Tuning Journal for Higher Education

Student and Teacher perceptions and experiences: How do they align?

ARTICLES

Tourism and hospitality management faculty satisfaction towards flexible learning: A cross-sectional survey from higher educational institutions in Central Luzon, Philippines

John Paul Miranda and Maria Anna D. Cruz

Tourism and hospitality management faculty satisfaction towards flexible learning: A cross-sectional survey from higher educational institutions in Central Luzon, Philippines

John Paul Miranda and Maria Anna D. Cruz*

Abstract: The present study aimed to assess faculty satisfaction on the delivery of tourism and hospitality management programs in the flexible learning mode at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. It employed a purposive sampling design where 85 Tourism and Hospitality Management (THM) faculty members, across 27 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the Central Luzon, Philippines, participated. While findings indicate that the faculty members are generally satisfied with the conduct of flexible learning in their institutions, they generally agree on items relating to having higher workloads, longer preparation time for a course, lack of human interaction by not seeing students face-to-face, lower participation of students, technical and connectivity problems, and the need to employ creativity and resourcefulness in the development of learning aids. As the better normal ushers in, flexible learning will still be implemented with the addition of limited face-to-face delivery. As such, faculty members play a vital role in the success of program delivery. That is, when they are satisfied with their conditions, students perform better which leads to better learning and outcome. Effective institutional support services are thus key to ensuring quality flexible learning environments. For continuous improvement, recommended actions should constantly be

* **John Paul P. Miranda** (corresponding author, jppmiranda@dhvsu.edu.ph)**, MIT,** is an assistant professor at Don Honorio Ventura State University (DHVSU), Mexico Campus in the Philippines, where he is presently the Program Head for International Linkages and Partnerships for the Office for International Partnerships and Programs.

Maria Anna D. Cruz (madcruz@dhvsu.edu.ph), PhD, has recently joined the roster of THM faculty at the Don Honorio Ventura State University (DHVSU), Mexico Campus, Philippines. Her fields of interests include tourism and hospitality management and culinary arts.

More information about the authors is available at the end of this article.

reviewed, modified, and enhanced to respond to uncertainties and the changing times. HEIs need to recalibrate their curriculum grounded on a deeper understanding of flexible learning to address these challenges; capacitate the faculty with innovations available to enhance student engagement; upgrade infrastructure designed to provide timely feedback and to ease out connectivity issues; and lastly, review policies on faculty workload and number of preparations to consider longer preparation time.

Keywords: Faculty satisfaction; flexible learning; tourism and hospitality education; COVID-19; higher education; Philippines.

I. Introduction

Flexible learning has been the norm since March of 2020 following the Philippine Commission on Higher Education's (CHED) pronouncement that the country's education system would adapt the flexible learning approach. This is part of the national government's stringent measures to thwart the still-raging COVID-19 virus and its multiple variants which were proven to be deadlier and more transmissible. In higher learning institutions, although students and teachers may have acclimatized themselves to this sudden shift, the concept of "one-size-fits-all" may not thoroughly apply to tourism and hospitality education. Similar to medical, allied health, engineering, and information technology programs, tourism and hospitality management programs are skills-based. They involve hands-on laboratory activities that cannot be delivered virtually,[1] and require experiential learning,[2] as the Filipino brand of service and hospitality is inculcated to the next generation of tourism professionals.[3]

Concluding one academic year of conducting mostly synchronous and asynchronous modalities of flexible learning for tourism and hospitality management programs, both students and faculty members are rearing to return to their colleges and universities. Flexible learning is defined as an all-encompassing term used to illustrate the design and delivery of programs and learning interventions that accommodates a variety of student needs in terms of learning styles and allows affordances and customizability of the students' learning experiences. The term is often erroneously used and interchanged with other terms such as "open learning," "distance learning," "work-based learning," as well as "e-learning," which are all modalities under flexible

---

[1] De Vera III, "Expansion of Limited Face-to-Face Classes to Other Degree Programs Approved by PRRD - CHED [Press Release]."

