RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 5, Page 180-189 | Article No. 18
DOI: 10.4898/jener.v2i5.a18
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

The Influence of Generation Gap on Teachers' Preparedness in the Utilization of Modular Distance Learning In the New Normal in Goa District

Ricah Callao Peteza[1]

[1]School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: May 2026

Keywords:
Generation Gap
Teachers' Preparedness
Modular Distance Learning

ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of generation gap on teachers' preparedness in the utilization of modular distance learning in the new normal in Goa District, Division of Camarines Sur. It focused on the generational profile of Grades 1-6 teachers and the degree to which generational differences shaped preparedness in instruction, active and personalized learning, utilization of resources, and learning assessment. The study is significant because modular distance learning became a major instructional modality during the new normal, requiring teachers of different age cohorts to adjust their pedagogical practices, resources, and assessment routines. It was designed to generate evidence-based policy directions for strengthening teacher support, instructional adaptation, and learning continuity. The research problem was situated within the need to understand how teachers from different generational groups respond to instructional change. The study identified four teacher cohorts: Boomer, Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z. The largest proportion of respondents belonged to Generation X, followed by Generation Y, Generation Z, and Boomer. This distribution indicates that the teaching workforce in the study locale was led numerically by experienced mid-career teachers while also including both older and younger generational groups. The study utilized descriptive-evaluative-inferential-correlational methods with documentary analysis. The respondents were 179 Grades 1-6 teachers in Goa District during School Year 2021-2022. A self-made questionnaire served as the main data gathering instrument. The statistical tools included weighted mean, frequency count, percentage, rank, Kendall Coefficient of Concordance with chi-square test, and Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance at the 0.05 significance level. Findings revealed that the influence of generation gap on teachers' preparedness was generally evident across all modular distance learning domains. Active and personalized learning obtained the highest average weighted mean and was interpreted as Very Much Evident. Instruction, utilization of resources, and learning assessment were interpreted as Much Evident. These results suggest that teachers perceived generational differences as relevant to preparedness, but the influence was most pronounced in learner-centered, adaptive, and collaborative dimensions of modular distance learning. In the instruction domain, the study found an average weighted mean of 4.47, interpreted as Much Evident. The highest-rated indicator emphasized that learning modules challenged learners to understand complex ideas, analyze information, evaluate arguments, consider different perspectives, and draw conclusions. Other highly rated indicators referred to module distribution and retrieval mechanisms, teacher supervision, teacher enthusiasm, instructional explanations, interaction, content knowledge, and learner interest. These findings imply that instructional preparedness involved both logistical competence and pedagogical guidance. In active and personalized learning, the average weighted mean reached 4.59, interpreted as Very Much Evident. The most prominent indicators included contextualized examples and learning activities, collaborative learning opportunities, learner engagement in analysis and synthesis, self-expression, customized assignments, reflective learning tasks, and problem-solving opportunities. This domain was also the only area where significant agreement among generational groups was found in the rank orders. The result indicates that generational differences were particularly meaningful in how teachers perceived learner-centered and personalized features of modular learning. In utilization of resources, the average weighted mean was 4.10, interpreted as Much Evident. Respondents emphasized the appropriateness of teacher inputs, learner-centered assignments, varied explanations of difficult concepts, relevant materials, multiple presentation formats, appropriate learning resources, ethical respect

between teacher and learners, and feedback-based supplementation. The findings indicate that teachers across generational groups recognized resource utilization as a core requirement of modular instruction. However, the lower mean compared with active and personalized learning suggests room for stronger resource support, especially in modular environments where learners rely heavily on printed and supplementary materials. In learning assessment, the average weighted mean was 4.12, interpreted as Much Evident. The highest-rated indicators involved varied assessment strategies, rubrics, reinforcement assignments, multidomain learning outcomes, responsiveness to diverse learners, clear grading criteria, reasonable timeframes, meaningful feedback, and assessment-related teacher inputs. The findings show that preparedness in assessment required both technical clarity and learner-sensitive evaluation practices. Assessment in modular distance learning was not limited to checking outputs but also involved communicating expectations and supporting learners through feedback. Inferential results showed a complex pattern. Kendall W results indicated significant agreement among generational groups only in active and personalized learning, while instruction, utilization of resources, and learning assessment did not show significant agreement. Kruskal-Wallis results showed a significant difference among generational groups only in instruction, while the other domains did not significantly vary across cohorts. These results suggest that generational effects were not uniform across all areas of modular distance learning preparedness. The study concluded that most respondents belonged to Generation X, that the influence of generation gap on preparedness was Much Evident overall, and that differences and agreements appeared selectively across domains. The policy recommendations emphasized monitoring and evaluation, ICT resource provision, mentorship, collaboration, educational technology training, understanding generational differences, module development, learner feedback, and stakeholder support. The manuscript therefore argues that generational diversity should be treated as a strategic resource rather than a barrier in modular distance learning implementation.

