International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies
Website: https://www.ijahss.in/
ISSN(*Online*): 2582-3647
Volume 3; Issue 5; Sep-Oct 2021; Page No. 78-88

Open Access | Original Paper

Instructor's Competencies in Flexible Teaching Modalities Toward Learning Engagement and Satisfaction of College Students

Maria Daisy Camilon[1] Menchie B. Ellamil[2] Delon A. Ching[3*]
[1,2]College of Arts and Sciences, Laguna State Polytechnic University
[3]College of Teacher Education, San Pablo City, Laguna, Philippines[*]

ABSTRACT
Being competent in managing online classes through the different qualities of the instructors incorporating active teaching and learning and technological capacities are important during the implementation of flexible schemes as a result of the educational reform amidst pandemic. With this, the researchers focused this study on determining the level of competence of the instructors in one institution in handling flexible teaching modalities and how it influences the engagement and satisfaction of the students in learning the lessons. Descriptive and correlational research designs were used having 133 randomly selected students from three different colleges in criminal justice education, computer students and teacher education. There were three sets of adopted instruments used answered by the students enrolled in a certain course handled by the researchers during 2020-2021 academic year. As observed by the students, their teachers are highly competent in establishing active learning, administration/ leadership, active teaching/ responsiveness and technological aspects in the delivery of flexible teaching and learning. When the teachers are highly competent in doing their task, students on the other hand are highly engaged and satisfied to different aspects involved in the flexible learning. As a result, there is a positive significant relationship depicted between teachers' competence and students' engagement. Similarly, positive significant relationship was obtained between teacher's competence and students' engagement in flexible teaching and learning. Moreover, when teachers were able to establish active learning and technological competence in their classes it predicts high engagement among their students. Lastly, when there is active learning and teaching as well planned by the teachers it predicts more satisfied students in the administration of flexible schemes of learning the tasks.

Keywords: *Synchronous Online, Asynchronous Online, Google Classroom, Active Learning, Administration/ Leadership, Active Teaching, Technological Competence.*

Citation: MD Camilon, MB Ellamil & DA Ching (2021). Instructor's Competencies in Flexible Teaching Modalities Toward Learning Engagement and Satisfaction of College Students. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies*, 3(5), 78-88.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, instructor skills and competencies are very essential for flexible online teaching modalities, especially in intensive online contexts where instructors must work hard to establish and maintain student engagement and satisfaction. The developing institutional competency for online education postulates a methodical approach to online instructor training as well as a significant investment in staff training and development [1].

The high demand for online courses necessitates a thorough examination of the roles and competencies of instructors and professors who intend to conduct online courses. While it is true that face-to-face teaching skills such as curriculum knowledge and pedagogy translate to online settings, it is equally critical to understand the unique skills required for online teaching effectiveness, as well as the role of institutions in defining instructor tasks and responsibilities.

The challenges brought to us by the COVID-19 pandemic, which makes all institutions to adopt flexible learning modalities to strictly follow health protocols as imposed by the state [2, 3]. Most of the teaching and learning processes in every institution were challenged. There were initiatives being done and several measures were implemented to ensure that the same quality of education will still be attained by the students [4]. The situation provides potential avenues for educating students shifting from traditional face-to-face to flexible modes of synchronous and asynchronous online learning delivery [5]. Instructors and students are expected to be out of their comfort zones and step on new modes of educational process.

Teaching and learning, as well as assessment given to students has transitioned to a largely digital media as education and teaching have. Formal assessment and students' self-evaluation are both important components of the teaching and learning process, as they serve as indicators of the acquisition of vital knowledge and help students to refine

their learning practices [6]. In the light of the above statement, this study aims to determine if instructor's competencies in flexible teaching modality have a significant impact on college students' learning engagement and satisfaction.

In Laguna State Polytechnic University in San Pablo City, Laguna, Philippines, the institution prepared all the necessary plans and actions for them to be able to implement effectively their educational policy on flexible learning. Despite the challenges brought by the situation, the institution was able to continuously deliver quality education to its student-clienteles adapting new modes of teaching and learning delivery. From its face-to-face setting, the institution adapted the flexible modes of synchronous and asynchronous online learning deliveries. As a result, from the conducted pre-determined study as to the preparedness of both faculty members and students in the implementation of flexible learning, there is an enough percentage of faculty and students who has the ability to use available gadgets, desktops and laptops and available internet connections for the institution to push through on flexible learning [7]. It is evident that the institution may implement the policy. However, we have to consider some other aspects aside with what has been established. The competence of the instructors who will handle and manage flexible learning in an online set-up should be examined.