[2] Sebby and Brown, "Experiential Learning in Hospitality Management Curriculum: Case Study in Rural Southeast U.S."

[3] Department of Tourism Philippines, "DOT Banners 'Filipino Brand of Service'; Assists over 35,000 Tourists amid Pandemic."

learning as they provide flexibility to learners in relation to where and when they may choose to access content of their lessons as well as how fast or slow they complete a lesson/module. In light of the COVID-19 pandemic, CHED, through memorandum number 4 series of 2020, further reiterates that flexible learning can ensure the inclusivity and accessibility of education to students with the help of digital and non-digital technologies when other modes of learning (i.e., in-classroom learning) are not feasible due to national crisis.[4]

Faculty satisfaction is a fundamental element in the delivery of quality education be it in the traditional face-to-face, limited face-to-face, or flexible learning mode.[5] Stickney et al.[6] further confirm that higher education faculty who teach online are generally satisfied and their satisfaction is found to be linked to suitable training received and the flexibility in terms of schedule. Similarly, Eom and Ashill[7] agree that faculty are a critical factor in the success of online learning. Moreover, Hebert[8] emphasizes that satisfaction of faculty boosts morale which influences behavior, productivity and quality of teaching which leads to student satisfaction and program quality. Similarly, Toropova et al.[9] emphasize that students are ultimately affected by how teachers are satisfied with their job. Ultimately, positive job satisfaction among teachers is beneficial not only to the teacher but also to their students.[10]

More studies have delved on student satisfaction[11] and performance in online learning and/or student readiness to adapt to the new normal[12] as compared to the

---

[4] Gocotano et al., "Higher Education Student's Challenges on Flexible Online Learning Implementation in the Rural Areas: A Philippine Case."

[5] Al-Zahrani, "Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching in Saudi Arabia's Higher Education Institutions"; Blundell, Castañeda, and Lee, "A Multi-Institutional Study of Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning."

[6] Stickney et al., "Online Higher Education: Faculty Satisfaction and Its Antecedents."

[7] Eom and Ashill, "The Determinants of Students' Perceived Learning Outcomes and Satisfaction in University Online Education: An Update*."

[8] Hebert, "Faculty Morale: A Perspective for Academic Leaders."

[9] Toropova, Myrberg, and Johansson, "Teacher Job Satisfaction: The Importance of School Working Conditions and Teacher Characteristics."

[10] Olmos-Gómez et al., "Quality in Higher Education and Satisfaction among Professors and Students"; Ortan, Simut, and Simut, "Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction and Teacher Well-Being in the K-12 Educational System."

[11] Hettiarachchi et al., "Student Satisfaction with Online Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Study at State Universities in Sri Lanka"; Elshami et al., "Satisfaction with Online Learning in the New Normal: Perspective of Students and Faculty at Medical and Health Sciences Colleges"; Dachner and Saxton, "If You Don't Care, Then Why Should I? The Influence of Instructor Commitment on Student Satisfaction and Commitment."

[12] Aboagye, Yawson, and Appiah, "COVID-19 and E-Learning: The Challenges of Students in Tertiary Institutions"; Almusharraf and Khahro, "Students Satisfaction with Online Learning Experiences during the COVID-19 Pandemic."

studies on the plight of the faculty. When the COVID-19 pandemic caused schools to suddenly close, the unforeseen and abrupt shift to flexible learning modalities instantaneously required teachers to manage the challenges of "distance learning" with varying degrees of structure, training, and support.[13]

Despite some research findings stating that learning outcomes in an online learning modality is comparable to that of the traditional face-to-face modality,[14] and current reports championing online education, researchers are still questioning its efficacy.[15] Research is still being conducted on the effectiveness of online teaching in spite of study results/findings that claim otherwise, particularly by that of Wingo et al.[16] on faculty perceptions about teaching online which reported faculty concerns regarding online teaching, such as frustrations with technical issues, faculty workload, and students' (lack of) access to technology, to name a few.

