Perception and Satisfaction on Flexible Learning Approach to Student's Academic Achievement

Romar B. Dinoy, Flora Mae A. Bantilan

College of Teacher Education, Bohol Island State University, Poblacion Norte, Clarin, Bohol

Abstract— *Flexible learning has been used as an alternative approach in delivering instruction during the peak of the pandemic. In this regard, this study aims to determine the perception of flexible learning in three constructs: content delivery and activities of the module, process of teaching and teaching strategies; level of student satisfaction with flexible learning, and academic achievement. Also, it evaluates the correlation between the student's perception and satisfaction and their academic achievement. The researchers utilized a Likert scale survey questionnaire to assess the said variables. Data were statistically treated using mean, standard deviation, percentage, and Pearson Product-Moment of Correlation. The results show that the students have a positive perception of flexible learning and are absolutely satisfied with the course. It is also revealed that student satisfaction is statistically related to academic achievement. Thus, it is recommended to encourage educators to evaluate the satisfaction of the students with their learning regularly.*

Keywords—*flexible learning, academic achievement, perception, satisfaction, online learning.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The devastating pandemic around the world that none of us was prepared for has caused a sudden change in our lives. Everything has changed since it happened, and education is no excuse here. For students not to stop learning even in today's stressful situation, educators looked for an alternative method of delivering instruction, from face-to-face classes to an online and modular way of teaching or a combination of both, called a flexible learning. However, it is not readily adaptable to students and teachers as well. The transition takes enough time for the affected ones to adapt to the ongoing inevitable situation.

Providing a learning environment to ensure students that they are unaffected and must learn even with the changes is a top priority for educators. The pandemic is almost over, yet we are still implementing the flexible learning. Flexible learning is an approach that involves the utilizes digital and non-digital technology. It covers in-person learning and out-of-classroom learning modes of delivery

(Commission on Higher Education, 2022). Consequently, it is necessary to acknowledge the possible effect of this implementation on the students.

As an educator, the student's wellbeing is the topmost responsibility. It is understood that somehow students were affected in any way, whether positive or negative. How the students perceived the situation and their learning satisfaction are the must-see aspects. Satisfied students are more likely to continue in their studies and are more likely to succeed academically [16]. This helps to assess on what to be retained and identify areas for improvement to have a better learning experience.

This study seeks to determine whether students' perception of flexible learning and satisfaction level affect their academic performance. The data gathered from the study may provide information about actions that can be taken to maintain high levels of satisfaction and improve student learning.

This study is based on CHED Memorandum Order No. 4 Series of 2020 in accordance with the pertinent provisions of RA No. 7722, otherwise known as the "Higher Education Act of 1994'', RA No. 11469, otherwise known as the Bayanihan to Heal as One Act, and by the virtue of Commission en Banc (CEB) Resolution No. 412-2020, series of 2020. The Commission on Higher Education stated the guidelines on Flexible Learning to be implemented by public and private Higher Education Institutions. As noted, the delivery of the instruction involves digital and non-digital technology. It covers both face-to-face or in-person learning, out-of-classroom learning modes of delivery, or a combination. It ensures the continuity of inclusive and accessible education when traditional modes of teaching are not feasible, as in the occurrence of national emergencies. Here learners and teachers are co-creators of knowledge and have control of the customization of the learning experiences for enhancement of learning grounded on the realities of our learning and teaching environment.

The student's perception of flexible learning and their level of satisfaction are considered as one of the factors that may influence the student's academic achievement. Academic achievement pertains to the performance outcomes of the student throughout the course [13]. The "investment model" explains the relationship between student satisfaction and academic performance. Satisfaction increases when the reward of study also increases [7].

Moreover, it is revealed that satisfaction is apparent when subjects are performed better [3]. The happy-productive student theory [4] suggests that student satisfaction is mediated by psychosocial factors such as coping, stress, and well-being. Based on the happy-productive theory, it was shown that high levels of distress resulted in low satisfaction.

Satisfaction is an individual's subjective and personal evaluation of a particular aspect. It is a crucial component that motivates people to achieve their long-term goals. Measuring and understanding student satisfaction is a must to identify areas that exceed expectations and need improvements [14].