1. Introduction

The new normal in education forced school systems to reconsider how teaching and learning could continue when face-to-face contact was restricted. Modular distance learning became one of the most widely used delivery modes because it allowed learners to receive printed or self-learning materials while remaining outside regular classroom structures. This modality required teachers to prepare modules, organize distribution and retrieval mechanisms, provide instructions remotely, and design assessment tasks that could be completed with limited direct supervision. In this context, teacher preparedness became a decisive factor in sustaining learning continuity.

Preparedness in modular distance learning is not a single technical ability. It includes instructional planning, resource selection, learner guidance, assessment design, feedback provision, and coordination with parents or guardians. Teachers had to make lessons understandable without relying solely on oral explanation or live classroom interaction. The quality of modular instruction therefore depended on how well teachers anticipated learner needs and translated curriculum expectations into independent learning tasks.

The rapid shift to modular distance learning also highlighted differences among teachers. Educators entered the new normal with varied teaching histories, beliefs, technological exposure, communication habits, and adaptability to change. Some teachers were more familiar with established classroom routines, while others were more exposed to digital tools and flexible forms of communication. These differences raised a relevant question about whether generational location influenced how teachers prepared for modular learning.

Generation gap refers to the differences in values, habits, experiences, and preferences associated with different age cohorts. In educational workplaces, these differences may appear in attitudes toward technology, communication styles, decision-making, collaboration, work routines, and openness to pedagogical innovation. Generational differences should not be treated as fixed limitations because individuals within each cohort remain diverse. However, generational groupings can still provide a useful lens for understanding workplace preparedness and instructional adaptation.

The study classified teachers into Boomer, Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z cohorts. These categories provided a framework for analyzing whether age-related experience and generational characteristics shaped preparedness in modular distance learning. The distribution of respondents showed that Generation X formed the largest group, followed by Generation Y, Generation Z, and Boomers. This profile suggests that the Goa District teaching workforce included both experienced teachers and younger cohorts who were responding to the demands of new-normal instruction.

In modular distance learning, instruction requires the careful design of modules that can stand on their own as learning guides. Teachers must ensure that module directions, examples, activities, and explanations are clear enough for learners who may not have immediate access to teacher clarification. The the study findings indicated that instruction was Much Evident as a domain of generational influence on preparedness. This means that teachers perceived instruction as an area where generational experiences affected the way modular learning was planned and facilitated.

Active and personalized learning is particularly important in modular distance learning because learners complete many activities independently or with family support. Without direct classroom interaction, modules need to provide opportunities for learners to

analyze, express ideas, collaborate when possible, and connect tasks to their background and interests. The study found that active and personalized learning was Very Much Evident and had the highest average rating among the preparedness domains. This makes the domain a central point in understanding how generational differences intersect with learner-centered practice.

The utilization of resources is another critical dimension of modular distance learning. Teachers must choose materials that fit the lesson purpose, appeal to different learning styles, clarify difficult concepts, and remain accessible to learners. The findings showed that this domain was Much Evident. Although this indicates positive preparedness, it also suggests that resource use may require continuing support because modular learning depends greatly on the quality and appropriateness of instructional materials.

Learning assessment in modular distance learning involves more than assigning grades. Teachers must communicate expectations clearly, provide meaningful feedback, design tasks that address various learning domains, and use rubrics where necessary. The study found that learning assessment was Much Evident as an area influenced by generation gap. This indicates that teachers recognized the importance of assessment systems that are clear, fair, and adaptable to diverse learner needs.

The use of inferential statistics in the study helped move the analysis beyond descriptive ratings. Kendall Coefficient of Concordance examined agreement in rank orders among generational groups. Kruskal-Wallis analysis examined whether the influence of generation gap significantly varied across teacher cohorts. These tests provided a more rigorous basis for identifying which domains were more sensitive to generational variation.

The Kendall W findings showed significant agreement only in active and personalized learning. This means that generational groups shared a meaningful pattern of ranking in this domain, while their rank orders in instruction, resource utilization, and assessment were not significantly concordant. The result reinforces the centrality of active and personalized learning in modular distance learning preparedness. It also implies that learner-centered approaches may serve as a common reference point across generations.

The Kruskal-Wallis findings showed a significant difference among generational groups only in instruction. This result suggests that teachers from different generational cohorts may have differed most in the instructional dimension of modular learning preparedness. Instruction is highly connected to teaching style, prior training, classroom experience, and adaptation to remote delivery. Therefore, it is reasonable that this domain emerged as the area where generational variation was statistically evident.