As faculty satisfaction is named as one of the five pillars of quality online education in the "Sloan Consortium Report to the Nation: Five Pillars of Quality Online Education" in 2002, faculty satisfaction being a vital contributor to the delivery of quality online courses could not be discounted.[17] Suffice it to say, faculty satisfaction and student outcomes converge when predicting success not only of online programs but of flexible learning modalities as well.

In this particular study, the THM programs were singled-out because of the nature of their course delivery where hands-on activities are supplemental in the learning process and are deemed essential in a people and service-oriented industry. Relative to this, CHED Commissioner Prospero De Vera III[18] has prioritized alongside medical and engineering courses, the hospitality management courses as they involve laboratory and hands-on subjects which are generally skills-based. The tourism and hospitality industry has been known to be labor-intensive[19] and since service and hospitality cannot readily be

---

[13] Thompson, Darwich, and Bartlett, "Not Remotely Familiar: How COVID-19 Is Reshaping Teachers' Work and the Implications for Teacher Education."

[14] Stack, "Learning Outcomes in an Online vs Traditional Course."

[15] Paul and Jefferson, "A Comparative Analysis of Student Performance in an Online vs. Face-to-Face Environmental Science Course From 2009 to 2016."

[16] "Faculty Perceptions about Teaching Online: Exploring the Literature Using the Technology Acceptance Model as an Organizing Framework."

[17] Bolliger, Inan, and Wasilik, "Development and Validation of the Online Instructor Satisfaction Measure (OISM)."

[18] De Vera III, "Expansion of Limited Face-to-Face Classes to Other Degree Programs Approved by PRRD - CHED [Press Release]."

[19] Bilsland, Nagy, and Smith, "Virtual Internships and Work-Integrated Learning in Hospitality and Tourism in a Post-COVID-19 World"; Elshaer and Marzouk, *Labor in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry*.

substituted, a well-trained workforce is needed as it fuels a country's economy. Tuomi et al.[20] explain that unlike other industries, automation or the use of service robots to replace people is relatively new in service settings which is particularly true in the Philippines. Additionally, THM-related jobs in the country prove to be a major economic driver[21] and biggest provider of jobs.[22]

Respondents in this study were limited to faculty members of selected higher education institutions in the Central Luzon, Philippines. These faculty members have handled courses for the Bachelor of Science in Tourism Management (BSTM), Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM), and Bachelor of Science in Hotel and Restaurant Management (BSHRM) programs and they have experienced conducting flexible learning (synchronous, asynchronous, and modular) classes at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. As such, this study aims to assess the teaching satisfaction of THM faculty from HEIs in Central Luzon in the flexible learning environment. Specifically, it intends to answer the following research questions:

RQ1. How may the demographic and academic profile of the respondents be described in terms of: a) affiliation, b) age, c) academic rank, d) employment status e) academic qualification f) years of teaching, g) experience in using the internet h) computer proficiency, i) workload, j) number of assigned positions, k) internet connectivity l) flexible training modalities used, and m) hours of training in flexible learning attended?

RQ2. How satisfied are the THM faculty with the conduct of flexible learning?

II. Literature review

II.1. *Flexible teaching and learning in COVID-19*

In March 2020, the UNESCO International Research and Training Centre for Rural Education (UNESCO INRULED), and Smart Learning Institute of Beijing Normal University (SLIBNU), released a book which

---

[20] Tuomi, Tussyadiah, and Stienmetz, "Applications and Implications of Service Robots in Hospitality."

[21] Philippine Statistics Authority, "GDP Expands by 7.6 Percent in the Third Quarter of 2022."

[22] Philippine Statistics Authority, "Employment Rate in October 2022 Is Estimated at 95.5 Percent"; United Nations Philippines, *Diversification, Jobs and the COVID-19 Recovery: Exploring Opportunities for Economic Diversification and Productive Employment in the Philippines*; INDUSTRY.GOV.PH, "Services."

defines the term "flexible learning" in the context of actual experiences during the onset of COVID-19 outbreak. Approaches exhibited were based on six components, and according to Huang et al.,[23] these are: infrastructure, learning tools, learning resources, teaching and learning methods, services for teachers and students, and cooperation among government, enterprises, and schools.