The impact of a blended learning classroom environment on students' satisfaction determines what combination of blended learning situations is more effective on student satisfaction [8]. The results indicate student satisfaction was higher in traditional learning [15]. Hence, in a face-to-face class, the students meet their expectations and have a higher learning motivation, and peer interaction encourages knowledge sharing, and cooperative learning, thinking more creatively, and stimulating curiosity.

On the other hand, reference [11] studied the relationship between student perceptions in blended learning course and their achievement revealing a strong relationship between the two. It is shown that high achievers also show high satisfaction. Further, the study claimed that student satisfaction and academic achievement denote a positive relationship [2].

However, a study revealed that student satisfaction and academic achievement are not significantly correlated [9], this means that the level of satisfaction does not affect academic achievement.

II. OBJECTIVES

The main thrust of the study is to determine the relationship between the perception and satisfaction of the students on the implementation of flexible learning and their academic achievement in Bohol Island State Unversity - Clarin Campus, A.Y. 2021-2022.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the perception of the students on the following:

     1.1 content delivery and activities;

     1.2 process of teaching; and

     1.3 teaching strategies?

2. What is the student's level of satisfaction of the students with flexible learning?

3. What is the academic achievement of the students?

4. Is there a significant correlation between students' perception of flexible learning and academic achievement?

5. Is there a significant correlation between students' level of satisfaction with flexible learning and academic achievement?

III. METHODOLOGY

The researchers utilize a descriptive-correlational design to evaluate and assess the relationship between the variables [10]. The study employs a survey to determine the respondents' perception, level of satisfaction, and academic achievement of the respondents. The researcher will utilize an adapted questionnaire to determine the perception of flexible learning [5] and student satisfaction [6].

The first part of the questionnaire determines the academic achievement of the respondents based on their General Weighted Average obtained in the first semester of the Academic Year 2021-2022. The second part of the questionnaire measures the students' perception of modular teaching. It is subdivided into three categories:

content delivery and activities of the modules with ten items, process of modular teaching with four items, and teaching strategies with seven items. It uses a 5-point Likert scale, 5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2-Disagree, and 1-Strongly Disagree. Further, the third part of the questionnaire evaluates student satisfaction using a 5-point Likert scale, 5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2-Disagree, and 1-Strongly Disagree.

The respondents of this study are the randomly selected students of Bohol Island State University-Clarin Campus from the two departments; College of Technology and Allied Sciences (BSES-CRM, BSHM, BSCS) and College of Teacher Education (BTLEd-HE, BEEd, BSEd-Math). The needed data will be gathered through the use of google forms. The researchers will ensure the confidentiality of their responses.

After the data collection, it will be calculated using the corresponding statistical test: mean, standard deviation, and Pearson Product-Moment of Correlation Coefficient, to determine the study results.

IV.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the results, analysis, and interpretation of data. It covers the perception of the respondents on content delivery and activities, the process of teaching, teaching strategies; the level of satisfaction with flexible learning, and their academic achievement. It also assessed the significant correlation between academic achievement and perception and the level of satisfaction with flexible learning.

Table 1: Perception of the Students

Perception	Mean	SD	Descriptor
Content Delivery and Activities			
1. Learning objectives were clear.	4.11	0.65	Agree
2. Content delivery was well organized.	4.03	0.78	Agree
3. There was a balance between teaching-learning activities.	3.72	0.90	Agree
4. I was encouraged to participate actively in different tasks.	3.90	0.83	Agree
5. The handouts were helpful.	4.19	0.84	Strongly Agree
6. The workload associated with	3.95	0.80	Agree
assignments were manageable.			
7. The assignments were relevant.	4.01	0.78	Agree
8. I received my grades and feedback within specified timescale.	3.85	0.92	Agree
9. The feedback I received on my progress was helpful.	4.13	0.73	Agree
10. Overall, I was satisfied with the learning modality.	3.87	0.88	Agree
Composite	3.97	0.82	Agree
Process of Teaching			
1. Stimulated interest in subject	3.89	0.68	Agree
2. Improved teacher-student interaction	3.71	0.97	Agree
3. Development of independent thinking	4.17	0.80	Agree
4. Preparation for critical thinking	4.12	0.78	Agree
Composite	3.97	0.83	Agree
Teaching Strategies			
1. Tutorials	4.34	0.76	Strongly Agree
2. Small group discussion	4.15	0.78	Agree
3. Problem based learning	4.13	0.67	Agree
4. Self-directed learning	3.94	0.90	Agree
5. Case based learning	3.95	0.79	Agree
6. Use of group assignments	3.94	0.93	Agree
7. Use of multimedia and power point	4.24	0.76	Strongly Agree
Composite	4.10	0.81	Agree