The policy implications of these findings are important for school leadership. Instead of assuming that all teachers require the same type of support, schools may use generational data to design differentiated professional development. Experienced teachers may benefit from training that strengthens technology-mediated modular delivery, while younger teachers may benefit from mentorship in classroom management, module design, and curriculum contextualization. Cross-generational collaboration can transform generational diversity into a source of institutional learning.

The findings also point to the importance of monitoring and evaluation. Teachers' preparedness cannot be measured by self-assessment alone because modular distance learning involves learner experience, parent support, module quality, assessment clarity, and instructional consistency. The policy recommendations emphasized intensive monitoring from supervisors, school heads, peers, and learners. Such monitoring can help identify whether preparedness translates into effective learner support.

The study further highlights the role of instructional resources and ICT. Although modular distance learning is often associated with printed materials, educational technology can support teacher collaboration, module preparation, communication, feedback, and resource enrichment. The recommendations called for ICT resources in classrooms, computer laboratories, and libraries. This indicates that even in modular learning contexts, digital readiness remains relevant to teacher preparedness.

Generational differences should therefore be approached with care. They should not be used to stereotype teachers or assume that older teachers are resistant and younger teachers are automatically prepared. Rather, generational analysis should help schools understand patterns of need, strength, and support. A responsive school system builds bridges among generations through mentoring, collaborative planning, shared tools, and respectful professional dialogue.

The present article reports the empirical study on generation gap and teacher preparedness in modular distance learning in Goa District. It presents the study in IMRAD format to foreground the research problem, methodology, results, conclusions, and policy implications. The discussion is anchored on the study's reported statistics, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Its purpose is to position the research for academic review and educational policy discussion while maintaining a direct researcher-centered scholarly voice.

2. Methodology

The study employed descriptive-evaluative-inferential-correlational methods with documentary analysis. This methodological combination was appropriate because the study aimed to describe the generational profile of teachers, evaluate the perceived influence of generation gap on preparedness, and test whether rank-order agreement and group differences existed among generational cohorts. The descriptive component established the distribution of teachers across generations and summarized ratings across preparedness domains. The inferential component strengthened the analysis by examining agreement and variation beyond simple weighted means.

The study was conducted in Goa District, Division of Camarines Sur, during School Year 2021-2022. The respondents consisted of 179 Grades 1-6 teachers. They were grouped into Boomer, Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z cohorts. These generational categories served as the basis for comparing preparedness-related perceptions in modular distance learning.

The respondent profile showed that Generation X represented the largest proportion of teachers, with 81 respondents or 45.25 percent. Generation Y followed with 57 respondents or 31.84 percent. Generation Z accounted for 24 respondents or 13.41 percent, while Boomer teachers accounted for 17 respondents or 9.50 percent. This distribution provided a multigenerational respondent base for examining preparedness in the new normal.

The main data gathering instrument was a self-made questionnaire. The instrument measured the influence of generation gap on teachers' preparedness in the utilization of modular distance learning along four domains: instruction, active and personalized learning, utilization of resources, and learning assessment. The questionnaire also enabled the generation of ranked indicators for each domain. The study used weighted means to describe the level of influence and rank orders to compare the patterns of responses across generational groups.

The first domain, instruction, captured teacher practices connected to module use, module distribution and retrieval, learner supervision, instructional explanation, content knowledge, interaction, and learner interest. The second domain, active and personalized learning, captured contextualized learning activities, collaboration, information processing, self-expression, customized assignments, reflective tasks, and problem-solving opportunities. The third domain, utilization of resources, examined the appropriateness, relevance, variety, and ethical use of modular learning resources. The fourth domain, learning assessment, measured varied assessment strategies, rubrics, reinforcement assignments, learning outcomes, grading criteria, timeframes, feedback, and assessment guidance.

Descriptive statistics were used to present the profile and domain ratings. Frequency count and percentage were used to describe the generational composition of the respondents. Weighted mean and rank were used to determine the level of influence of generation gap on preparedness in each domain and indicator. The interpretations included Much Evident and Very Much Evident, depending on the reported average weighted means.

Kendall Coefficient of Concordance W with the corresponding chi-square test was used to determine significant agreement on the rank orders among the generational groups of teachers. This non-parametric statistic was appropriate because the study dealt with rank orders rather than interval-level assumptions. The test identified whether the different generational groups ranked preparedness indicators in a sufficiently similar manner. The significance level was set at 0.05, while one result was interpreted as significant at $p < 0.025$ based on the reported test output.

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test significant differences among the generational groups. This non-parametric test was appropriate for comparing multiple independent groups when normality assumptions could not be presumed from ordinal and ranked response data. The test examined whether the influence of generation gap on preparedness varied significantly across Boomer, Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z respondents. The reported H values were interpreted using the 0.05 significance criterion and indicated whether the alternative hypothesis was retained or rejected.