Presently, because of the pandemic, education systems in countries across the globe have shifted to varied learning modes with online learning as one of the main modes.[24] Singh and Thurman[25] characterize online learning as learning experiences in synchronous or asynchronous environments using different devices (e.g., mobile phones, laptops, etc.) with internet access. Joaquin et al.[26] explicate further that online learning may be delivered synchronously with real-time teacher-led discussions and assessment activities, or asynchronously, with the teacher having pre-recorded discussions with accompanying assessment activities which students can access and complete at their own pace and convenient time. Synchronous learning is designed with real-time or live virtual teacher-led discussions where students can participate and get instant feedback on queries and some assessment mechanisms. Comparatively, students in the asynchronous learning environment cannot get instant feedback, and the learning content is not provided in live classes, but rather on different learning management platforms.[27] In a more recent study conducted during the pandemic, Daniel[28] reiterates that flexible learning provides a variety of courses and flexibility of time and place of learning to help students get back on track.

In the Philippines, several months after the initial reactions on the implementation of different modalities of remote learning in March 2020, CHED Chairperson further explained that flexible learning must be encompassing and should focus on the delivery and design of learning

---

[23] Huang et al., *Handbook on Facilitating Flexible Learning During Educational Disruption: The Chinese Experience in Maintaining Undisrupted Learning in COVID-19 Outbreak*, 4.

[24] Huang et al., *Handbook on Facilitating Flexible Learning During Educational Disruption: The Chinese Experience in Maintaining Undisrupted Learning in COVID-19 Outbreak*.

[25] Singh and Thurman, "How Many Ways Can We Define Online Learning? A Systematic Literature Review of Definitions of Online Learning (1988-2018)."

[26] Joaquin, Biana, and Dacela, "The Philippine Higher Education Sector in the Time of COVID-19."

[27] Littlefield, "The Difference Between Synchronous and Asynchronous Distance Learning."

[28] Daniel, "Education and the COVID-19 Pandemic."

interventions based on students' individual context (e.g., pace, place, process, outputs).[29] Furthermore, recent studies[30] have assessed the implementation of flexible learning in the country from both the student and teacher context. In particular, Tarrayo et al.[31] explore how teachers view flexible learning amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. Their study reveals that there are still several areas that need to be improved [32]. In a separate study, Penuliar et al.[33] examine the instructional delivery preference of students in the context of flexible learning. Their study indicates that partial-offline-online modality is preferred and at the same time it reduces the instructional loads and allows greater flexibility among teachers.

I.1.1. Faculty satisfaction on flexible learning

Faculty satisfaction in this specific study is defined as the perception that the process of teaching in the flexible learning environment is efficient, effective, and beneficial for the faculty.[34] Faculty perspectives are likewise vital since they are the ones responsible for the processes and delivery of student learning. Understanding the current challenges and diversity of their learners with focus on students' individual context is important in making the teaching and learning process more effective in flexible learning.[35] In a study conducted by Bolliger and Wasilik,[36] three main factors that influence

---

[29] Joaquin, Biana, and Dacela, "The Philippine Higher Education Sector in the Time of COVID-19"; Parrocha, "HEIs May Hold Limited Face-to-Face Classes in MGCQ Areas."

[30] Talosa, Javier, and Dirain, "The Flexible-Learning Journey: Phenomenological Investigation of Self-Efficacy Influencing Factors among Higher Education Students"; Tarrayo, Paz, and Gepila, "The Shift to Flexible Learning amidst the Pandemic: The Case of English Language Teachers in a Philippine State University"; Absolor et al., "The Preparedness of a Philippine Higher Education Institution on the Implementation of Flexible Learning (FL)"; Moralista and Oducado, "Faculty Perception toward Online Education in a State College in the Philippines during the Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19) Pandemic"; Arciosa, "Flexible Learning and Its Effectiveness in Teaching College Subjects amidst Covid 19 Pandemic."

[31] Tarrayo, Paz, and Gepila, "The Shift to Flexible Learning amidst the Pandemic: The Case of English Language Teachers in a Philippine State University."