The concept of instructors competence was anchored from the concept presented by Chickering and Gamson in 1987 as cited by Bigatel, et. al. [8] concerning the seven priinciples of effective teaching that considers to encourage contact between students and faculty, develop reciprocity and cooperation among students, encourage active learning, give prompt feedback, emphasize time on task, communicate high expectations and respect diverse talents and ways on learning. These seven principles were the key areas that were analyzed to form the four competencies as observed by the students and explored by Bigatel [8] on active learning, administration/ leadership, active teaching/ responsiveness and technological competence.

Various teaching and learning processes and even the competence of the teachers should assist students in dynamic learning opportunities that advance the improvement of basic reasoning, critical thinking, and execution capacities while assisting them with accepting accountability for distinguishing and utilizing learning assets [9]. It is beneficial that the teacher who manages the class is competent enough to handle different learning opportunities of the students. When teachers are competent, students are more engaged and satisfied to learn concepts in the subject or course they are taking. When there is an effective management of students learning the executives, expanding proficiency, and other learning factors will be well managed. A scope of systems ought to be utilized to advance positive connections, participation, and deliberate learning. It ought to guarantee the dynamic and fair commitment of students in useful errands.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study is focused on evaluating the level of instructor's competency in managing flexible teaching and how it contributes to the engagement and satisfaction of the students in learning college lessons. Specifically, it aimed to:

1) Determine the level of competencies of the instructors in managing flexible classes with regard to active learning, administration/ leadership, active teaching/ responsiveness and technological competence.
2) Describe the level of engagement of the students whenever they attend flexible learning sessions.
3) Describe the level of satisfaction of the students being exposed to a flexible learning modality.
4) Find-out whether the engagement and satisfaction levels of the students significantly related to the level of competencies of the instructors in managing flexible classes.
5) Find-out whether the parameters on instructor's competencies singly or in combination predict the level of engagement of the students.
6) Find-out whether the parameters on instructor's competencies singly or in combination predict the level of satisfaction of the students.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study used descriptive and correlational research designs. The researchers were able to describe the level of competence of the instructors using the parameters established in the study of Bigatel, et. al. [8] and adopted their questionnaires considering the active learning, administration/ leadership, active teaching/ responsiveness and technological competence. In addition, the study also determines the level of engagement and satisfaction of the students which both of the variable instruments were adopted from the study of Commissiong [10]. The instruments used were analyzed by the researchers as to how it fits to the condition and qualities of the instructors and students to be subjected in the study. The study was conducted during the first year of implementation of the flexible learning modes on synchronous and asynchronous online learning sessions as established in the policy of Laguna State polytechnic University in San Pablo City, academic year 2020-2021.

Table 1: Profile of the Respondents

Profile	College

		CCJE	CCS	CTE
College	Respondents per College	40	12	81
Gadget Used at Home for Online Learning	Cellphone	38	12	76
	Desktop Computer	2	1	4
	Tablet	0	0	1
	Laptop	6	3	26
Internet Connection at Home	Digital Subscriber Line (DSL)	1	1	4
	Fiber Connection	14	6	32
	Wifi Connection from Neighbor	5	1	10
	Wireless Broadband/ Mobile Data	26	5	40

The respondents who participated in the study are 40 college students from the Criminal Justice Education, 12 from Computer Studies and 81 from the Teacher Education who were selected at random handled in a course subject by the researcher. They are the students who attended synchronous and synchronous sessions during flexible learning implementation of the school. Whenever they attend online classes most of them utilized their mobile phone which is handy that can easily navigate their learning materials. Most of them rely on their wireless broadband and mobile data during online classes since there are promos provided which are cost effective for them.

As to the statistical analyses used in the study, mean and standard deviations were used to describe the variables set. In response to the inferential objective on analyzing whether the engagement and satisfaction levels of the students significantly related to the level of competencies of the instructors in managing flexible classes, Pearson product moment correlation was used. Lastly in response to the hypothesis of the study on significant prediction, multiple linear regression was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researchers explored the level of competence of the instructors based on how they were able to establish active learning, administration/ leadership, active teaching/ responsiveness and technological competence. The next tables indicate students perspective as they assessed their instructors considering the components.

It can be gleaned from Table 2 that instructors were highly competent in managing their flexible classes on active learning with ($\bar{x}$ =4.55). It simply implies that instructors established active learning by showing respect among students in his/her communications, facilitates learning activities to construct explanations, encourages to share their knowledge and expertise with the learning community, participate in discussion forums, encourages to interact with others by individual or group task and provides resources for them to go deeper into the content of the course.

