

# Appreciation of Synchronous Online Learning Class in English 10: A Focus on Design and Delivery

Trixie E. Cubillas<sup>1</sup> Francis May Q. delos Reyes<sup>2</sup>

Caraga State University<sup>1</sup>  
Butuan City School of Arts and Trade<sup>2</sup>

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.12.12.2022.p13231  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.12.12.2022.p13231>

Paper Received Date: 5<sup>th</sup> November 2022  
Paper Acceptance Date: 5<sup>th</sup> December 2022  
Paper Publication Date: 20<sup>th</sup> December 2022

**Abstract-** The paper aims to identify the students' level of appreciation of synchronous classes in the new normal. It is a descriptive-correlative type of study since it assessed the level of appreciation of students in synchronous class in English 10 and it quantified their level of academic performance in the same subject and it also tries to establish an association between the level of appreciation of the synchronous class design and delivery and the students' academic performance. The participants of the study are the students of the synchronous online class in English 10 from the two (2) big schools in the division of Butuan City, Philippines. The study revealed that the students are very much satisfied with their synchronous class design and delivery. It is recommended that teachers may consider attending learning and development opportunities to enhance their technological know-how for better navigation of different online platforms.

**Index Terms-** level of appreciation, online class, synchronous class design, synchronous class delivery

## I. INTRODUCTION

The novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) was declared by the World Health Organization as an international public health emergency. Owing to its high infectivity, countries all over the world implemented nationwide lockdowns with the hope of flattening the pandemic curve. Nearly 1.5 billion school children around the globe or 87 percent of Earth's student population are affected by this health problem since schools have closed because of the novel COVID pandemic, and more than 60 million teachers are forced to work at their homes as well, according to the United Nations (Sahu, 2020).

Public institutions such as schools, universities and further education providers ceased on site teaching and shift to distance learning. There are however perceptible challenges that have to be overcome by the implementation of this type of modality. The students who struggle to participate in this distance digital learning and the teachers who challenged to reach out students for effective learning and communication were among them (Li & Lalani, 2020).

Research regarding online learning and teaching showed that they were effective only if students have consistent access to the internet and computers and if teachers have received targeted training and supports for online instruction. Because these needed requirements for effectiveness have been largely absent for many, remote education during the pandemic has impeded teaching and learning (García, Weiss, & Engdahl, 2020).

The policy level intervention was also vital. Education system across the world needed to invest on the professional development of teachers, especially on ICT and effective pedagogy, considering the present scenario. Making online teaching creative, innovative and interactive through user-friendly tools is the other area of research and development (Pokhrel & Chhetri, 2021). This would assist and prepare the education system for such uncertainties in the future. And, the most critical opportunity gaps that education faces at present is the insufficient possessions of high-tech gadgets to and internet access critical to learning online. This digital divide has made it virtually impossible for some students to learn during the pandemic.

Acknowledging this gap, in the Philippines, the Department of Education conducted a survey among parents about the household's availability of gadgets and devices and access to internet and their preferred learning modality for school learners who enrolled in public schools (Mateo, 2020). Accordingly, parents prefer the modular learning modality for their children over other options. Data from Learner Enrollment and Survey Form (LESF) showed that 8.8 million parents preferred modular. Aside from modular learning, 3.8 million parents also voted for online learning (Arcilla, 2020).

Online learning was good news to these 3.8 million learners, but on its initial stage, it poses certain threats to students as well as to teachers. Attitude change and technological literacy would help them gain confidence in order to succeed in their courses with a positive vibe (Kumar, 2015).

A large part of the academic research had identified that online learning situations may it be in asynchronous or prepared online class materials and synchronous or real time online class inside the instructional innovation engage students essentially through specific correspondence (Malik, et al. 2017). Locally, major adjustments have been made. There is an increasing need among teachers to be equipped with training on technologies and in dealing with

students through synchronous online learning, as well as students too. Despite all these inequalities, teaching and learning still has to go on.

As part of the learning continuity plan, the teachers should design the synchronous sessions through pedagogical value and should give importance to the learning experiences of the students. While synchronous sessions may be new to some teachers, oftentimes students are also unfamiliar with this format. Even if they participated in synchronous sessions before, those experiences may vary greatly. Laying the foundations on why and how to conduct the class helps set expectations, creating a shared class culture where students take more responsibility for their participation (Lateef, 2020). Planning on how to conduct the classes is an effective way to offer quality education even in this new normal set-up.

There were various studies conducted before which pertain to online classes but there were only a limited number which focused on synchronous classes in the new normal. As there are limited studies written on the same nature, this study was conceptualized.

One particular study suggested that a formal assessment of effectiveness of synchronous online learning should be conducted, which must be distinguished from efficiency, can provide insight into how students learn and which subjects are the most suitable for which forms of delivery. This information will allow faster, more efficient convergence to effective course design and appropriate technologies for distance learning (Midkiff & DaSilva, 2000). Another study by Malik, et al (2017) emphasized the need for a synchronous course and program both must be designed on the basis of developmental research in the field of online learning.

The aforementioned issues and findings prompt the researchers to conduct the study about online synchronous learning. As teachers in English, they took interest in evaluating the synchronous class in the selected schools in Butuan City, Philippines. Hence, this investigation was conceptualized.

The study hoped to identify the level of students' appreciation of the synchronous classes with special focus on the design and delivery. Its results would be used as bases for designing a localized intervention program.

## II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study generally aimed to identify the students' level of appreciation of synchronous class in the new normal and to compare it with their learning performance. In particular, it sought to achieve the following objectives:

1. Ascertain the students' level of appreciation of synchronous class in the new normal in terms of:
  - 1.1 design; and
  - 1.2 delivery
2. Determine the students' academic performance in English 10;
3. Establish consistency between the level of appreciation of the synchronous class design with the level of appreciation of the synchronous class delivery;
4. Correlate the level of appreciation of the synchronous class design and delivery with students' academic performance in English 10; and

## III. SCOPE AND DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This study explored the students' level of appreciation of synchronous class through its design and delivery. The study was specifically conducted in the big schools in Butuan City Division, Philippines which include Butuan School of Arts and Trades (BCSAT) and Agusan National High School (ANHS) in Butuan City in the S.Y. 2020-2021. It involved Grade 10 students who were attending synchronous classes in English. Another aspect which was investigated in this study was the level of students' academic performance in English 10 synchronous classes which was significant in determining the efficacy of the modality to students' learning.