Data analysis was confined to the variables, statistics, and results generated by the study. The article does not introduce additional variables, unreported item-level values, or unsupported statistical outcomes. Instead, it organizes the documented results into journal-style tables and analytical discussion. This preserves the integrity of the evidence while presenting the study in a publication-ready IMRAD format.

3. Results and Discussion

This section presents the results of the study in relation to the research objectives. The tables are organized to show the respondent profile, preparedness domains, rank-order agreement, significant differences, and policy directions. The discussion interprets the quantitative findings in relation to teacher preparedness, generational diversity, school leadership, and policy development. Each table is followed by analytical commentary to clarify the educational meaning of the results.

Table 1. Profile of Teacher-Respondents by Generational Group

Generational Group	Year Range	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Generation X	1965-1981	81	45.25%	1
Generation Y	1982-1995	57	31.84%	2
Generation Z	1996-2009	24	13.41%	3
Boomer	1946-1964	17	9.50%	4
Total		179	100.00%	

The respondent profile shows that the largest group of teachers belonged to Generation X, representing 45.25 percent of the respondents. This means that nearly half of the teaching workforce in the study was composed of educators likely to have substantial classroom experience prior to the new normal. Their prominence in the sample is important because Generation X teachers may occupy a middle position between older established instructional routines and newer technology-influenced teaching expectations. In modular distance learning, this group may have played a stabilizing role in adapting existing pedagogical practices to changed delivery conditions.

Generation Y constituted 31.84 percent of the respondents, forming the second largest generational group. This indicates a strong presence of teachers who may have entered the profession during a period of expanding digital tools and shifting educational reforms. Their participation in modular distance learning may reflect both professional adaptability and familiarity with collaborative and technology-supported practices. The presence of this group likely contributed to the positive ratings in active and personalized learning.

Generation Z teachers accounted for 13.41 percent of the respondents. Although smaller in number, this group represents the youngest cohort in the teaching force and may bring stronger familiarity with digital communication and contemporary learning tools. However, their relatively limited professional experience may also require support in instructional planning, classroom management, and assessment design. This profile suggests the value of pairing younger teachers with experienced mentors while also allowing them to contribute digital competencies.

Boomer teachers represented 9.50 percent of the respondents. Their smaller share does not diminish their institutional importance because they may possess long-term professional knowledge, curriculum familiarity, and strong practical judgment. In a multigenerational school environment, senior teachers can serve as mentors in curriculum interpretation and learner guidance. At the same time, they may benefit from targeted support in technology-assisted communication and modular learning systems.

Table 2. Influence of Generation Gap on Preparedness along Instruction

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Learning module stresses critical thinking and complex idea analysis	4.51	Very Much Evident	1
Teacher has set-up mechanisms in distribution and retrieval of modules	4.48	Much Evident	2.5
Teacher supervises learner focus in reading and answering activities	4.48	Much Evident	2.5
Teacher expresses enthusiasm in guiding learners	4.48	Much Evident	2.5
Teacher explanations and instructions are appropriate to the lesson	4.46	Much Evident	5
Teacher promotes interaction through discussions and collaborative tasks	4.45	Much Evident	6
Teacher manifests adequate knowledge on lesson content	4.43	Much Evident	7.5
Module awakens learner interest to read attentively	4.43	Much Evident	7.5
Average Weighted Mean	4.47	Much Evident	

The instruction domain obtained an average weighted mean of 4.47, interpreted as Much Evident. The highest-rated indicator was the module's emphasis on critical thinking, including complex idea analysis, comparison, evaluation of arguments, consideration of perspectives, and conclusion-making. This suggests that teachers perceived modular instruction not merely as content delivery but as a vehicle for higher-order thinking. In the new normal, this is especially important because learners must engage with modules independently and need tasks that promote active cognitive processing.

The next highest indicators focused on distribution and retrieval mechanisms, learner supervision, and teacher enthusiasm in guiding learners. These indicators reveal that instructional preparedness in modular distance learning includes both administrative and pedagogical dimensions. Teachers had to organize logistics while also sustaining learner motivation and guidance despite reduced physical interaction. The similarity of these ratings implies that teachers saw module management and learner support as closely connected responsibilities.

The indicators on appropriate explanation, interaction, content knowledge, and learner interest were also rated Much Evident. This pattern suggests that generational influence did not prevent teachers from recognizing the importance of content mastery and learner engagement. However, the domain's average remained below active and personalized learning, indicating that instruction may be more affected by generational differences in teaching style and adaptation. This interpretation is reinforced by the Kruskal-Wallis result showing significant differences among generational groups in instruction.

Overall, instruction appears as the most generationally sensitive domain. Teachers from different cohorts may vary in how they design explanations, supervise independent learning, and manage learner interaction in modular formats. The policy implication is that instructional support should not be generic. Schools should provide differentiated coaching that addresses both traditional instructional clarity and new-normal delivery requirements.