Table 2: Instructor's Level of Competencies on Active Learning

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
The Instructor…			
1. encourages students to interact with each other by assigning individual/group tasks and projects, where appropriate.	4.57	0.59	HC
2. includes individual/ group assignments where appropriate.	4.52	0.62	HC
3. encourages students to share their knowledge and expertise with the learning community.	4.59	0.59	HC
4. encourages students to participate in discussion forums.	4.56	0.60	HC
5. provides opportunities for hands-on practice so that students can apply learned knowledge to the real-world.	4.45	0.70	C
6. provides additional resources that encourage students to go deeper into the content of the course.	4.53	0.63	HC
7. facilitates learning activities that help students explain ideas.	4.59	0.54	HC
8. uses assessment tool appropriate to determine my proficiencies.	4.49	0.62	C
9. shows respect to students in his/her communications.	4.62	0.57	HC
Overall	4.55	0.49	HC

Legend: *4.50-5.00 Highly Competent (HC), 3.50-4.49 Competent (C), 2.50-3.49 Moderately Competent (MC), 1.50-2.49 Less Competent (LC), 1.00-1.49 Not Competent (NC)*

It is very evident that instructor's level of competencies on active learning truly encourages and leads to engagement as well as satisfaction among college students. A quantitative analysis utilizing a regression analysis approach provided strong evidence that active learning has an impact on professional competencies. A qualitative analysis further revealed that active knowledge with high engagement in learning tasks and a collaborative learning culture were important modes of active learning [11]. This is also parallel to the study of Shin, et. al, [12] that an active learning technique can aid undergraduate students in gaining competencies. In addition, research studies had a significantly larger impact on student teacher's professional competencies when they had active learning experiences as well. Research studies and active learning jointly predicted 33% of teachers professional development concepts and 25% of ethical thinking in the teaching profession; active learning added value to all competency categories [13].

Table 3: Instructor's Level of Competencies on Administration/ Leadership

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
The instructor…			
1. makes grading visible for student tracking purposes.	4.43	0.71	C
2. clearly communicates expected student behaviors.	4.47	0.58	C
3. is proficient in the chosen course management system.	4.50	0.61	HC
4. adheres to the university's policies on Flexible Learning	4.57	0.57	HC
5. integrates the use of technology that is meaningfulto students.	4.53	0.61	HC
Overall	4.50	0.51	HC

Legend: *4.50-5.00 Highly Competent (HC), 3.50-4.49 Competent (C), 2.50-3.49 Moderately Competent (MC), 1.50-2.49 Less Competent (LC), 1.00-1.49 Not Competent (NC)*

Table 3 presents the level of competencies college instructors on administration and leadership. It simply implies that administration and leadership is highly competent among college instructors with ($\bar{x}$ =4.50). That is, instructors adhere to the university's policies on flexible learning, integrates the use of technology that is meaningful and relevant to students and proficient in the chosen course management system.

The instructor's crucial role as the director of the teaching and learning process is recognized in the second competency which is Administration/Leadership. This competency's specific activities represent the same level of leadership, supervision, and class management that would be anticipated in a traditional face-to-face classroom, such as behavior control and transparent grading [8]. According to the study's results, senior management in schools does not utilize a unique leadership paradigm. However, it was also shown that, regardless of the leadership model employed in schools, top management must be confident, competent, and self-managing in order to properly encourage workers. As a result, the study suggest that in order to be competent and effective motivators, school senior managers should be able to recognize internal and extrinsic motivational elements [14]. Indeed, it is evident in this study that teachers paid the greatest attention to communication, empathy, and initiative throughout the study, and these are the psychological traits that leaders need to change the most, regardless of their preferred leadership style. The research's main suggestions were to have a caring management style and to provide assistance for instructors [15].

Table 4: Instructor's Level of Competencies on Active Teaching/ Responsiveness

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
The Instructor…			
1. provides prompt, helpful feedback on assignments and exams that enhances learning.	4.48	0.62	C
2. provides clear, detailed feedback on assignments and exams that enhances the learning experience.	4.46	0.66	C
3. shows caring and concern that students are learning the course.	4.61	0.63	HC
4. helps keep the course participants on task.	4.56	0.62	HC
5. uses appropriate strategies to manage the online workload.	4.55	0.61	HC
Overall	4.53	0.54	HC

Legend: *4.50-5.00 Highly Competent (HC), 3.50-4.49 Competent (C), 2.50-3.49 Moderately Competent (MC), 1.50-2.49 Less Competent (LC), 1.00-1.49 Not Competent (NC)*

Table 4 shows the level of competencies of college instructors on active teaching and responsiveness. It simply connotes that instructor is highly competent on active teaching and responsiveness among college students with ($\bar{x}$ =4.53). It could be gleaned from this table that college instructors shows caring and concern that students are learning

the course content, helps keep the course participants on task, and uses appropriate strategies to manage the online workload.