## IV. METHODOLOGY

The study is quantitative in nature. It is used a descriptive-correlative research design. It is descriptive because it assessed the level of appreciation of students on synchronous class in English 10 and it quantified the students' level of performance in the same subject. Also, it was correlative since it would try to identify whether there was a significant relationship between the following: the level of students' appreciation on the synchronous class design and synchronous class delivery; and the level of students' appreciation on the synchronous class design and delivery and the students' level of academic performance. It was conducted in the big public secondary schools in the Division of Butuan City, Philippines which include the two (2) schools which were all holding synchronous classes particularly in English 10: Butuan City School of Arts and Trade (BCSAT) and Agusan National High School (ANHS). These big schools were classified as such in the Brigada Eskwela in the search of Best Implementing Schools. Both schools have total enrollees which hit the two highest numbers in the division. The Grade 10 students in English were the main participants of the study since they were the ones who have experienced the conduct of synchronous classes and they can give insights on the particular type of modality on its lesson design and delivery. Their level of academic performance in English was determined through their grade in the same subject. For economic and administrative considerations, only fifty percent (50%) of the student population were considered participants. Hence, there was total of 112 students in Grade 10 who were involved in this study.

In selecting the participants, simple random sampling was used which was done through a lottery. The participants responded to a questionnaire developed by the researchers which consists of three (3) parts. Part one contained the information about the participant. Part II is comprised of seven (7) sections with five (5) indicators each. Included in it are the items regarding the level of appreciation on synchronous class design in English 10 specifically on structure, instructions, student-centered learning, content and resources, technology and accessibility, student learning assessment, and support. Part III, the last part consists of indicators on synchronous class delivery. It is also comprised of seven (7) sections; each has five (5) indicators. Among the sections were the structure, instructions, student-centered learning, content and resources, technology and accessibility, student learning assessment, and support.

The data regarding the level of students' academic performance were collected based on their Form 138 or School Report Card with their permission as the study strictly observed the Data Privacy Act. Full respect to students' right to privacy and confidentiality is recognized. The instrument underwent a validity and pilot test. The results of the

reliability test of the survey tool revealed strong internal reliability statistics that is Cronbach’s Alpha 0.983. In other words, all questions were retained as they are in the tool.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Students’ Appreciation of Synchronous Class in the New Normal in terms Design

A. Structure

Structure	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 Using the online components in class is easy.	3.14	Good	Moderately Satisfied
2 The class has logically sequenced lessons that have overviews describing outcomes, activities, assignments, assessments/tests, and resources.	3.42	Good	Moderately Satisfied
3 The learning sequence in the e- class and the face-to-face class (in the old normal) are identical; both clearly state measurable learning outcomes.	3.16	Good	Moderately Satisfied
4 The e- class design facilitates readability with minimal distractions.	3.39	Good	Moderately Satisfied
5 The e- class lessons make use of the teacher’s skills or know-how into research-based e- learning design principles.	3.53	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

Among the indicators under the synchronous class design in terms of structure in Table I-A, the highest weighted mean 3.53 described as “very good” went to indicator 5 which states that the e-class lessons make use of the teacher’s skills or know-how into research-based e-learning design principles. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean

3.14 described as good is given to indicator 1 which states that using the online components in class is easy.

The overall weighted mean is 3.33 which is described as good. This means that the students are moderately satisfied with the synchronous class design specifically on its structure.

In consonance to the results above, Batts et al. 2010 as cited by LeShea (2013) posited that providing proper training for the instructors could help to overcome barriers regarding online course functionality. Although this need for training has been established, the previously mentioned study by Batts et al., reported that more than half of the participants of the study did not receive off-campus training for online teaching during the previous year.

Thus, in order to be successful with the implementation of online programs, the administration needs to develop systems that provide faculty with the resources and support they need to be successful in this type of learning environment.

B. Instruction

Instruction	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 Instructions clearly explain the class structure; how to begin the class/lesson and how to locate and use the e-class learning platform or set-up.	3.61	Very Good	Extremely Satisfied
2 Instructions clearly identify the differences between required and optional activities.	3.60	Very Good	Extremely Satisfied
3 Instructions clearly explain the purpose and use of the e-class materials.	3.63	Very Good	Extremely Satisfied
4 Instructions on the use of multimedia or audio-visual materials that are relevant to the e-class lesson content and outcomes are given or in place.	3.45	Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 Instructions on the use of multi-media or audio-visual materials that are in multiple formats (e.g. MP4, MPEG, et cetera) are given or in place.	3.38	Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

Among the indicators under the synchronous class design in terms of instruction in Table I-B, the highest weighted mean 3.63 described as “very good” went to indicator 3 which states that the instructions clearly explain the purpose and use of the e-class materials while, the lowest weighted mean 3.38 described as good is given to indicator 5 which states that instructions on the use of multi- media or audio-visual materials that are in multiple formats (e.g. MP4, MPEG, et cetera) are given in place.

The overall weighted mean is 3.53 which is described as very good. This means that the students are moderately satisfied with the synchronous class design specifically in terms of instruction.

Based on the result above, synchronous sessions may be new to some instructors, oftentimes students are also unfamiliar with this format. Even if they participated in synchronous sessions before, those experiences may vary greatly. Laying the foundations of why and how the teacher conduct his or her class helps set expectations, creating a shared class culture where students take more responsibility for their participation (Latheef, 2020).

Student Centered-Learning

Student Centered-Learning	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 The e- class includes the requirements for student participation in learning activities and assignment completion.	3.85	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2 The e- class contains the requirements for assignment completion.	3.68	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3 Learning activities in e-class focus on student-centered learning; meaning they are designed for and focused on students.	3.71	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4 Learning activities in e-class support active learning through the promotion of student-to-student collaboration and teacher-to-student collaboration.	3.71	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 Learning activities in e-class make use of a variety of teaching strategies, methods and materials.	3.61	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

Based on the results presented in Table I-C, among the indicators under the synchronous class design in terms of teaching and learning design, the highest weighted mean 3.71 described as “very good” went to indicator 1 which states that the e- class includes the requirements for student participation in learning activities and assignment completion.