Table 3. Influence of Generation Gap on Preparedness along Active and Personalized Learning

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Examples and activities are contextualized based on learner cultural background	4.66	Very Much Evident	1
Learners are engaged in collaborative learning activities	4.63	Very Much Evident	2
Learners gather, synthesize, and analyze information	4.60	Very Much Evident	3
Learners use self-expression while reading the module	4.58	Very Much Evident	4.5
Learners actively sign, write, or use other forms of expression	4.58	Very Much Evident	4.5
Learners customize learning through assignments tailored to interests and needs	4.56	Very Much Evident	6.5
Learners design, develop, perform, and reflect after module reading	4.56	Very Much Evident	6.5
Learners gather information, synthesize, analyze, and solve problems	4.52	Very Much Evident	8
Average Weighted Mean	4.59	Very Much Evident	

Active and personalized learning obtained the highest average weighted mean of 4.59 and was interpreted as Very Much Evident. This means that respondents strongly perceived generational influence in the ways teachers supported learner-centered modular activities. The leading indicator emphasized contextualization based on learners' cultural background. This finding is important because contextualization helps make modules meaningful, especially when learners work independently or with limited teacher contact.

The high rating for collaborative learning activities indicates that teachers valued peer engagement even in modular distance learning. Although modular learning is often associated with individual work, the findings show that respondents still recognized collaboration as a vital strategy. Opportunities for learners to gather, synthesize, and analyze information also point to a constructivist orientation. Teachers appeared prepared to encourage learners to process information rather than merely complete worksheets.

Indicators related to self-expression, customized assignments, reflection, and problem-solving all received Very Much Evident ratings. These practices suggest that modular distance learning preparedness extended beyond compliance with module distribution. Teachers recognized the need to adapt tasks to learner interests, backgrounds, and capacities. This is where generational diversity can become productive because different teacher cohorts may contribute varied strategies for personalization, discipline, communication, and creativity.

This domain was the only one that showed significant agreement in rank orders among generational groups. The finding implies that despite generational differences, teachers shared a common valuation of active and personalized learning. This common ground can be used as an entry point for professional development. Programs that focus on learner-centered modular design may unite teachers across generations and reduce workplace gaps.

Table 4. Influence of Generation Gap on Preparedness along Utilization of Resources

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Teacher inputs are appropriate to the lesson being presented	4.13	Much Evident	1
Assignments are learner-centered and relevant to the lesson	4.12	Much Evident	2.5
Module presents difficult concepts in varied ways	4.12	Much Evident	2.5
Materials used are relevant to the purpose of the lesson	4.12	Much Evident	2.5
Module uses varied presentation formats for different learning styles	4.11	Much Evident	5
Teacher uses appropriate resources in delivering the lesson	4.10	Much Evident	6.5
Teacher and learners show respect based on ethical standards	4.10	Much Evident	6.5
Teacher seeks feedback and provides additional resources when necessary	4.04	Much Evident	8
Average Weighted Mean	4.10	Much Evident	

Utilization of resources obtained an average weighted mean of 4.10, interpreted as Much Evident. The results suggest that respondents recognized the influence of generation gap on how teachers selected, adapted, and supplemented resources in modular distance learning. The highest-rated indicator concerned the appropriateness of teacher inputs to the lesson. This indicates that teacher-provided explanations and supplemental guidance remained essential even when learners relied primarily on modules.

The cluster of indicators rated 4.12 shows that assignments, conceptual explanations, and lesson materials were perceived as relevant and learner-centered. This finding indicates that teachers did not view resources as merely physical or printed materials. Rather, resources included the structure of tasks, the diversity of presentation formats, and the alignment between lesson purpose and material use. In modular learning, these qualities influence whether learners can understand content without continuous teacher presence.

The use of varied presentation formats was also rated Much Evident. This points to preparedness in addressing different learning styles and abilities, which is important in a home-based learning environment. The ethical respect between teachers and learners was included in the resource domain and also rated positively. This suggests that resource utilization in modular learning includes relational and ethical dimensions, not only material provision.

The lowest-rated item within this domain was the teacher's seeking of feedback and provision of additional resources when necessary. Although still interpreted as Much Evident, this lower mean suggests a practical area for improvement. Modular distance learning requires feedback loops because teachers cannot easily observe confusion in real time. Strengthening feedback systems can improve resource responsiveness across all generational groups.