The study describes the vital role of the online instructor as the "connection" between the student and his or her learning system, which is reflected in the term "active teaching/responsiveness." This competency's behaviors' describe features of responsiveness, feedback quality, and the need of having a caring approach and care for student achievement. The Community of Inquiry paradigm, for example, reflects this competency (COI). In order to enhance student success, the Teacher Presence dimension of this paradigm highlights the necessity for the online instructor to be visible, active, and responsive to the online learner; it is also linked to the cognitive and social aspects of the learning experience. Although, the Active Teaching/Responsiveness skill is closely similar to the Active Learning competency, it covers more instructor actions and responsibilities and emphasizes the instructor's role as a visible presence in class activities [8]. For instance, Kavanagh, et.al., [16] qualitative case study was inspired by a desire to explore if and how practice base method to teacher development may assist to instructors in practicing responsiveness rather than decontextualized movements. To that aim, we looked into how early-career teachers were helped to resemble teaching practice in a practice based professional development program. We investigated how well approximations of practice helped teachers improved their ability to respond to students ideas. The findings highlighted features of approximations of practice that helped teachers improve their ability to deliver responsive teaching. Program design, teacher educator pedagogy, and future research are all impacted by these findings. Indeed, it is evident in this study that the ability of inexperienced teachers to identify the substance of students' thinking and respond in beneficial ways is a crucial characteristic to measure. In science and engineering education, where students' initial, distinctive beliefs and practices determine the chance that particular teaching tactics will help them learn, this teacher noticing is especially crucial [17].

Table 5: Instructor's Technological Competence

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
The Instructor…			
1. uses a variety of multimedia technologies to achieve objectives.	4.48	0.61	C
2. uses multimedia technologies that are appropriate for the learning.	4.57	0.55	HC
3. is proficient with the technologies used in the online classroom.	4.47	0.63	C
4. is confident with the technology used in the course.	4.51	0.56	HC
Overall	4.51	0.50	HC

Legend: *4.50-5.00 Highly Competent (HC), 3.50-4.49 Competent (C), 2.50-3.49 Moderately Competent (MC), 1.50-2.49 Less Competent (LC), 1.00-1.49 Not Competent (NC)*

It could be gleaned from Table 5 the level of competencies of instructors in terms of technological competence. It pertains that instructor's level of competencies on technological competence is highly competent with ($\bar{x}$=4.51). It shows that college instructors' uses multimedia technologies that are appropriate for the learning activities, and is confident with the technology used in the course.

Technological Competence, which is widely regarded as a vital component of online course instructor preparation, was also ranked highly competent among other competences. This study was contrary to the study of Bigatel, et. al. [8], that the actions associated with this skill shows the importance of sufficient instructor preparation for the technological learning system, as well as subsequent instructor trust in these technologies. It's unclear why this competency didn't rank higher on the list unless survey respondents assumed the online instructor would already have the requisite technological abilities. On the other hand, this study is supported by De la Rama, et. al., [18], that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which rendered traditional classroom instruction an impossible mode of delivering education, the educational system in the Philippines is rapidly embracing virtual teaching. As a result, determining instructors' attitudes regarding virtual science teaching, technological ability, and access becomes a vital requirement. Likewise, teachers should be able to use information and communication technology (ICT) effectively in order to live, learn, and work productively in an increasingly complex and information-rich world. Today's teachers must be prepared to provide enriched learning possibilities in ICT to their students. Preparation for ICT use and comprehension of how technologies might help student learning should be part of every teacher's professional repertoire [19].

Table 6: Students' Level of Engagement

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
As a student who works in Flexible Learning mode, I…			
1. Apply critical thinking skills to the course activities	4.49	0.64	E
2. Integrate their own views with that of others when learning.	4.47	0.66	E
3. Indicate that they prepare study notes to understand the course.	4.43	0.67	E

4. Apply their learning of the course material to real-life situations	4.56	0.57	HE
5. Interact with the instructor at least once a week about the course	4.48	0.68	E
6. Obtain meaningful feedback on assignments I accomplished.	4.49	0.64	E
7. Understand difficult concepts and content better after interacting with the instructor	4.50	0.61	HE
8. Collaborate with peers in a one-to-one or group relationship	4.44	0.67	E
9. Interact with peers on mastering the course at least once a week	4.40	0.73	E
10. Respect peer differences	4.65	0.54	HE
11. Utilize the online learning space to participate in the activities	4.59	0.58	HE
Overall	4.50	0.50	HE

Legend: *4.50-5.00 Highly Engaged (HE), 3.50-4.49 Engaged (E), 2.50-3.49 Moderately Engaged (ME), 1.50-2.49 Less Engaged (LE), 1.00-1.49 Not Engaged (NE)*

Table 6 shows the level of engagement of college students in flexible learning through their instructors' flexible teaching modalities. It simply implies that college students are highly engaged in flexible learning with ($\bar{x}$=4.50). It shows that college students respect peer differences, utilize the online learning space to participate in the course activities, apply their learning of the course material to real-life situations, and understand difficult concepts and content better after interacting with the instructor.