On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean 3.61 still described as very good is given to indicator 5 which states that learning activities in e-class make use of a variety of teaching strategies, methods and materials. The overall weighted mean is 3.71 which is described as very good. This means that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class design specifically on teaching and learning.

Evidently, synchronous learning allows students to engage with class materials at the same time as their peers as long as they can connect to the internet. Likewise, teachers may choose synchronous delivery over asynchronous formats because the format allows a more conversational approach, especially if the material requires instant feedback and discussion (Wintemute, 2021). In addition, synchronous learning creates a sense of urgency in which, real-time deadlines and expectations lead to greater participation (Wind, 2020).

As browsed in Table I-D, among the indicators under the synchronous class design in terms of content and resources, the highest weighted mean 3.94 described as “very good” went to indicator 5 which states that all authors or owners of the borrowed resources and materials used in e-class are appropriately mentioned or given recognition.

Whereas, the lowest weighted mean 3.63 described as very good is given to indicator 2 which states that instructional materials are appropriate for e-learning; contribute to the achievement of the learning outcomes. The overall weighted mean is 3.73 which is described as very good. This means that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class design specifically in terms of the content and resources.

### B. Content and Resources

Content and Resources	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 Instructions explain the purpose and use of e-class lesson materials.	3.74	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2 Instructional materials are appropriate for e-learning; contribute to the achievement of the learning outcomes.	3.63	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3 Instructional materials are updated and made available to students.	3.66	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4 The e-class provides student access to online databases (files and records), and resources.	3.69	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 All authors or owners of the borrowed resources and materials used in e-class are appropriately mentioned or given recognition or credits.	3.94	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

In support to the results above, Teaching and Learning (n.d) explicated that synchronous learning allows students to engage with content and develop skills with immediate instructor guidance and supervision. This is especially true in classes where students require access to situations or equipment that they are unlikely to have at home. Questions can be answered immediately by the instructor, and the class navigates this content as a whole in a supported, structured way.

### C. Technology and Accessibility

Technology and Accessibility	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 The e-class includes minimum technology requirements (hardware, browser, software, etc.) and requires technical skills of the student.	3.70	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2 The e-class provides an orientation opportunity for students to learn the basics of online learning.	3.51	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3 Proven effective and emerging technological tools are used to support student learning.	3.54	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4 A monitoring system is in place to determine the level of engagement and access of students to the e-class learning tools and materials.	3.57	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 The e-class features accessible technologies and instructions for all types of students.	3.46	Good	Moderately Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

As viewed in Table I-E, among the indicators under the synchronous class design in terms of technology and accessibility, the highest weighted mean 3.70 described as “very good” went to indicator 1 which states that the e-class includes minimum technology requirements (hardware, browser, software, etc.) and requires technical skills of the student. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean 3.46 described as good is given to indicator 5 which states that the e-class features accessible technologies and instructions for all types of students. The overall weighted mean is 3.56 which is described as very good. This entails that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class design particularly in terms of technology and accessibility. Anent the results above, Francescucci and Rohani (2019) posited that there are growing trends in post-secondary education and emphasized the importance of online and technology-enabled learning. Besides, one has to consider integrating some synchronous learning tools into online courses and he or she should see the difference it can make for engaging and motivating students (McClelland, 2020).

In addition, Ahmadi (2018) stated that the use of technology has become an important part of the learning process in and out of the class. Every language class usually uses some form of technology. Technology has been used to both help and improve language learning. Technology enables teachers to adapt classroom activities, thus enhancing the language learning process. Also, technology continues to grow in importance as a tool to help teachers facilitate language learning for their learners.

### D. Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 The assessments (tests, quizzes, exams, et cetera) are appropriate for e-learning which means that they measure content mastery, critical thinking skills, and core or essential learning.	3.96	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2 The assessments (tests, quizzes, exams, et cetera) are differentiated and varied	3.88	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3 The grading policy is stated clearly and addresses specific and descriptive criteria for the evaluation of student work.	3.83	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4 Tests, quizzes, exams, and other types of assessments are appropriate to the student work being assessed.	3.79	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 Tests, quizzes, exams, and other types of assessments are consistent with the activities and resources.	3.86	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

As gleaned in Table I-F, among the indicators under the synchronous class design in terms of student learning assessment, the highest weighted mean 3.96 described as “very good” went to indicator 1 which states that the assessments (test, quizzes, exams, et cetera) are appropriate for e-learning which means that they measure content mastery, critical thinking skills, and core essential learning. On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean 3.79 described as very good is given to indicator 4 which states that test, quizzes, exams, and other types of assessments are appropriate to the student work being assessed. The overall weighted mean is 3.86 which is described as very good. This suggests that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class design specifically in terms of student learning assessment.

In numerous instructive foundations, innovation has gone before the path for online evaluations and assessments. It is subsequently to be expected that many organizations are thus making progressive shift from utilizing on the web evaluation devices. Like, online assessment system lightening the workload of faculty members, online exams help saving a lot of time, money and paper usage (Fedena Online, 2020).

As indicated in Table I-G, among the indicators under the synchronous class design in terms of support, the highest weighted mean 3.95 described as “very good” went to indicator 5 which states that a forum (gc, gmail, fb messenger, SMS, et cetera) is set to accommodate students’ concerns while the lowest weighted mean 3.45 went to indicator 2 which states, training or orientation is provided to students in the mechanics and best practices for an e-class. The overall weighted mean is 3.64 which is described as very good. This means that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class design specifically in terms of support.