Table 1 illustrates the perception of the students on the modular teaching in the three constructs: content delivery and activities, process of teaching, and teaching strategies. For content delivery and activities, it is shown that the

handouts were helpful got the highest rating (M=4.19, SD=0.84). This implies that the students perceived the usefulness of the handouts in their learning. Thus, ensuring that the instructional materials provided are comprehensible is necessary. It was followed by the statement, "The feedback I received on my progress was helpful", which got a mean of 4.13 (SD=0.73). This conveys that the students need immediate feedback on their performance to monitor their progress.

Further, the process of flexible teaching revealed that modular teaching developed independent thinking (M=4.17, SD=0.80) and is a preparation for critical thinking (M=4.12, SD=0.78). This means that the said modality has helped the students develop their independence and critical thinking due to the absence of the instructor's presence, where students' concerns weren't addressed immediately.

On the other hand, tutorials (M=4.34, SD=0.76) and the use of multimedia and PowerPoint (M=4.24, SD=0.76) were considered as helpful as a part of the student's learning process.

Table 2. Student's Satisfaction

Statement	Mean	SD	Descriptor
I am satisfied with my overall experience in this course.	3.94	0.76	Agree
I would not recommend this course to other students.	2.50	1.17	Disagree
I am satisfied with the level of student interaction that occurred in the course.	3.76	0.80	Agree
I am satisfied with my learning in the course.	3.94	0.83	Agree
I am satisfied with the instructor in the course	3.69	0.84	Agree
I am satisfied with the content of the source.	3.93	0.74	Agree
Composite	3.79	0.88	Agree

Table 2 presents the students' satisfaction of the students with the flexible learning modality. It was revealed that the students were satisfied with their overall experience (M=3.94, SD=0.76) and their learning (M=3.94, SD=0.83) in the course taken. Also, the students agreed that they were satisfied with the content (M=3.93, SD=0.74), instructor (M=3.69, SD=0.84), and level of student interaction (M=3.76, SD=0.80). On the other hand, the students disagreed not to recommend their course to other

students (M=2.50, SD=0.80), implying that they manifest a higher level of satisfaction with modular teaching.

Table 3. Academic Achievement

Grades	Frequency	Percentage
1.1	5	4.76
1.2	13	12.38
1.3	29	27.62
1.4	11	10.48
1.5	10	9.52
1.6	8	7.62
1.7	5	4.76
1.8	5	4.76
1.9	6	5.71
2.0	4	3.81
2.1	2	1.90
2.2	2	1.90
2.5	4	3.81
2.8	1	0.95
Total	105	100

Table 3 shows the academic achievement of the students. It is shown that most of the students had a general weighted average of 1.3 which comprise 27.62%, followed by 1.2 with 12.38%, and 1.4 with 10.48%. It also revealed that 2.5 and 2.8 grades got the least percentage, with 3.8% and 0.95%, respectively.

Table 4: Correlation Between Students' Perception of Flexible Learning and Academic Achievement

Perception	r	p-value	Interpretation
Content Delivery and Activities	.032	.746	Not Significant
Process of Teaching	.090	.363	Not Significant
Teaching Strategies	.107	.277	Not Significant

Table 4 shows no significant correlation between student's academic achievement and their perception of modular teaching in content delivery and activities, $r(103)$=.032, p=.746, the process of teaching, $r(103)$=.090, p=.363, and teaching strategies $r(103)$=.107, p=.277. Thus, the decision was to reject the null hypothesis. This result implies that the student's academic achievement is not affected by flexible learning modality, and it has nothing

to do with their academic performance. This indicates that this modality is as effective as any other methods.