[32] Absolor et al., "The Preparedness of a Philippine Higher Education Institution on the Implementation of Flexible Learning (FL)."

[33] Penuliar et al., "Offline or Online?: How Should Biology Be Taught in a Flexible Learning Modality in the Philippines."

[34] Elshami et al., "Satisfaction with Online Learning in the New Normal: Perspective of Students and Faculty at Medical and Health Sciences Colleges," 1.

[35] Dayagbil et al., "Teaching and Learning Continuity Amid and Beyond the Pandemic."

[36] Bolliger and Wasilik, "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education."

instructors' satisfaction emerged; (1) student-related, (2) instructor-related, and (3) institutional-related. In another related study, Bolliger et al.[37] developed an instrument to measure faculty satisfaction for teaching online and validated its psychometric properties. The instrument was administered to 168 instructors who taught courses in a public university. Results include five factors which are instructor-to-student interaction, affordances, institutional support, student-to-student interaction, and course design. Similarly, Al-Zahrani[38] examine faculty satisfaction with online teaching adapting the same instrument developed by Bolliger et al. and recommends that HEIs should faithfully consider their instructors' 21st century professional and psychological needs (i.e., faculty satisfaction). Blundell et al.[39] conducted a similar study which reveals that faculty satisfaction is influenced by three main factors relating to instructor-student interaction, technology and institutional support which proved that their revised online faculty satisfaction tool is valid and reliable. He initially used the OFSS-R in an earlier study where the respondents are faculty from private HEIs in Ohio. Results reveal that faculty satisfaction and student satisfaction are linked throughout the online course. As such, he further investigated whether applying the Quality Matters TM Rubric [QMR] as a foundation for online course design increases faculty self-reported levels of satisfaction. However, his analysis found no significant differences. Blundell[40] findings further expose that faculty satisfaction is relative to their agreement on their course design. Furthermore, in another study on faculty perceptions about teaching online by Wingo et al.,[41] outcomes disclose that institutional strategic plans to promote online programs can be developed and implemented only if academic leaders have an in-depth understanding of it.

I.1.2. Faculty satisfaction vis-a-vis student satisfaction

In flexible teaching, student interaction is a skill that faculty found to be the most difficult to master as it is not part of the traditional component in

---

[37] Bolliger, Inan, and Wasilik, "Development and Validation of the Online Instructor Satisfaction Measure (OISM)."

[38] Al-Zahrani, "Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching in Saudi Arabia's Higher Education Institutions."

[39] Blundell, Castañeda, and Lee, "A Multi-Institutional Study of Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning."

[40] Blundell, "A Disruption of Online Learning Course Design: Comparing Self-Reported Levels of Faculty Satisfaction with Online Courses Created Applying the 2011-2013 Edition of the Quality Matters™; Rubric Standards to Those Online Courses Created Without."

[41] Wingo, Ivankova, and Moss, "Faculty Perceptions about Teaching Online: Exploring the Literature Using the Technology Acceptance Model as an Organizing Framework."

classroom instruction. Bolliger and Wasilik[42] explain in their findings that faculty members with higher satisfaction have a high level of interaction with online students as compared to their less satisfied counterparts. Similarly, higher levels of interaction can potentially influence faculty decisions to adopt, reject, or continue with teaching. Huang et al.[43] underscore in their flexible learning handbook that to motivate learners to ask teachers for help when encountering difficulties, three conditions are necessary: (a) external encouragements from teachers, administration; (b) close association between teachers and students; and, (c) timely and effective feedback. Furthermore, more than the content, it is the engagement of participants in the course that matters.

I.1.3. Faculty concerns on online learning

According to Allen and Seaman,[44] even before the pandemic in the United States, faculty personnel were asked to teach online. However, they expressed reluctance to embrace online teaching and its different forms primarily due to fear of change brought about by concerns on the reliability of technology, skepticism on the achievement of learning outcomes, workload issues, and similar aspects.[45] Other parallel concerns were on longer preparation for flexible learning, particularly on online courses, as compared to the traditional face-to-face courses.[46] On-line course development and planning for instruction to include student participation as well as technological skills require much time and effort. Accordingly, best practices must be shared among faculty particularly by those with expertise in online learning modality to improve the teaching and learning process.[47]

---

[42] Bolliger and Wasilik, "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education," 177.