### E. Support

Support	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 Technical support in e-class is provided to students; mostly provided by the teacher or by an IT expert.	3.48	Good	Moderately Satisfied
2 Training or orientation is provided to students in the mechanics and best practices for an e-class.	3.45	Good	Moderately Satisfied
3 Tutorials are given to students if necessary.	3.54	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4 The deadlines set for the e-class requirements are flexible; special considerations are given (if deemed necessary).	3.78	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 A forum or medium (GC, Gmail, Fb messenger, SMS, et cetera) is set to accommodate students’ concerns	3.95	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

In view of the results above, Teachonline.ca. (n.d.) suggested that in order to have the best opportunity for success in studies, online learners need access to more than course content and effective teaching. They need access to a wide range of support services that help them to engage with their institution and instructors, succeed in their studies, connect with each other, and make a successful transition

to the workplace. The challenge is to provide all of the students, especially our under- served populations, with the breadth and quality of support they need and deserve in a user-friendly format so they can be nurtured, encouraged and supported throughout their academic careers.

### Overall Mean Distribution of the Level of Students’ Appreciation of Synchronous Class Design in the New Normal

	Indicators	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
		Mean	Verbal Description	
1	Structure	3.33	Good	Moderately Satisfied
2	Instructions	3.53	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3	Student Centered-Learning	3.71	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4	Content and Resources	3.73	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5	Technology Accessibility and Learning	3.56	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
6	Student Assessment	3.86	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
7	Support	3.64	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
	<b>Grand Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

It can be gleaned on the table above that the student learning assessment got the highest weighted mean of 3.86 and which is described as very good. On the other hand, the structure garnered the lowest weighted mean of 3.33 described as good.

The grand weighted mean is 3.62 described as very good. This entails that the students are very much satisfied with their synchronous class design. This result further suggests that the students’ level of appreciation of the synchronous class design is in a very respectable level.

In consonance to the results above, McBrien, Jones, and Rui (2009) as cited by LeShea (2013) explained that in regards to students’ perception of online learning, there were positive results when a synchronous online platform was used. This was especially true for those students who are shy by nature and therefore feel more comfortable expressing their opinions in this type of environment versus a face-to-face class.

As viewed in Table II-A, among the indicators under the structure, the highest weighted mean 3.67 described as “very good” went to indicator 5 which states that when adding e-class lesson content, the teacher follows research-based e- learning design standards regarding accessibility, readability, and student-centered learning.

Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean 3.21 described as good is given to indicator 3 which states that the sequence or order of the e-class lessons is similar to the face-to-face class (in the old normal) for student’s ease of transition from one platform (face-to face) to another (online) set-up. The overall weighted mean is 3.52 which is described as very good. This means that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class delivery specifically in terms of its structure.

In consonance to the results above, Hill (2012) explicated that each educational delivery model for online education has its own set of characteristics and goals. It is easy to get caught up in the media hype and throw all models for online education into the same bucket. In addition, online technology and its associated delivery models will continue to evolve at an accelerated pace, at least compared with the experience of the past decade.

## II. Level of students' appreciation of synchronous class in terms of delivery

### A. Structure

Structure	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 Using the online components in class is made easy by the teacher.	3.61	Very Good	Moderately Satisfied
2 The class provides multiple learning opportunities for students to master the content.	3.56	Very Good	Moderately Satisfied
3 The sequence or order of the e-class lessons is similar to the face-to-face class (in the old normal) for student's ease of transition from one platform (face-to face) to another (online) set-up.	3.21	Good	Moderately Satisfied
4 The teacher adheres to readability standards when adding e-class lesson content.	3.53	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 When adding e-class lesson content, the teacher follows research-based e-learning design standards regarding accessibility, readability, and student-centered learning.	3.67	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

Moreover, synchronous sessions, regardless of how they are structured, offer opportunities for community building and connection for the students. building connection and community within remote settings is an essential component of student learning and engagement and having a clear plan around how one will use this time (and how students will benefit from it) will increase success in the course (Teaching and Learning, n.d.).

As observed in Table II-B, among the indicators under the instruction, the highest weighted mean 3.88 described as "very good" went to indicator

1 which states that the teacher uses available or accessible tools to promote student mastery of learning as (they) students are guided in each of the learning activity. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean 3.68 described as very good is given to indicator 3 which states that the teacher clearly engages with students via instructions on the proper use of each of the tools and materials used for e- class learning activities. The overall weighted mean is 3.76 which is described as very good. This manifests that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class delivery particularly in terms of instruction.

In view of this, Gardiner (2021) cited that synchronous learning is interactive, two-way online instruction that happens in real time with a teacher in the virtual classroom. Synchronous learning instruction allows educators to replicate many of the experiences found in an in-person classroom. This includes the ability for attendees to access lecture slides, respond to interactive questions and engage with their classmates in discussion threads.

### B. Instruction

Instruction	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 The teacher uses available or accessible tools to promote student mastery of learning as (they) students are guided in each of the learning activity.	3.88	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2 Through clear instructions, the teacher makes sure that the student prioritizes required over optional activities; thus, ensures student learning.	3.71	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3 The teacher clearly engages with students via instructions on the proper use of each of the tools and materials used for e- class learning activities.	3.68	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4 The teacher encourages students to make use of personalized media and other media relevant to the content in ways that extend and contribute to student mastery of learning.	3.74	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 The teacher encourages students to make use of multi-media materials in various formats to ensure that they can have full use in them.	3.77	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

As seen in Table II-C, among the indicators under the student -centered teaching and learning, the highest weighted mean 3.87 described as "very good" went to indicator 5 which states that the teacher uses a variety of strategies and techniques in delivering the e- class lesson to students to ensure student mastery of learning. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean 3.63 described as very good is given to indicator 1 which states that the teacher uses communication tools to encourage and promote student mastery of learning as they stemmed from the student's engagement in each of the learning activity.

The overall weighted mean is 3.65 which is described as very good. This reveals that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class delivery specifically on the student-centered teaching and learning.

### C. Teaching and learning

Student-centered Teaching and Learning	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 The teacher uses communication tools to encourage and promote student mastery of learning as they stemmed from the student's engagement in each learning activity.	3.63	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2 Students achieve stated learning outcomes through the completion of the e-class activities.	3.71	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3 The teacher engages students in e-class activities designed appropriately for their level, needs, interests, et cetera.	3.73	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4 The teacher engages students in e-class activities that promote collaboration among themselves and with her or him.	3.71	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 The teacher uses a variety of strategies and techniques in delivering the e-class lesson to students to ensure student mastery of learning.	3.87	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

In agreement with the results above, Riggs (2020) emphasized that while remote instruction during an emergency pandemic is not the same as carefully designed online education, remote educators can take some notes from experienced online colleagues about how to bridge the distance. Besides, thinking of the learning experience from a student-centered perspective is one valuable take- away begin to teach from a

distance, and to consider the new learning environment from a student- centered perspective.