This is parallel to the findings of Chakraborty, M., & Nafukho, F.M., [20], that study highlighted a number of elements that can help online learners have more engaging learning experiences. The most important criteria are: developing and sustaining a good learning environment; forming a learning community; providing regular and timely feedback; and employing the appropriate technology to deliver the appropriate information. Additionally, the findings suggested that online activities and tools such as multimedia and discussion boards may increase emotional engagement in online learning, but not necessarily behavioral or cognitive engagement, that educators should identify students who are taking online courses for the first time and provide necessary technical assistance to increase their emotional engagement, and that educators should identify students who are taking online courses for the first time and provide necessary technical help to increase their emotional engagement [21]. However, the current research looks on the impact of mobile technologies and computer-assisted collaboration on student learning habits and engagement. A quasi-experimental study assessed the influence of H&N learning on student engagement and academic achievement using Facebook as the mobile collaboration platform. While all students in the study engaged in face-to-face, in-class cooperation, the data suggest that providing students with the choice of out-of-class H&N learning supported by mobile technology has a favorable influence on participation (actual learning behavior) and perceived engagement [22]

Table 7: Students' Level of Satisfaction

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
As a student who works in a Flexible Learning mode, I am satisfied with the…			
1. Quality of learning experiences	4.41	0.66	S
2. Quality of learning materials used.	4.40	0.66	S
3. Alignment of course activities to the course objectives	4.47	0.61	S
4. Interactions with instructors	4.47	0.68	S
5. Interaction with Peers	4.39	0.72	S
6. Orientation program provided for flexible learning	4.50	0.59	HS
7. Online learning platform used.	4.50	0.59	HS
Overall	4.45	0.53	S

Legend: *4.50-5.00 Highly Satisfied (HS), 3.50-4.49 Satisfied (S), 2.50-3.49 Moderately Satisfied (MS), 1.50-2.49 Less Satisfied (LS), 1.00-1.49 Not Satisfied (NS)*

It can be gleaned from Table 7 the level of satisfaction among college students in flexible learning through their instructors' flexible teaching modalities. It simply implies that college students are satisfied in flexible learning with ($\bar{x}$ =4.45). It shows that college students are using online platforms and they were being provided though an orientation program for flexible learning. This same finding was supported by Siming (2015), that there is a growing need to comprehend the aspects that influence student learning satisfaction. Every student's motivation and satisfaction are different. Some students are motivated by a sense of success, while others are motivated by a desire to serve others.

Personal ideals, interaction to other students using internet connections and psychological needs fulfillment are all sources of satisfaction for students.

The significance of assessing student satisfaction with college offerings has progressed beyond academic debate. Increased rivalry among higher education institutions, reduced state financing, increased focus by governing bodies on institutional accountability, and changes in student demographics have all contributed to a developing climate of private inquiry into higher education institutions. Furthermore, student satisfaction is a feeling of delight or pleasure that comes from achieving something or receiving something that you desired [23]. This is also parallel with the study of Tan, et. al. [24], that the level of interaction a student encounters while participating with the online learning system is related to the level of happiness that students have with the online learning system. Student happiness and satisfaction would be enhanced through fascinating functionalities and information provided on the online learning system, as well as proactive engagement between learners and instructors through optimal use of the online learning system's functions. The availability of audio and visual accompaniment in the online learning system will pique interest in using the online learning system as a tool for knowledge transfer.

Table 8: Correlation on Level of Competencies of the Instructors to the Engagement and Satisfaction Levels of the Students

Teacher's Competency	Learning Engagement	Learning Satisfaction
Active Learning	.794**	.683**
Administration/ Leadership	.779**	.688**
Active Teaching/ Responsiveness	.709**	.695**
Technological Competence	.709**	.625**

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

As observed in the given table, there is a positive significant relationship between the teacher's competencies and learning engagement of the students. This imply that when teachers are highly competent that they were able to establish in their classes the sense of active learning primarily in the tasks or activities provided to them, students will be more engage in learning the lessons [25, 26]. There were learning interactions in doing the tasks as established during synchronous learning sessions where students talk to their classmates for a more active participation which evidently shows that they are engaged. Moreover, it is observed that when teachers are highly competent in showcasing true leadership qualities in leading the class, students tend to be more engaged in the classroom [27, 28]. Considering that the teachers were able to manage effectively their google classroom and properly organized their modules and other assignments given, students were able to navigate and actively engage themselves to accomplish those. Furthermore, when teachers actively teach students well and are responsive to their students need, better engagement among the students is expected [29, 30]. The efforts exerted by the teachers of being responsive to several tasks that they provide even if it takes additional hours of working would create active engagement of the students in learning the lessons. Lastly, when teacher is highly competent in utilizing several technological devices and application whenever they meet their students ensures better learning engagement among students [31, 32].