[43] Huang et al., *Handbook on Facilitating Flexible Learning During Educational Disruption: The Chinese Experience in Maintaining Undisrupted Learning in COVID-19 Outbreak*, 16.

[44] Allen and Seaman, "Grade Level: Tracking Online Education in the United States."

[45] Bacow et al., "Barriers to Adoption of Online Learning Systems in U.S. Higher Education"; Betts and Heaston, "Build It But Will They Teach?: Strategies for Increasing Faculty Participation & Retention in Online & Blended Education"; Bolliger and Wasilik, "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education."

[46] Al-Zahrani, "Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching in Saudi Arabia's Higher Education Institutions"; Bolliger and Wasilik, "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education."

[47] Al-Zahrani, "Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching in Saudi Arabia's Higher Education Institutions."

Some other faculty concerns raised are about interacting with students in online courses[48]. Apprehensions include the negative effects on faculty promotion and tenure[49] and how performance evaluations for teaching online may be conducted.[50] Some issues deal with students' conduct in the new learning environment, particularly on the possibility for students to cheat in assessments.[51] Faculty members are likewise bothered whether or not students already possess the necessary technical skills, or if their students have the appropriate gadget, or if they have the skills and abilities to use online learning technology.[52] Nevertheless, the flexibility of the learning environment can be positive to faculty members.

I.1.4. Flexibility of the pedagogy

The flexible pedagogy has its share of affordances. It is seen as an avenue for otherwise timid students to participate in asynchronous discussions via discussion stream, not to mention that its flexibility can accommodate students with work and family obligations.[53] Bolliger et al. further stress that, "online instructors can provide pedagogically effective learning environments where the instruction is highly interactive, supportive, communicative, and social."[54]

I.1.5. Institutional support

Institutional support is key to guaranteeing quality flexible learning environments. According to Huang et al.,[55] support services include two

---

[48] Allen and Seaman, "Grade Level: Tracking Online Education in the United States"; Bacow et al., "Barriers to Adoption of Online Learning Systems in U.S. Higher Education"; Bolliger and Wasilik, "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education."

[49] Allen and Seaman, "Grade Level: Tracking Online Education in the United States"; Allen and Seaman, "Changing Course: Ten Years of Tracking Online Education in the United States."

[50] Bacow et al., "Barriers to Adoption of Online Learning Systems in U.S. Higher Education."

[51] Bacow et al.; McGee, "Supporting Academic Honesty in Online Courses."

[52] Bacow et al., "Barriers to Adoption of Online Learning Systems in U.S. Higher Education"; Bolliger and Wasilik, "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education."

[53] Bolliger, Inan, and Wasilik, "Development and Validation of the Online Instructor Satisfaction Measure (OISM)."

[54] Bolliger, Inan, and Wasilik, 185.

[55] Huang et al., *Handbook on Facilitating Flexible Learning During Educational Disruption: The Chinese Experience in Maintaining Undisrupted Learning in COVID-19 Outbreak*, 23.

forms where one is support for teachers and the other is support for students' learning. Both of these can be provided in collaboration with the government, schools, enterprises, families, society, etc. Faculty members can be highly satisfied when their institutions value their plight and have policies in place to support them.[56] It may come in the form of adequate preparation time and tools, training and technical support, institutional policies in place, and fair compensation.[57] Support cannot be undermined because faculty members are unlikely to perform well unless they are comfortable with the circumstances they are in.