**Content and Resources**

Content and Resources	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 Instructions explain the purpose and use of e-class lesson materials.	3.74	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2 Instructional materials are appropriate for e-learning; contribute to the achievement of the learning outcomes.	3.63	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3 Instructional materials are updated and are made available to students.	3.66	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4 The e-class provides student access to online databases (files and records), and resources.	3.69	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 All authors or owners of the borrowed resources and materials used in e-class are appropriately mentioned or given recognition or credits.	3.94	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

As viewed in Table II-D, among the indicators under content and resources, the highest weighted mean 3.94 described as “very good” went to indicator 5 which states that all authors or owners of the borrowed resources and materials used in e- class are appropriately mentioned or given recognition or credits. On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean 3.63 described as very good is given to indicator 2 which states that instructional materials are appropriate for e-learning; contribute to the achievement of the learning outcomes. The overall weighted mean is 3.73 and which is described as very good. This suggests that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class delivery specifically in terms of content and resources.

Undoubtedly, teachers are doing all they can to support their students from afar, and they require unique distance learning resources through virtual classroom for the continuity of learning (Karbowski, 2020). On the other hand, prompt participations are required to interact with the content, including reading, watching, listening, and doing activities (Shank, 2020).

As viewed in Table II-E, among the indicators under the technology and accessibility, the highest weighted mean 3.78 described as “very good” went to indicator 1 which states that the teacher ensures that the technology used in the conduct of e-class is available to students and that it works with the identified hardware,

Consequently, one area that is key to online learning is the type of digital technology to be used. Digital technologies should be made available for students in different time zones and international contexts. Tools should also include accessibility features like enlarged cursors, closed-captioning, keyboard shortcuts, alternative text, high-contrast themes and text-to-speech capabilities. Above all, accessibility can be fostered through listening to the concerns and desires of their students and make changes accordingly (Hodge, 2020).

As reflected in Table II-F, among the indicators under the student learning assessment, the highest weighted mean 3.88 described as “very good” went to indicator 5 which states that the teacher gives assessments such as tests, quizzes, exams, et cetera that are consistent with the e-class lesson and activities. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean 3.58 described as very

browsers, and other software. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean 3.62 described as very good is given to indicator 2 which states that the teacher briefs or orients students on the basics of online learning to ensure students full participation in e-class with minimal distractions. The overall weighted mean is 3.70 and which is described as very good. This means that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class delivery, technology and accessibility in particular.

**D. Technology and Accessibility**

Technology and Accessibility	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1 1. The teacher ensures that the technology used in the conduct of e-class is available to students and that it works with the identified hardware, browsers, and other software.	3.78	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2 2. The teacher briefs or orients students on the basics of online learning to ensure students' full participation in e-class with minimal distractions	3.62	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3 3. Evidence from student work and tools confirm that tools and media support student engagement and ensure effective learning.	3.67	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4 4. The teacher monitors student engagement and access to e-class tools and materials to determine delays and technical difficulties due to technology.	3.69	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5 5. The teacher makes sure of inclusivity in class which means that all students can have access to the e-class tools and materials.	3.74	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

**Students' Learning Assessment**

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

With regard to the result above, it is not surprising that many educational institutes are making the progressive shift from practicing traditional assessment practices to using online assessment devices that benefit the students and teachers and also be worthwhile to the institutes. In addition, such a modality enables learners to meet for the exam at a location of their choice. It also assures that teachers can invigilate the estimates remotely. In which, decreases the stress of the learners and teachers and helps save the time and expense of travel (Bhojane, 2020).

**E. Support**

good is given to indicator 2 which states that the students are engaged in or exposed to differentiated and varied activities which is evident in their performance in e- class. The overall weighted mean is 3.74 which is described as very good. This means that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class delivery specifically on student learning assessment.

Support	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
	M	VD	
1. The teacher makes use of appropriate communication tools and help resources within the class to quickly direct students for resolving technical obstacles.	3.87	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2. The teacher takes advantage of the training offered and demonstrates their learning by assisting students in handling basic technology in e-class	3.74	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3. The teacher provides tutorials or links to tutorials (if deemed necessary) to help students who experience the difficulty in using technology.	3.76	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4. The teacher gives due or considerations among students who missed requirements in e-class (if deemed necessary).	3.91	Very Good	Students'
5. Student's concerns and queries are addressed through a forum or any venue such as group chats, Gmail, fb messenger, SMS, et cetera.	4.05	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

As viewed in Table II-G, among the indicators under support to synchronous class delivery, the highest weighted mean 4.05 described as “very good” went to indicator 5 which states that the student’s concerns and queries are addressed through a forum or any venue such as group chats, Gmail, fb messenger, SMS, et cetera. Meanwhile, the lowest weighted mean 3.74 described as very good is given to indicator 2 which states that the teacher takes advantage of the training offered and demonstrates their learning by assisting students in handling basic technology in e-class. The overall weighted mean is 3.87 and which is described as very good. This indicates that the students are very much satisfied with the synchronous class delivery specifically in terms of support.

Significantly, in synchronous learning, students usually go through the learning path together, accompanied by their instructor who is able

to provide support while students are completing tasks and activities. The teacher must also make sure that the synchronous session offers novel content, insights, or activities and avoid duplicating what is covered elsewhere in the course, e.g., readings, videos, discussion boards (Norman, 2017).

half the time (Miller, 2019). Thus, the more online synchronous classes there are, the more that they should be make better for both students and teachers.