Table 5: Correlation Between Students' Level of Satisfaction and Academic Achievement

Variables	*r*	*p*-value	Interpretation
Satisfaction & Academic Achievement	.313	.001	Not Significant

Table 5 shows a significant relationship between student level of satisfaction with flexible learning and academic achievement, $r(103)=.313$, $p=.001$. Thus, the decision was to reject the null hypothesis. The correlation coefficient of $r=.313$ indicates a weak positive relationship between the two variables, stating that the level of satisfaction is related to academic achievement. Also, the direct relationship implies that the higher the level of satisfaction, the higher the academic achievement.

V. CONCLUSION

In light of the findings, the researcher concludes implementing of a flexible learning in Bohol Island State University Clarin Campus attains its purpose, which is to ensure that the students will be given the proper knowledge even amid crisis. The level of satisfaction also has a great contribution to academic achievement. On the other hand, how students perceived modular teaching has no significant bearing on the student's academic achievement.

REFERENCES

[1] Commission on Higher Education (2022). Guidelines on the Implementation of Flexible Learning. https://chedro3.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/CMO-No.-4-s.-2020-Guidelines-on-the-Implementation-of-Flexible-Learning.pdf

[2] Bordelon, K. (2013). Perceptions of Achievement and Satisfaction as Related to Interactions in Online Courses. In T. Bastiaens & G. Marks (Eds.), Proceedings of E-Learn 2013--World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education (pp. 1058-1065). Las Vegas, NV, USA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved June 17, 2023 from https://www.learntechlib.org/p/115004.

[3] Churchill, G. A., & Suprenant, C. (1982). An Investigation into the Determinants of Customer Satisfaction. Journal of Marketing Research, 19(4), 491. Doi:10.2307/3151722

[4] Cotton, S.J., Dollard, M.F. & de Jonge J. (2002): Stress and Student Job Design: Satisfaction, Well-Being, and Performance in University Students. International Journal of Stress Management 9, 147–162. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015515714410

[5] Fatima U, Naz M, Zafar H, Fatima A, Khan RR. (2019) Student's perception about Modular teaching and various instructional strategies in the subject of Obstetrics and Gynecology. Professional Med J 2020; 27(1):40-45. DOI: 10.29309/TPMJ/2020.27.1.3162

[6] Gray, J. A., & DiLoreto, M. (2016). The effects of student engagement, student satisfaction, and perceived learning in online learning environments. International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 11(1), n1.

[7] Hatcher, L., Kryter, K., Prus, J. S., & Fitzgerald, V. (1992). Predicting College Student Satisfaction, Commitment, and Attrition from Investment Model Constructs. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22(16), 1273–1296. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00950.x

[8] Kalantarrashidi, S. Mohammadpour E, & Sahraei F (2015): Effect of Blended Learning Classroom Environment on Student's Satisfaction, Vol. 3, No.5. https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v3i5.1013

[9] Khan, J., & Iqbal, M. J. (2016). Relationship between student satisfaction and academic achievement in distance education: A case study of AIOU Islamabad. FWU Journal of Social Sciences, 10(2), 137.

[10] McBurney, D. & White, T. (2009). Research Methods. New York, NY: Cengage Learning.

[11] Owston, R., York, D., & Murtha, S. (2013). Student perceptions and achievement in a university blended learning strategic initiative. The internet and higher education, 18, 38-46.

[12] Rusbult, Caryl E.; Agnew, Christopher; and Arriaga, Ximena (2011): The Investment Model of Commitment Processes. Department of Psychological Sciences Faculty Publications. Paper 26.

[13] Steinmayr, R., Meiǹer, A., Weideinger, A. F., & Wirthwein, L. (2014). Academic achievement (pp. 9780199756810-0108). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

[14] Study Portals (2019). Student Satisfaction: A Global Overview. Retrieved from https://www.studyportals.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Global-Student-Satisfaction-Report-A-2019-global-overview.pdf

[15] Tratnik, Alenka, Urh, Marko & Jereb, Eva (2017): Student satisfaction with an online and a face-to-face Business English course in a higher education context, Innovations in Education and Teaching International, DOI: 10.1080/14703297.2017.1374875

[16] Webber, K. L., Krylow, R. B., & Zhang, Q. (2013). Does involvement really matter? Indicators of college student success and satisfaction. Journal of College Student Development, 54(6), 591-611.