Both faculty and students reluctantly adapted the flexible learning modality as education systems across the globe found it as a solution to continue schooling amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. Though some educational institutions have been adapting it in different forms like distance learning, the modular approach to learning and the more popular online learning, scholars have studied its efficacy and some positive findings that have surfaced include the flexibility and affordances it provides in terms of place, process and outputs.[58] Institutional support services are key to its success particularly in terms of infrastructure, technical support training, tools, institutional policies, clear and well-defined course structure, and fair compensation.[59] Issues and concerns have likewise surfaced such as reliability on technology, longer preparation time, and course development and planning for instruction which require much time and effort.[60] But amidst all these, literature suggests that faculty satisfaction leads to student satisfaction which ultimately leads to quality flexible learning.

---

[56] Bolliger and Wasilik, "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education."

[57] Bolliger, Inan, and Wasilik, "Development and Validation of the Online Instructor Satisfaction Measure (OISM)," 185.

[58] Penuliar et al., "Offline or Online?: How Should Biology Be Taught in a Flexible Learning Modality in the Philippines"; Joaquin, Biana, and Dacela, "The Philippine Higher Education Sector in the Time of COVID-19"; Parrocha, "HEIs May Hold Limited Face-to-Face Classes in MGCQ Areas"; Daniel, "Education and the COVID-19 Pandemic"; Bolliger, Inan, and Wasilik, "Development and Validation of the Online Instructor Satisfaction Measure (OISM)."

[59] Blundell, Castañeda, and Lee, "A Multi-Institutional Study of Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning"; Huang et al., *Handbook on Facilitating Flexible Learning During Educational Disruption: The Chinese Experience in Maintaining Undisrupted Learning in COVID-19 Outbreak*.

[60] Al-Zahrani, "Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching in Saudi Arabia's Higher Education Institutions"; Allen and Seaman, "Grade Level: Tracking Online Education in the United States."

III. Materials and methods

III.1. Data collection procedures, sample size, and sampling design

The study used an online cross-sectional survey with three open ended questions from May to June 2021. The study also utilized purposive sampling design which according to Robinson,[61] is often utilized to select informants based on their specialty or knowledge of, and/or experience. In this study, only faculty members teaching in the programs BS Tourism Management (BSTM), Hospitality Management (BSHM), and Hotel and Restaurant Management (BSHRM) in Central Luzon, Philippines are eligible to participate. The researchers sought the approval and assistance of the college deans of HEIs in the Central Luzon to get in touch with THM faculty through Facebook Messenger, where a Google Form link to the survey instrument was attached. A total of 85 THM faculty across 27 different universities and colleges responded in the study (Table 1).

Table 1

List of institutions responded in the study

Institution	Type	No. of faculty*	No. of THM students**
Angeles University Foundation	Private	14	300
Bataan Peninsula State University	Public	10	950
Bulacan State University	Public	34	1,218
Central Luzon State University	Public	***	1,037
Centro Escolar University – Malolos	Private	4	198
City College of Angeles	Public	15	20
Clark College of Science and Technology	Private	2	***
Colegio de San Juan de Letran – Bataan	Private	***	39
Colegio de San Sebastian	Private	4	61
College of Subic Montessori	Private	2	49
College of the Immaculate Conception	Private	5	139
Dominican College of Tarlac	Private	10	650

---

[61] Robinson, "Purposive Sampling."

138

Institution	Type	No. of faculty*	No. of THM students**
Don Bosco Academy	Private	***	***
Exact College of Asia	Private	5	334
Holy Angel University	Private	25	722
Holy Cross College	Private	5	435
Jocson College	Private	10	160
Mabalacat City College	Public	14	896
Nueva Ecija University Science and Technology	Public	15	838
Our Lady of Fatima University – Pampanga	Private	9	500
Pampanga State Agricultural University	Public	7	10
Philippine Women's University	Private	***	104
Phinma Araullo University	Private	17	1,400
Republic Central College	Private	2	25
Systems Plus College Foundation	Private	11	340
University Assumption	Private	7	505
Wesleyan University Philippines	Private	15	716

    * based from data of individual HEI.
  ** based on CHED data for academic year 2021 – 2022.
*** No official data was shared by the HEI.