**Overall Mean Distribution of the Level of Students’ Appreciation of Synchronous Class Delivery**

	Indicators	Level of Appreciation		Interpretation
		Mean	Verbal Description	
1	Structure	3.65	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
2	Instructions	3.76	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
3	Student Centered-Learning	3.65	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
4	Content and Resources	3.73	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
5	Technology and Accessibility	3.70	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
6	Student Learning Assessment	3.74	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
7	Support	3.87	Very Good	Very Much Satisfied
	<b>Grand Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Very Much Satisfied</b>

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.00 (Excellent)

As browsed on the table above, the support got the highest weighted mean of 3.87 and which is described as very good. On the other hand, the structure garnered the lowest weighted mean of 3.65 described as very good. The grand weighted mean is 3.71 described as very good. This entails that the students are very much satisfied with their synchronous class delivery. This result further suggests that the students’ level of appreciation of the synchronous class delivery is in a very respectable level.

Anent the results above, Emma (2020) explained that in synchronous classes, students can study where they feel most comfortable and can videoconference to their classes at the click of a button. While schooling at home, it is also easier to complete other hobbies and housework that otherwise would have been placed on the back burner. By being at home, many students are able to get things done in a safe and relaxing environment.

Moreover, today’s workforce is moving online. Forty-six percent of organizations recently surveyed by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) said that they use virtual teams. With that, the number of professionals which include teachers who regularly work from home has increased 159 percent over the last decade, with more than 4.7 million employees working remotely at least

**III. Level of Students’ Academic Performance in English 10**

Grade	Frequency	Percentage	Interpretation
90 above	65	58.03%	Proficient
85-89	42	37.5%	Approaching Proficiency
80-84	5	4.46%	Developing
75-79	0	0%	Beginning
74 below	0	0%	Needs Intervention

Legends: 74 below (needs intervention); 75-79 (beginning); 80-84 (developing); ); 85-89 (approaching proficiency); 90 above (proficient)

It can be gleaned from Table III above that 65 or 58.03% of the students are in the range of 90 above. This means that majority of them are proficient learners in English. Moreover, 42 or 37.5% of the them are in the range of 85 - 89; meaning they are still approaching to proficiency. Five or 4.46% of them are in the range of 80 – 84 or still developing. None of the students are in the range of 75 – 79 and 74 below described as beginning and need intervention respectively.

In agreement with the results above, the results of the study of Enriquez (2020) show that an online course can be as effective as the traditional on- campus, face-to-face format. The retention rates are almost the same for the online and on-campus groups, and the success rates are identical. There is no statistically significant difference in the levels of performance of the face-to-face and online classes.

One study also proposed that course design, quality of the instructor, prompt feedback, and students’ expectations are the four prominent determinants of learning outcome and satisfaction of the students during online classes. The above- mentioned factors should be considered in online synchronous classes in order to ensure greater student academic achievement (Lee, 2014).

**IV. Association between the Synchronous Design and Delivery**

Variables	Mean	SD	R	Sig. (2 – Tailed)	Remarks	Decision
Design	3.6237	.20102	0.524**	0.001	Reject Ho	Significant
Delivery	3.7091	.14286				

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

It can be gleaned from the Table IV above that the p-value is below the 0.05 level of significance set for analysis. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant relationship between the students' level of appreciation of the synchronous design and delivery. This indicates that the synchronous class design is associated with the synchronous class delivery. Hence, the better the design of the synchronous class, the better the synchronous class delivery gets.

In a 2009 study of Seaman as cited in Simon (2012), he found out that 80% of U.S higher education faculty with no online teaching or online course design experience believed that the outcomes of online learning were inferior to those of face-to-face courses. In contrast, the majority of faculty with experience in online teaching and course design believed that the outcomes were either equivalent or better. Despite evidence that carefully designed online courses yield excellent learning 15 outcomes (Means et al., 2009), the stigma attached to this teaching modality remains an important hurdle to overcome for those who have never taught online.

Correspondingly, Noren (2020) posited that faculty will need to rethink the role that both synchronous online delivery approach plays in creating effective flexible online learning experiences for students. It is evident that neither approach is perfect; there are pros and cons to both modalities for online delivery. Increasingly, faculty are opting for an approach that incorporates the delivery format and enables faculty to be more flexible and responsive to the diversity of learner needs. Ultimately, deciding on one's approach will depend on the learners, the curriculum, course materials and the time and capacity as an instructor and other contextual factors. If one considers designing online courses that incorporate the strengths of synchronous delivery models, one can create experiences that enable both flexibility and structure to co-exist, thus creating a more enriching teaching and learning environment for students and instructors.

**Association between the Students' Performance in English and their Level of Appreciation of the Synchronous Class Design and Delivery**

Variables	Mean	SD	R	Sig. (2-tailed)	Remarks	Decision
Students' Performance vs. Level of Appreciation	4.5089	.56942				
<b>• Design</b>						
a. Structure	3.3286	.78676	0.154	0.104	Failed to reject Ho	Not significant
b. Instructions	3.5339	.85039	0.163	0.086	Failed to reject Ho	Not significant
c. Student Centered-Learning	3.7125	.80260	0.130	0.172	Failed to reject Ho	Significant
d. Content and Resources	3.7321	.84579	0.207*	<b>0.029</b>	Reject Ho	Not significant
e. Technology and Accessibility	3.5571	.83458	0.088	0.356	Failed to reject Ho	Not significant
f. Student Learning Assessment	3.8643	.88601	0.106	0.266	Failed to reject Ho	
g. Support	3.6375	.80697	0.107	0.261	Failed to reject Ho	
<b>• Delivery</b>						
a. Structure	3.5161	.78207	.113	0.236	Failed to reject Ho	Not significant
b. Instructions	3.7554	.88173	.046	0.633	Failed to reject Ho	Not significant
c. Student Centered-Learning	3.6536	.84725	.197*	<b>0.037</b>	Failed to reject Ho	Significant
d. Content and Resources	3.7321	.83377	.115	0.227	Failed to reject Ho	Not significant
e. Technology and Accessibility	3.6982	.82221	.115	0.225	Failed to reject Ho	Not significant
f. Student Learning Assessment	3.7411	.77140	.126	0.184	Failed to reject Ho	
g. Support	3.8661	.78517	.049	0.608	Failed to reject Ho	

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

As viewed in the Table V, majority of the p-values are beyond the 0.05 level of significance set for analysis. However, on the students' level of appreciation of class design particularly the content and resources, it obtained the p-value (0.029) which is below 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This indicates that there is a relationship between the students' performance in English and their level of appreciation of the synchronous class design specifically on the content and resources. The R-value (0.207) however suggests a weak correlation between the two mentioned variables. This result manifests that the students' performance in English is somehow associated with their level of appreciation of the synchronous class design specifically on the content and resources. This can perhaps be attributed to students' positive perception towards the activities and leaning materials that they have in their synchronous online class.

