance learning they felt unmotivated since they never practice collaborative learning unlike in face-to-face. It has no way to boost one's self-esteem and cannot develop their thinking skills which results of low academic performance.

Moreover, they find modular learning uncomfortable to analyze data and to meet the lesson objectives due to lack of proper guidance and feedbacks from the teachers. Students also felt that

modular is expensive and does not have a conducive learning environment since they are not physically together with teachers and their classmates.

However, students agreed that during modular learning it can increase their vocabulary and knowledge since learning resources are available and accessible in different sites through using different devices. The total grand mean of the students' perceptions in modular distance learning approach is 2.4287 which means that the data provided evidence and majority of the respondents disagreed on the said approach.

Table 2. Factors affecting face-to-face learning approach and modular distance learning approach as perceived by the students of MSU-Sulu

FACTORS	Mean for F-t-FLA	Description For F-t-FLA	Mean for MDLA	Description for MDLA
1. Low economic status	2.734	Agree	2.814	Agree
2. Limited resources such as books, journals and other learning materials.	2.800	Agree	2.802	Agree
3. Poor internet access	2.742	Agree	3.053	Agree
4. Far-flung area	2.713	Agree	2.807	Agree
5. Not conducive Learning environment	2.490	Disagree	2.679	Agree
6. Teaching style	2.923	Agree	2.729	Agree
7. No electricity	2.444	Disagree	2.868	Agree
8. Lack of motivation	2.389	Disagree	2.800	Agree
9. Very expensive	2.676	Agree	2.899	Agree
10. No immediate feedback between teacher and student	2.466	Disagree	2.836	Agree
TOTAL	2.6377	Agree	2.8287	Agree

Legend: 1-1.49 =Strongly Disagree; 1.5-2.49=Disagree; 2.5-3.49= Agree; 3.5-4=Strongly Agree

Table 2 shows the factors affecting face-to-face learning (FTFLA) and modular distance learning approach (MDLA) as perceived by the students of Mindanao State University –Sulu. The data have shown that students agreed that the highest factor can affect their learning is the teaching style applied by the teacher. That in face-to-face learning, it is important how teacher uses techniques and strategies in delivering topics. They also experienced limited

resources because of the poor internet access in the province. Those students have low family income and those from far flung area also agreed that education might be quite expensive.

However, students disagreed that traditional face-to-face can affect their learning for not being conducive environment along with the electric interruption. As a matter of fact, having feedbacks from teachers during

face-to-face makes them feel that they are recognized. Thus, they are motivated to learn.

All in all, it was found out that the respondents agreed on the factors mentioned. The data have provided evidence to conclude that there are factors that contribute to their learning and to their academic performance on modular distance learning approach.

Table 3. Significant difference of students' perceptions in face-to-face learning approach and modular distance learning approach

Perceptions on Face-to-Face Learning vs. Modular Learning	.91498	31.652	413	.001	Reject Ho

Table 3 shows the differences of the students' perceptions in face-to-face learning approach (FTFLA) versus modular distance learning approach (MDLA). The findings for paired sample t-test statistics obtained the t- Value 31.652 at degree of freedom of 413 under Sig. value (2-tailed) 0.000 (reported as $p < .001$) is less than the alpha level of 0.05. Thus, it indicates the null hypothesis is rejected. The data have shown that there is a significant difference of the students' perceptions in the two learning approaches. This means that the students do not have the same learning experience in both approaches. They felt that they have undergone a little margin in difficulty and sometimes struggled in their academe during modular distance learning approach than in face-to-face learning approach.

5. Discussion

This study is covered by the following objectives: 1) to determine the perceptions of the students in face-to-face learning approach and modular distance learning approach; 2) to ascertain the factors affecting face-to-face learning approach and modular distance learning approach as perceived by the students in Mindanao State University –Sulu, and 3) to find out the significant difference of students' perceptions in face-to-face learning approach and modular distance learning approach.

The findings of the study are: the students agreed that face-to-face learning approach have much contributed to their learning than modular distance learning approach; they were motivated to learn new things where group discussion took place unlike in modular; and Face-to-face learning approach can boost their self-confidence and develops Higher Thinking Skills (HOTS) that can actually help them in maximizing their academic performance.

With the availability and accessibility of the learning resources in face-to-face learning, students made it easy to comprehend the text, vocabulary and other knowledge on the specific learning areas and they became comfortable to analyze data in order to meet the learning objectives of the lesson. Those have done with the guidance of the teachers with their immediate feedback in the teaching-learning process. The findings also have shown as the respondents concerned, face-to-face learning is more conducive and affordable way of learning than modular learning approach since teachers and students are both physically together during the process. However, modular can also help students in increasing their vocabulary and knowledge by surfing in different sites using diverse devices as learning resources are available and can be accessed on it. But majority of the students disagreed on the abovementioned.