Table 5. Influence of Generation Gap on Preparedness along Learning Assessment

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Teacher uses varied assessment strategies and rubrics if necessary	4.13	Much Evident	1.5
Teacher provides assignments as reinforcement to measure understanding	4.13	Much Evident	1.5
Learning outcomes appeal to cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains	4.13	Much Evident	1.5
Learning activities meet diverse learners, styles, and processing needs	4.13	Much Evident	1.5
Course and assignment grading criteria are communicated clearly	4.13	Much Evident	1.5
Assignments are adequately challenging and required within reasonable time	4.12	Much Evident	6
Rubrics are clear and provide meaningful feedback	4.11	Much Evident	7
Teacher provides inputs on how learning shall be assessed	4.10	Much Evident	8
Average Weighted Mean	4.12	Much Evident	

Learning assessment obtained an average weighted mean of 4.12, interpreted as Much Evident. The top indicators clustered at 4.13, suggesting that respondents similarly valued varied assessment strategies, reinforcement assignments, multidomain outcomes, diverse learner needs, and clear grading criteria. This pattern indicates that assessment preparedness in modular distance learning was perceived as multidimensional. Teachers had to design assessments that were clear, fair, and meaningful despite the limitations of remote modular delivery.

The emphasis on rubrics and varied assessment strategies is particularly important in modular distance learning. Without face-to-face clarification, learners need transparent criteria to understand what is expected from their outputs. Rubrics also help parents and guardians support learners without replacing the teacher's evaluative role. The finding suggests that teachers were prepared to use assessment tools that promote clarity and accountability.

The inclusion of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning outcomes shows that respondents recognized holistic assessment. Modular distance learning can easily become output-driven if assessment is reduced to checking written responses. The findings imply that teachers still valued multiple learning domains and the need to accommodate diverse ways of processing information. This is especially relevant for elementary learners whose development cannot be measured by written tasks alone.

The lower-rated indicators on meaningful feedback and teacher inputs on assessment remain important areas for improvement. Although they were still rated Much Evident, the small decline suggests that feedback practices may be less consistently implemented than task assignment and criteria communication. Schools should therefore strengthen assessment literacy, especially feedback design, rubrics, and learner-friendly instructions. Cross-generational collaboration can help teachers exchange practical methods for improving modular assessment.

Table 6. Significant Agreement on Rank Orders among Generational Groups

Domain	Kendall W	Chi-square	Probability	Interpretation	Decision
Instruction	0.151	4.228	$p > 0.05$	Not significant	Alternative hypothesis rejected
Active and Personalized Learning	0.631	17.668	$p < 0.025$	Significant	Alternative hypothesis accepted
Utilization of Resources	0.148	4.144	$p > 0.05$	Not significant	Alternative hypothesis rejected
Learning Assessment	0.022	0.616	$p > 0.05$	Not significant	Alternative hypothesis rejected

The Kendall Coefficient of Concordance results show that significant agreement among generational groups was found only in active and personalized learning. The coefficient for this domain was 0.631 with chi-square of 17.668 and probability below 0.025. This means that the generational groups had a meaningful level of shared ranking in this area. The finding suggests that teachers across age cohorts recognized similar priorities in learner-centered modular learning.

Instruction did not show significant agreement in rank orders, with Kendall W of 0.151 and chi-square of 4.228. This indicates that generational groups did not rank instructional preparedness indicators in a strongly similar pattern. The absence of agreement may reflect differences in pedagogical habits, experience with independent learning materials, and comfort with new-normal instructional procedures. It may also indicate that teachers from different generations emphasized different aspects of instruction.

Utilization of resources and learning assessment also showed no significant agreement. Their Kendall W values were 0.148 and 0.022, respectively, indicating weak concordance in rank orders. These results suggest that teachers across generations may have varied priorities regarding materials, feedback, assessment criteria, and resource supplementation. The particularly low W for learning assessment suggests substantial diversity in how assessment-related indicators were ranked.

The agreement pattern is policy-relevant because it identifies where shared professional understanding already exists and where alignment must be strengthened. Active and personalized learning can serve as a common platform for professional development because teachers across generations appear to agree on its importance. In contrast, instruction, resource use, and assessment may require more structured standard-setting, peer observation, and collaborative planning. School leaders should use these results to design targeted interventions rather than broad one-size-fits-all programs.

Table 7. Significant Difference among Generational Groups

Domain	Computed H	Probability	Interpretation	Decision
Instruction	23.365	$p < 0.005$	Significant	Alternative hypothesis accepted
Active and Personalized Learning	1.095	$p > 0.05$	Not significant	Alternative hypothesis rejected
Utilization of Resources	1.523	$p > 0.05$	Not significant	Alternative hypothesis rejected
Learning Assessment	1.099	$p > 0.05$	Not significant	Alternative hypothesis rejected

The Kruskal-Wallis results indicate that significant generational differences existed only in the instruction domain. The computed H value for instruction was 23.365 with probability below 0.005. This means that the influence of generation gap on instructional preparedness varied significantly among teacher cohorts. Instruction therefore emerged as the domain where generational differences were most statistically visible.