It is also revealed in the study that there is a positive significant relationship between the competencies of the instructors and the learning satisfaction of the students. When the instructors showcase a highly competent level of competence in active learning, administration/ leadership, active teaching/ responsiveness and technological competence it makes the students realize that they are satisfied in the flexible learning modality as implemented by the institution. In posting active learning to students, the instructors tend to show respect whenever they talk to students especially when they ask them to share ideas and prior knowledge based from the topic being discussed, with this, students felt more satisfied in learning the concept [33]. When it comes to the leadership of the teachers, they ensure that they follow effectively the policies implemented by the institution and integrate technology meaningfully as they lead the students to be more satisfied in the learning scheme [34]. Moreover, when teachers are responsive to their students particularly that it makes students felt being cared and concerned in learning the course helps them be satisfied in the flexible learning class [35]. Lastly, when teachers use multimedia technologies that are appropriate to the learning activities, it moves the students learning to a satisfactory level [36].

Table 9: Significant Prediction on Instructor's Level of Competencies to Students' Level of Engagement

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.

	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.287	.244		1.175	.242
Active Learning	.448	.090	.438	5.000	.000
Technological Competence	.214	.080	.213	2.662	.009

Adj. R^2 = .698 *Dependent Variable: Level of Engagement*

F(4,128)=77.388

p<0.01

N=133

Regression Equation: LE = .448AL+.214TC+.287

where LE= Level of Engagement; AL= Active Learning and TC= Technological Competence

A multiple linear regression was conducted with the level of engagement as the dependent variable and the instructor's competenceas independent variables. The multiple regression analysis revealed that established active learning and technological competence of the instructors contributed significantly to the regression model F (4,128) = 77.388, p < .01 and accounted for 69.8% of the variation in the level of engagement. The equation above further justifies that for every .448 units increase in the established active learning as managed by the instructors, there is a one unit increase in the level of engagement of the students keeping other factors constant. The instructors as observed by the students facilitates learning activities posted in their google classrooms which allow students to construct explanations. It is an activity that involves critical thinking which is continuously enjoyed by the students. If the students felt that they are actively involved in the learning scheme and their outputs in the subjects played an important aspect for them to pass the subject it allows them to be more engaged in dealing with it. The activities posted by the instructors which challenges students critical thinking for them to think with creativity and innovative perspectives to attain better outcomes is one of the key determinants that make students be engaged in learning [37].

On the other hand, for every .214 units increase in the technological competence of the instructors there us a one unit increase in the level of engagement of the students keeping other factors constant. The instructors in the campus shows high level of proficiency in using technology whenever they do synchronous and asynchronous online learning sessions with their students. And it is manifested in the table that one of the determinants of students engagement is how they view their instructors to be proficient in employing teaching and learning process with the aid of technology. Apart from the knowledge of the instructors in using technology through Microsoft word in preparing their modules, its uploading to the google classroom for dissemination to their students and meeting their students via google meet during synchronous lessons, instructors use other online and offline learning applications to aid their discussion of the topic. It is evident that through this, the students would be more engage in learning the lessons [38].

Table 9: Significant Prediction on Instructor's Level of Competencies to Students' Level of Satisfaction

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	.561	.310		1.808	.073
Active Learning	.303	.114	.283	2.663	.009
Active Teaching/ Responsiveness	.309	.096	.318	3.230	.002

Adj. R^2 = .556 *Dependent Variable: Level of Satisfaction*

F(4,128)=42.334

p<0.01

N=133

Regression Equation: LS = .303AL+.309ATR+.561

where LS= Level of Satisfaction; AL= Active Learning and ATR= Active Teaching/ Responsiveness

Another multiple linear regression was conducted with the level of satisfaction as the dependent variable and the instructor's competence as independent variables. The multiple regression analysis revealed that established active learning and active teaching of the instructors contributed significantly to the regression model F (4,128) = 42.334, p < .01 and accounted for 55.6% of the variation in the level of satisfaction. The equation above further justifies that for every .561 units increase in the established active learning as managed by the instructors, there is a one unit increase in the level of satisfaction of the students keeping other factors constant. Students' interaction is necessary to post active

learning among students. The instructors ensure that for every activity that they give to students, there should always be interaction to be established, either its interaction between one student to another or between the student to the instructors. The interaction was done during synchronous online learning when it comes to group activity or students' recitation with the teacher [39, 40]. These actions taken by the instructors whenever they interact with their students posted higher level of learning satisfaction.

Lastly, if there is .309 units increase in the active teaching among the instructors, it enables one unit increase in the learning satisfaction of the students in the flexible learning modality. It is necessary as well that teachers were able to manage effectively their flexible learning sessions with students considering that they can provide helpful feedback to the outputs submitted by the students. When students felt that their outputs are important and they earn credits from it, they become more satisfied with the rendered quality education of the instructors. Right after the activities were submitted and the examinations were taken by the students, the instructors do their part on providing relevant feedback to students output which makes them more satisfied to receive better grades [41].