In addition, it is believed that face-to-face learning approach gives significant to the learning of the students while modular distance learning, majority of the respondents disagreed on the said approach.

This study also stated that students agreed that there are factors can affect their learning during face-to-face learning and modular distance learning. Moreover, the data indicates that there is significant difference of students' perceptions in face-to-face learning approach versus modular distance learning approach.

6. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the data provided result to conclude that students agreed in the face-to-face learning approach gives significant and have much contributed to their learning where they can feel motivated and comfortable learning because they have experienced the teaching-learning process collaboratively in which teachers and students are physically together in the four corners of the room. On the other hand, the majority of the students disagreed with the modular distance learning approach because they experienced being left behind as they learned by themselves through self-learning modules (SLMS) such as commonly printed and audio materials with delayed feedback.

7. References

Adesope, R., & Ahiakwo, M. (2016). Perception of educators towards using modular object oriented dynamic learning environment (module) for teaching. International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection, 4(3), 46–16. [Google Scholar]

Ana-Maria Bliuc, Robert A Ellis, Peter Goodyear, Leanne (2011). Group processes online: Teaching collaboration through collaborative processes. Educational Technology

Bruner (1971) Effective learning. Available onloine at http://www.cdlponline.org

Crunkilton, F. &. (1984).Curriculum Development in Vocational and Technical. httpps//www.google.com.

Diaz, D., and R. Cartnal. 1999. Students' learning styles in two classes: Onlinedistance learning and equivalent on-campus. College Teaching 47 (4): 30-135130

Fraser& Deane (1998). Learning Strategies. http://www.voced.educ.au/content/ngv:180 14

Gardner (1995). the NF Learning Style.
https://experts.umn.edu/en/publications/effectiv eness-of-treatment-with-a-brace-in-girls

Getinet, S. (2016). Assessment of the implementation of continuous

assessment: The case of Mettu University. European Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 4(4), 534.544. [Google Scholar]

Goldschmid, B., & Goldschmid, M. (1973). Modular instruction in higher

education: A review. Journal of Higher Education, 2, 15–32. doi:10.1007/BF00162534 [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]

Hazem M El-Bakry, N. M. (2009). 9th WSEAS International Conference on Applied Informatics and Communication. https://scholar.google.com/scholar.

Hernandez, R. (2012). Does continuous assessment in higher education

support student learning? Higher Education, 64, 489–502. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]

Keirsey, D., and M. Bates. 1984. Please understand me: Character &

temperament types. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.

Llego, M. A. (2020). DepEd Learning Delivery Modalities for School year 2020-2021. http:www.teacherph.com/deped-.

Malik, K. (2012). Effects of modular and traditional approaches on

students' general comprehension. Elixir Social Studies, 42, 6228–6231. [Google Scholar]

Manlove, D., & David, B. (1985). Flexible scheduling. New York: Longmans

Green and Company. [Google Scholar]

Mary Anne Weegar, D. P. (2012). A Comparison of two theories of learning behaviorism as applied to face-to-face and online learning. https://scholar.google.com/scholar.

Moore and Kearsley (1996) Three types of interactions. https://www.teaching perspectives.com

Nadeem, M. (2013). Learner- centered english language teaching. The

International Journal of Engineering and Science, 2(1), 114–120. [Google Scholar]

Pareek, U. a. (1981). A Handbook for Trainers in Educational Management. UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific Bangkok, Thailand.

Scott D Johnson, S. R. (2000). Comparative analysis of learner satisfaction and learning outcomes in online and face-to-face learning environment . Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 29-49.

Sejpal, D. K. (2013). Effective of Modular Approach in Teaching at University Level. (vol 2, issue:2, February 2013 (IJRE) ISSN: 2320-091X PP.170.

Skinner. 1974. Behaviourism. available at http://www.Distance-education.org

Tadesse, T., & Getachew, K. (2009). Faculties' perception and responses to

academic dishonesty of undergraduate students in education, business and economics. Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences, 4(2), 21–42. [Google Scholar]

Vygotsky, L. (1963). Direct teaching. available at http://www.ltu.mm.ac.uk/ltia/issues

Wenli Chen, C.-k. L. (2007). Incorporating online discussion in face-to-face classroom learning: A blended learning approach. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 23.