The significant instructional difference may be attributed to the varied professional experiences of teachers across generations. Older teachers may have stronger experience with conventional classroom instruction and curriculum delivery, while younger teachers may have greater exposure to digital communication or flexible instructional tools. In modular distance learning, both types of competence are important but may be expressed differently. This reinforces the need for cross-generational mentoring instead of isolated training.

Active and personalized learning, utilization of resources, and learning assessment did not show significant differences among generational groups. This suggests that although teachers may differ individually, their group-level preparedness in these domains was not statistically distinct by generation. The result is encouraging because it indicates that teachers across age cohorts can participate in common professional development for these areas. It also suggests that the challenges of modular learning may have created shared professional demands across generations.

Taken together, the inferential findings reveal a nuanced picture. Generational groups agreed significantly on active and personalized learning, but differed significantly only in instruction. This means that generational gap should not be generalized as

a uniform influence across all areas of preparedness. Policy responses should focus particularly on instructional adaptation while using active and personalized learning as a shared professional anchor.

Table 8. Consolidated Policy Directions

Policy Area	Consolidated Recommendation
Monitoring and evaluation	Implement intensive monitoring of teacher performance related to modular distance learning through supervisors, school heads, peers, and learners.
ICT and learning resources	Equip classrooms, laboratories, and libraries with ICT resources and maintain instructional facilities such as models, projectors, flip charts, and public address systems.
Mentorship and collaboration	Develop mentorship programs that pair teachers with expertise in specific skills with teachers who need support in those areas.
Assessment and feedback	Evaluate learners in relation to modular learning and conduct feedbacking with learners, parents, and stakeholders every quarter.
Generational awareness	Conduct seminar-workshops on Boomer, Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z values, communication preferences, technology needs, and workplace expectations.
Technology training	Provide educational technology training that addresses basic technical skills and pedagogical integration of ICT-based learning.
Module development	Encourage teachers to prepare modules that stimulate learner interest and provide clear assessment inputs and rubrics.
Stakeholder support	Seek local government assistance for learning materials and for maintaining safety protocols during module distribution and retrieval.

The policy recommendations emphasize that generation gap should be addressed through institutional systems rather than left to individual adjustment. Monitoring and evaluation were identified as a primary policy direction because teacher preparedness must be observed through multiple perspectives. District supervisors, school heads, peers, and learners can provide evidence that self-assessment alone cannot capture. A monitoring system also makes it possible to determine whether modular distance learning practices are consistent, learner-responsive, and improving over time.

ICT and learning resource support was another major recommendation. Even though the study focused on modular distance learning, the recommendations acknowledged that ICT facilities remain vital to teacher preparedness. Computers, projectors, libraries, laboratories, and other instructional facilities can help teachers design richer modules and provide additional learning support. Resource provision also reduces generational disadvantage by giving all teachers access to tools needed for new-normal instruction.

Mentorship and collaboration were repeatedly emphasized in the recommendations. These strategies are especially appropriate in a multigenerational workforce because they allow teachers to exchange strengths rather than compete across age cohorts. Experienced teachers can provide curriculum, assessment, and classroom management expertise, while younger teachers may share digital and collaborative tools. Through structured mentoring, generation gap can be transformed into professional complementarity.

The recommendations also call for deeper generational awareness. Teachers and school leaders should understand the values, needs, communication preferences, and technology orientations of different generations. This does not mean stereotyping teachers by age group. Rather, it means creating workplace policies that respect diversity while building common professional expectations. In the context of modular distance learning, this awareness can improve collaboration, training design, and instructional support.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

The study concludes that Generation X constituted the largest proportion of teacher-respondents in Goa District. This means that the modular distance learning workforce was numerically led by teachers who likely possessed substantial professional experience before the new normal. Generation Y, Generation Z, and Boomer teachers also formed meaningful segments of the workforce. The multigenerational composition of the respondents made the study relevant for understanding workplace diversity in educational adaptation.

The influence of generation gap on teachers' preparedness in modular distance learning was generally Much Evident. This conclusion indicates that respondents perceived generational location as relevant to how teachers prepared, delivered, supported, and assessed modular learning. The influence was not interpreted as weak or marginal. Instead, it was visible enough to merit policy attention and professional development planning.

Active and personalized learning emerged as the strongest domain, with a Very Much Evident interpretation. This indicates that teachers across generational groups strongly recognized the need for contextualized, collaborative, expressive, and learner-centered modular activities. It also suggests that modular distance learning can support active learning when teachers intentionally design tasks beyond simple reading and answering. The domain therefore represents a promising area of strength in the study locale.