Also, between the students' academic performance and their level of appreciation of the synchronous class delivery, majority of the p-values are beyond the 0.05 level of significance set for analysis. However, on the students' level of appreciation of the class delivery particularly the student centered-learning, it obtained the p-value (0.037) which is below 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This entails that there is a relationship between the students' performance in English and their level of appreciation of the synchronous class delivery specifically on the student centered-learning. The R-value (0.197) however suggests a weak correlation between the two mentioned variables. This result suggests that the students' performance in English is somehow associated with their level of appreciation of the synchronous class delivery specifically on the student centered-learning. This can somehow be attributed to students' positive

view on how the lessons were delivered and their views that their class is basically focused on them.

Moreover, as presented in the table, majority of the p-values are beyond the 0.05 level of significance set for analysis. This further implies that the students' performance in English is not associated on their level of appreciation of the synchronous class design and delivery. Hence, no matter how better the design of the synchronous class design and its delivery as viewed by the students themselves, it has nothing to do with their performance in English.

With regards to the results above, while much of the academic literature has paid attention to the effectiveness of an online learning environment compared with an F2F classroom environment, there has been no consensus on how online learning affects student performance. Some studies found that there is no statistical difference between students' grades and course delivery mode and others present opposite results (Driscoll et al., 2012).

As Cavanaugh as cited in Simon (2012) concluded that more importantly, when synchronous class is implemented with the same care as effective face-to face instruction, distance education programs can be used to complement, enhance, and expand education options for students, at least at intermediate, middle, and upper grades levels". In other words, the determinant of learning outcomes is not the modality, rather the quality of the instructional design.

## Conclusions

The students are very much satisfied with their online English classes which suggests that their level of appreciation of the synchronous class design is at a very respectable level. Furthermore, when it comes to the level of students' performance in English, majority of them are proficient learners and no one is in the developing, beginning and needed intervention. This manifests that the students are performing well in their synchronous class in English 10.

When the synchronous class design is compared with synchronous class delivery, a significant relationship between the students' level of appreciation of the two aforementioned factors was established. This indicates that the synchronous class design is associated with the synchronous class delivery. Hence, the better the design of the synchronous class, the better the synchronous class delivery gets.

When the students' academic performance in English 10 and their level of appreciation of the synchronous class design and delivery are compared, no significant relationship between the two aforesaid factors was found. This manifests that the students' performance in English is not associated with their level of appreciation of the synchronous class design and delivery. Hence, no matter how better the design of the synchronous class design and its delivery as viewed by the students themselves, it has nothing to do with their performance in English.

There is, however, a weak positive correlation between the students' performance in English with their level of appreciation of the synchronous class design in terms of content and resources and class delivery in terms of student-centered learning. This entails that the students' performance in English is somehow associated with their level of appreciation of the synchronous class design particularly on the content and resources and their level of appreciation of the synchronous class delivery specifically on

student-centered learning. This can somehow be attributed to students' positive perception of the given activities and learning resources in their synchronous online class and their positive view on how the student-centered lessons were delivered.

Consequently, a localized intervention program is crafted that is entitled Enhancing English Teachers' Competence on Online Synchronous Instruction which aimed to upgrade teachers' digital literacy for a better navigation of different online platforms. This hopes to enhance the teachers' digital skills especially in maneuvering the technological tools which can positively affect the students' level of academic performance in English as well as in other disciplines.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Arcilla, J. (2020). The Manila Times. Most Parents Prefer Modular Learning. Department of Education (DepEd). Learner Enrollment Survey Forms.
- [2] Best Schools. (2021). Synchronous learning vs. asynchronous learning. Retrieved April 21, 2021, from <https://thebestschools.org/magazine/synchronous-vs-asynchronous-education/>
- [3] Bhojane, V. ( June 2020). Advantages Of Online Assessment In Education <https://www.myschoolr. DepEdcom/blog/advantages-of-online-assessment-in-education.html>
- [4] DEPED Memorandum No.066,s.208 ( April, 2018).Eskwela Implementing Guidelines.
- [5] Driscoll, A. (2012). Can online courses deliver in- class results? A comparison of student performance and satisfaction in an online versus a face-to-face introductory sociology course. *Teaching Sociology*, 40, 312-331.
- [6] Emma ( May 2020) Blog, Digital Citizenship, Distance Learning, Educational Technology, Mental Health, Online Learning, Teachers, Teaching Topics, Technology What Are the Benefits of Distance Learning? <https://learnsafe.com/what-are-the-benefits-of-distance-learning>
- [7] Enriquez, A. (2010). Assessing the Effectiveness of Synchronous Content Delivery in an Online Introductory Circuits Analysis Course. Proceedings of the 2010 American Society for Engineering Education Zone IV Conference. <https://tinyurl.com/bfr5d9dv>
- [8] Fedena Online: (April, 2020). For Online classes and Remote Teaching during Covid-19. <https://fedena.com/blog/2020/4/fedena-online-for-online-classes-and-a-remote-teaching-during-covid-19.html>.
- [9] Foster, M. (2013). The VIRI (virtual, interactive, real-time, instructor-led) classroom: The impact of blended synchronous online courses on student performance, engagement, and satisfaction. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 43(3), 78-91.
- [10] Francescucci A, Rohani L. (2019). Exclusively synchronous online (VIRI) learning: the impact on student performance and engagement outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Education*. ;41(1):60-69. doi:10.1177 /0273475318818864
- [11] García, E., Weiss, E. and Engdahl, L.(2020). Access to online learning Amid Coronavirus is far from universal, and children who are poor suffer from a digital divide. Working Economics Blog (Economic Policy Institute), April 17, 2020.
- [12] Gardiner,E. (June, 2021). When and How to use Synchronous vs Asynchronous teaching methods. <https://tophat.com/blog/remote-teaching-when-and-how-to-use-synchronous-vs-asynchronous-methods/>
- [13] Hill, P., (November, 2012).EDUCASERVIEW.Online Educational Delivery Models:A descriptive view.<https://er.educause.edu/articles/2012/11/online-educational-delivery-models--a-descriptive-view>
- [14] Hodge, E. (October 2020) How to Improve the Accessibility of Online Learning <https://www.keystoneacademic.com/news/improving-accessibility-online-learning>