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is important that every institution has to determine the capability and competence of their teachers in handling online classes or whatever their have incorporated in the delivery of their flexible learning during this pandemic. In this study, it resulted that the instructors who were observed by their students posted that they are highly competent in the delivery of flexible learning by establishing active learning, administration/ leadership, active teaching/ responsiveness and technological competence. They are the teachers who can interact well with their students showing respect to assist students in attaining their learning goals. They are the instructors as well who follows efficiently the policies imposed by the institution showcasing good qualities of being an online classroom leader. They provide useful and relevant feedback to learning output which make students feel more engages and satisfied in the learning process. And they are the teachers who are proficient when it comes to the use of technology in the online classroom considering that they were able to utilize online and offline learning applications.

When it comes to the learning engagement of the students upon exposure to the flexible learning of synchronous and asynchronous online learning, they are highly engaged in learning the lessons. Their engagement was observed to respect individual differences between and among their classmates and were able to apply what they have learned in school to real-life situations. They actively participate to synchronous online discussion and have utilized effectively their learning spaces and resources at home.

Students were found to be satisfied in the flexible learning delivery of the institution as facilitated by their instructors. Through an orientation given to them, they were able to understand fully the processes they have to take as they attend synchronous and asynchronous online learning with their professors. Students are much satisfied with the online learning platform used by the institution particularly the google classroom, for all the learning guides, materials and activities were posted and logically organized.

As a result, there is a positive significant relationship depicted between teachers' competence and students' engagement. Similarly, positive significant relationship was obtained between teacher's competence and students' engagement in flexible teaching and learning. Moreover, when teachers were able to establish active learning and technological competence in their classes it predicts high engagement among their students. Lastly, when there is active learning and teaching as well planned by the teachers it predicts more satisfied students in the administration of flexible schemes of learning the tasks.

Educational institutions have to continuously monitor the implementation of the flexible learning during these early years of educational reform due to COVID. They have to ensure that their teachers are competent enough to handle teaching and learning situations and its arising concerns for them to be viewed effective educators. Trainings and re-orientations be done before the semester starts for teacher to become ore equipped as they face their students in online classes. Institutional policy on instruction should always be relevant to the instructional effectiveness and needs of the students. With all these, students will always be engaged and satisfied in the delivery of flexible learning.

REFERENCES

1. Gregory, M. S. J., & Lodge, J. M. (2015). Academic workload: the silent barrier to the implementation of technology-enhanced learning strategies in higher education. *Distance education*, *36*(2), 210-230.
2. Schleicher, A. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on education insights from education at a glance 2020. *Retrieved from oecd. org website: https://www. oecd. org/education/the-impact-of-covid-19-on-education-insights-education-at-a-glance-2020. pdf.*
3. Reimers, F. M., & Schleicher, A. (2020). A framework to guide an education response to the COVID-19 Pandemic of 2020. *OECD. Retrieved April*, *14*(2020), 2020-04.