Instruction, utilization of resources, and learning assessment were all interpreted as Much Evident. These results show that teachers perceived generational influence in the practical work of guiding learners, using materials, and evaluating learning. However, the slightly lower ratings compared with active and personalized learning indicate that these areas may require

continuing support. Among these, instruction deserves special attention because inferential testing showed significant generational difference in this domain.

The Kendall W test established significant agreement on rank orders only in active and personalized learning. This means that the generational groups shared similar ranking patterns in learner-centered modular practices but not in instruction, resource utilization, or assessment. This conclusion reveals that the influence of generation gap is selective and domain-specific. It also identifies active and personalized learning as a common ground among teachers across generations.

The Kruskal-Wallis test established significant difference among generational groups only in instruction. This means that instructional preparedness differed across cohorts while active and personalized learning, utilization of resources, and learning assessment did not significantly vary by generation. The conclusion suggests that instructional adaptation is the key area where generational support should be concentrated. Schools should not assume that all preparedness domains are equally affected by age cohort differences.

The study concludes that policy recommendations were necessary to support teachers' career advancement and new-normal teaching responsibilities. These recommendations covered monitoring, ICT resources, mentorship, educational technology training, generational awareness, module preparation, learner feedback, assessment rubrics, and local government support. The range of recommendations reflects the complexity of modular distance learning. It also shows that teacher preparedness is shaped by institutional systems, not only individual effort.

Overall, the study demonstrates that generation gap can influence teachers' preparedness but should not be viewed as an obstacle alone. Generational diversity can be leveraged for professional learning when schools provide structured collaboration, mentoring, and inclusive training. The findings support a balanced approach that recognizes cohort differences while building shared instructional standards. This conclusion is especially relevant for school systems recovering from or adapting beyond the new normal.

4.2 Implications

For school leadership, the findings imply that teacher support programs should be differentiated by instructional need. Since instruction showed significant differences among generational groups, school heads should conduct needs assessments before designing training. Teachers may require different levels of support in module explanation, learner supervision, interaction design, and distribution-retrieval systems. A differentiated strategy is more likely to improve preparedness than uniform training alone.

For professional development, the study implies the importance of cross-generational mentorship. Schools should not separate generations into isolated training groups but should create structured opportunities for them to learn from one another. Experienced teachers can mentor younger teachers in curriculum interpretation and learner management, while younger teachers can support colleagues in digital tools and flexible communication. Such collaboration can reduce generational misunderstanding and improve modular learning practice.

For curriculum implementation, the findings imply that active and personalized learning should be strengthened as a common professional platform. Since significant agreement was found in this domain, it can serve as a shared entry point for training and innovation. Teachers across generations may be more receptive to professional learning that begins with learner-centered modular design. From there, schools can extend support to instruction, resource utilization, and assessment.

For assessment practice, the findings imply that rubrics, feedback, and clear grading criteria must be emphasized in modular distance learning. Learners completing modules outside the classroom need transparent expectations and meaningful guidance. Teachers should be trained to design assessment tasks that cover cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. Assessment should also include mechanisms for feedback from learners, parents, and stakeholders.

For resource management, the study implies that modular learning requires more than printed modules. Teachers need appropriate materials, varied presentation formats, supplementary explanations, and access to ICT facilities. School heads should therefore treat learning resources as part of teacher preparedness. Adequate resource provision can help reduce disparities among teachers from different generational groups.

For policy makers, the results imply that generational data can inform educational planning. Categorizing teachers by generation, as recommended by the study, can help identify patterns of support needed in instructional adaptation, technology training, and communication. However, such categorization should be used constructively and ethically. The purpose should be to provide responsive support, not to label or limit teachers by age cohort.

For parents and community stakeholders, the findings imply that modular distance learning requires shared responsibility. The recommendations on feedbacking, local government support, and assistance during module distribution and retrieval show that preparedness extends beyond the teacher alone. Parents and community partners can help sustain learner engagement and safe module processes. Their participation can strengthen both implementation and accountability.

For future research, the study implies the need to examine generation gap in wider locales and in relation to other variables. Future studies may include school heads' perspectives, learner outcomes, teacher work performance, technology readiness, and demographic predictors. Qualitative inquiry may also deepen understanding of how teachers from different generations experience modular learning. Such research can refine policies for multigenerational teaching workforces in post-pandemic education contexts.

References

[1] Department of Education Philippines. (2020). Learning continuity plan.
[2] World Bank. (2021). Remote learning report.
[3] UNESCO. (2020). Education in COVID-19.

[4] Knowles, M. (2020). Adult learning theory.
[5] Prensky, M. (2019). Digital natives vs immigrants.
[6] Rogers, E. M. (2020). Diffusion of innovations.
[7] Hodges, C. et al. (2020). Emergency remote teaching.
[8] Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Teacher adaptation.
[9] OECD. (2021). Education responses to pandemic.
[10] Schleicher, A. (2020). Global education disruption.