- [15] Jones, M.H. & Gallen, A. (2016). Peer observation, feedback and reflection for development of practice in synchronous online teaching. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 53(6), 616-626.
- [16] Kumar, S. (2015). 5 Common problems faced by students in eLearning and how to overcome them. <https://elearningindustry.com/5-common-problems-faced-by-students-in-elearning-overcome>
- [17] Lateef, Z. (2020). Synchronous strategies for the “New Normal.”
- [18] <https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/online-education/online-course-delivery-and-instruction/synchronous-strategies-for-the-new-normal/>
- [19] Lee, J. (2014). An exploratory study of effective online learning: Assessing satisfaction levels of graduate students of mathematics education associated with human and design factors of an online course. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 15(1), 111–132.
- [20] LeShea, A. (2013). The effects of synchronous class sessions on students’ academic achievement and levels of satisfaction in an online introduction to computers course. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1808&context=doctoral>
- [21] Li, C. & Lalani, F. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic has changed education forever. This is how. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/04/coronavirus-education-global-covid19-online-digital-learning/>
- [22] Malik, M., Fatima G., Hussain, A. & Sarwar, A. (2017). E-Learning: Students’ Perspectives about Asynchronous and Synchronous Resources at Higher Education Level. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1210223.pdf>
- [23] Mateo, J. (2020). Tech woes among top concerns for distance learning. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2020/08/02/2032336/tech-woes-among-top-concerns-distance-learning>
- [24] McBrien, J., Jones, P., & Rui, C. (2009). Virtual spaces: Employing a synchronous online classroom to facilitate student engagement in online learning. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning*, 10(3), 1-17. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.com.
- [25] McClelland, L. (2020). 4 Synchronous Tools for Online Teaching and Learning. Retrieved <https://tophat.com/blog/synchronous-teaching-tools/>
- [26] Midkiff, S., & Da Silva L. (2000). Leveraging the web for synchronous versus Asynchronous distance learning. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228818810Leveraging\\_the\\_web\\_for\\_synchronous\\_versus\\_asynchronous\\_distance\\_learning](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228818810Leveraging_the_web_for_synchronous_versus_asynchronous_distance_learning)
- [27] Miller, K. (September, 2019) The Benefits of Online Learning: 7 Advantages of Online Degrees <https://www.northeastern.edu/graduate/blog/benefits-of-online-learning/>
- [28] Noren, A. (2020). Synchronous and asynchronous online course design and delivery. <https://camosunlearning.opened.ca/2020/12/15/synchronous-and-asynchronous-online-course-design-and-delivery/>
- [29] Norman, M. (2020, December 08). Synchronous online classes: 10 tips for engaging students. Retrieved April 21, 2021, from <https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/online-education/online-student-engagement/synchronous-online-classes-10-tips-engaging-students/>
- [30] Pokhrel, S., & Chhetri, R. (2021). A literature review on impact of covid-19 pandemic on teaching and learning. *Higher Education for the Future*, 8(1), 133-141. doi:10.1177/2347631120983481
- [31] Riggs, S. (April, 2020) Student-Centered Remote Teaching: Lessons Learned from Online Education <https://er.educause.edu/blogs/2020/4/student-centered-remote-teaching-lessons-learned-from-online-education>
- [32] Sahu, P. (2020). Closure of universalities due to Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Impact on Education and mental health of students and Academic staff. *Cureus*.12(4)e7541 Retrieved from Google Scholar Medline.
- [33] Shank, P. (June, 2020) (The Right) Learning Modalities To Deliver Digital Learning: Part 4 <https://elearningindustry.com/create-synchronous-learning-digital-modalities-part-4>
- [34] Simon, E. (2012). The impact of online teaching on higher education faculty’s professional identity and the role of technology: the coming of age of the virtual teacher. [https://www.colorado.edu/atlas/sites/default/files/attached-files/the\\_impact\\_of\\_online\\_teaching\\_on\\_higher\\_education\\_faculty.pdf](https://www.colorado.edu/atlas/sites/default/files/attached-files/the_impact_of_online_teaching_on_higher_education_faculty.pdf)
- [35] Teaching and Learning (n.d). Balancing the synchronous and asynchronous parts of your course. <https://researchcentres.wlu.ca/teaching-and-learning/building/balancing-synchronous-and-asynchronous-content.html>
- [36] UNESCO. (2020). Global Education Coalition-290- million students out school due-COVID-19. In Unesco. <https://en.unesco.org/news/290-million-students-out-school-due-covid-19-unesco-releases-first-global-numbers-and-mobilizes>
- [37] United Nations. 2020. Education During COVID-19 and Beyond. Policy Brief. August 2020.
- [38] Ward, M.E., Peters, G., & Shelly, K. (2010). Student and faculty perceptions of the Quality of online learning experiences. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 11(3), 57-77. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- [39] Wind, D. (2020). Synchronous vs Asynchronous Learning: What’s More Effective? [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.eduflow.com/blog/synchronous-vs-asynchronous-learning-whats-more-effective>
- [40] Wintemute, D. (2021) Synchronous vs Asynchronous classes: What’s the difference. <https://thebestschools.org/resources/synchronous-vs-asynchronous-programs-courses/>

#### AUTHORS

**First Author** – Trixie E. Cubillas, Caraga State University  
**Second Author** – Francis May Q. delos Reyes, Butuan City School of Arts and Trade

**Correspondence Author** – [tecubillas@carsu.edu.ph](mailto:tecubillas@carsu.edu.ph)