4. De Giusti, A. (2020). Policy Brief: Education during COVID-19 and beyond. *Revista Iberoamericana de Tecnología En Educación y Educación En Tecnología*, (26), e12-e12.
5. 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.
6. Colthorpe, K., Sharifirad, T., Ainscough, L., Anderson, S., & Zimbardi, K. (2018). Prompting undergraduate students' metacognition of learning: implementing 'meta-learning'assessment tasks in the biomedical sciences. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(2), 272-285.
7. Callo, E. C., & Yazon, A. D. (2020). Exploring the factors influencing the readiness of faculty and students on online teaching and learning as an alternative delivery mode for the new normal. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(8), 3509-3518.
8. Bigatel, P. M., Ragan, L. C., Kennan, S., May, J., & Redmond, B. F. (2012). The identification of competencies for online teaching success. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *16*(1), 59-77.
9. Nessipbayeva, O. (2012). The Competencies of the Modern Teacher. *Bulgarian Comparative Education Society*.
10. Commissiong, M. A. (2020). *Student Engagement, Self-Regulation, Satisfaction, and Success in Online Learning Environments* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
11. Niemi, H., Nevgi, A., & Aksit, F. (2016). Active learning promoting student teachers' professional competences in Finland and Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(4), 471-490.
12. Shin, H., Sok, S., Hyun, K. S., & Kim, M. J. (2015). Competency and an active learning program in undergraduate nursing education. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *71*(3), 591-598.
13. Niemi, H., & Nevgi, A. (2014). Research studies and active learning promoting professional competences in Finnish teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *43*, 131-142.
14. Mphale, L. M. (2014). Leadership capability model for motivating junior secondary school teachers in Botswana.
15. Aslanargun, E. (2015). Teachers' expectations and school administration: Keys of better communication in schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *15*(60), 17-34.
16. Kavanagh, S. S., Metz, M., Hauser, M., Fogo, B., Taylor, M. W., & Carlson, J. (2020). Practicing responsiveness: Using approximations of teaching to develop teachers' responsiveness to students' ideas. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *71*(1), 94-107.
17. Dalvi, T., & Wendell, K. (2017). Using student video cases to assess pre-service elementary teachers' engineering teaching responsiveness. *Research in Science Education*, *47*(5), 1101-1125.
18. De la Rama, J. M., Sabases, M., Antonion, A. F., Ricohermoso, C., Torres, J. M., Devanadera, A., ... & Alieto, E. (2020). Virtual teaching as the'new norm': Analyzing science teachers' attitude toward online teaching, technological competence and access. *De la Rama, J., Sabasales, M., Antonio, A., Ricohermoso, C., Torres, J., Devanadera, A., & Alieto, E.(2020). Virtual Teaching as the'New Norm': Analyzing Science Teachers' Attitude toward Online Teaching, Technological Competence and Access. International Journal of Advanced Science and Technolog*.
19. Castillo, J. G. D., Herrera, P. J. C., Carrillo, J. A. O., & McCalman, D. G. (2016). Raising the technological competence of high school science and mathematics teachers of Mexico through delivery of an online program. *International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management*, *16*(2), 163-180.
20. Chakraborty, M., & Nafukho, F. M. (2014). Strengthening student engagement: what do students want in online courses?. *European Journal of Training and Development*.
21. Sun, J. C. Y., & Rueda, R. (2012). Situational interest, computer self-efficacy and self-regulation: Their impact on student engagement in distance education. *British journal of educational technology*, *43*(2), 191-204.
22. Northey, G., Govind, R., Bucic, T., Chylinski, M., Dolan, R., & van Esch, P. (2018). The effect of "here and now" learning on student engagement and academic achievement. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *49*(2), 321-333.
23. Van Truong, H., Pham, C. H., & Vo, N. H. (2016). Service quality and students level of satisfaction in private colleges in Vietnam. *International Journal of Financial Research*, *7*(3), 121-128.
24. Tan, S., Chuah, F., & Ting, H. (2016). Factors affecting university students' satisfaction on online learning system. In *TARC International Conference On Learning & Teaching* (Vol. 2016, pp. 17-20).
25. Brame, C. (2016). Active learning. *Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching*.
26. Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. *Online Learning*, *22*(1), 205-222.
27. Angelle, F. (2018). Leadership For Student Engagement.
28. Yusof, H., Kanvidi, K., Jalil, N. A., Noor, M. A. M., & Mansor, M. (2018). Teachers' Readiness to be Leaders and its Relationship with Students' Engagement in the Classroom. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *8*(4), 1011-1022.
29. Arjomandi, A., Seufert, J. H., O'Brien, M. J., & Anwar, S. (2018). Active teaching strategies and student engagement: A comparison of traditional and non-traditional business students.
30. Khan, A., Egbue, O., Palkie, B., & Madden, J. (2017). Active learning: Engaging students to maximize learning in an online course. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, *15*(2), pp107-115.

31. Harris, J., & Al-Bataineh, A. (2015, April). One to one technology and its effect on student academic achievement and motivation. In *Global Learn* (pp. 579-584). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
32. Francis, J. (2017). The effects of technology on student motivation and engagement in classroom-based learning.
33. Hyun, J., Ediger, R., & Lee, D. (2017). Students' Satisfaction on Their Learning Process in Active Learning and Traditional Classrooms. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *29*(1), 108-118.
34. Loton, D., Parker, P., Stein, C., & Gauci, S. (2020). Remote learning during COVID-19: Student satisfaction and performance.
35. Narinasamy, I. (2018). The Need to Care: Students' Perceptions of Teacher's Caring Behaviour. In *Conference: Asia-Pacific Network for Moral Education, At Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan. https://www. researchgate. net/publication* (Vol. 326668365).
36. Tjørve, K., Erik, S., Bjørg, M., Åshild F, K., Neil, F., & Stian, E. (2010). The use of technology in teaching: student satisfaction and perceived learning.
37. Murawski, L. M. (2014). Critical Thinking in the Classroom… and Beyond. *Journal of Learning in Higher Education*, *10*(1), 25-30.
38. Stern, J. (2018). Introduction to online teaching and learning. *International Journal of Science Education*, *3*(1), 1-10.
39. Hatta, P., Aristyagama, Y., Yuana, R., & Yulisetiani, S. (2020). Active Learning Strategies in Synchronous Online Learning for Elementary School Students. *Indonesian Journal of Informatics Education*, *4*(2).
40. Hurst, B., Wallace, R. R., & Nixon, S. B. (2013). The impact of social interaction on student learning. *Reading Horizons*.
41. Jeffrey, L. M., Milne, J., Suddaby, G., & Higgins, A. (2014). Blended learning: How teachers balance the blend of online and classroom components. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, *13*.