III.2. Survey instrument, pilot testing, validity, and reliability analysis

The researchers developed a two-part survey to gather the needed data. The first part is composed of personal and academic profile questions particularly the respondent's age, institution type, academic rank, employment status, highest academic qualification, number of years in teaching, experience in using the Internet, computer literacy, workload, number of assigned positions other than teaching, estimated number of hours training attended in relation to flexible learning, internet connectivity, and their experience in flexible learning modalities.

For the second part, it adopted and revised an online faculty satisfaction survey by Bollinger and Wasilik.[62] The same instrument was also used in a

---

[62] Bolliger and Wasilik, "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education."

more recent multi-institutional study which sought to determine factors influencing faculty satisfaction on online teaching and learning by Blundell et al.[63] Each item used a four-point Likert scale (Table 2). Item questions no. 1 - 4, 8 - 10, 14 – 16, 22, 27-29 are rated from highly satisfied to highly dissatisfied. While items no. 6, 7, 11-13, 18, 17, 19, 23, 24 - 26 are rated using strongly disagree to strongly agree and the rest of the scaled questions available responses are reversed. The term "online" was replaced with the word "flexible learning" across the 29 items. Some of the items were rephrased for contextual purposes. Three questions pertaining to the level of satisfaction in flexible learning were added and to gather more in-depth responses (total 31), three open-ended questions were included. To ensure the validity of the instrument, three experienced professors in the conduct of flexible learning in their respective colleges and/or universities performed face and content validation. One of the validators is a doctor of education, a graduate school professor and a vice-president for academic affairs in another HEI in Pampanga. The other is a professor and director in a state university with a background in educational management. After considering their comments and suggestions, the instrument was revised before pilot testing.

The instrument was pretested among 18 THM faculty from an HEI that implemented flexible learning at the onset of school closures due to COVID-19 in October 2020. The HEI has seven campuses offering THM courses and has approximately 4,674 THM students taking flexible learning courses. The researchers sought the assistance of the staff of the Commission of Higher Education Region III (CHED RO III) and the Council of Hotel and Restaurant Educators of the Philippines Region III (COHREP III) to reach faculty respondents. All THM faculty respondents were then invited through their respective deans or department heads to voluntarily answer the FFSS via Google Forms. The 18 THM faculty respondents were excluded in the population as their responses were used for pre-testing. The gathered data were subjected to a reliability test with 0.70 Cronbach's alpha and questions below the established minimum were discarded. Results thus indicate that the 29 items are considered reliable ($\alpha = 0.788$) and valid.

The third part consists of three supplementary open-ended questions which aim at extracting more in-depth views of THM faculty on their experiences in teaching in a flexible learning environment practicing varied flexible learning modalities which may differ depending on the location and sociodemographic profile of the institution.

---

[63] Blundell, Castañeda, and Lee, "A Multi-Institutional Study of Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning."

Table 2

Likert-scale and its interpretation

Range	Interpretation
3.00 - 4.00	Highly satisfied/ strongly agree
2.00 - 2.99	Satisfied/ agree
1.00 - 1.99	Dissatisfied/disagree
0.99 - 1.00	Highly dissatisfied/ strongly disagree

III.3. Ethical considerations

All of the respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, its duration, potential risk, handling of their data, and their right to refuse and participate. They were asked in the form of online consent to read all the information about the study and agree to participate in the research.

IV. Results and discussion

IV.1. Faculty demographics

Of the 85 respondents, 51 teach in private HEIs and the rest teach in public HEIs otherwise known as State Universities and Local Colleges in the Philippines (n = 34). As shown in Table 3, the average age of the faculty is 35 where majority (62.4%) have Instructor academic rank. It also shows that more than half of the respondents are permanent (62.4%), almost one-third of them have a contract-of-service status (28.2%), and the remainder have either temporary or probationary status. As regards academic qualification, the faculty respondents have varied backgrounds: 31.8% have master's degrees; 23.5% are pursuing master's degrees; 27.1% are pursuing doctorate degrees; and the rest are doctorate degree holders. This is expected since the minimum requirement for faculty in the country to teach at the tertiary level is a master's degree in their fields of specialization based on Philippine's CHED memorandum order no. 40 series of 2008.

As of May 2021, the teaching experience of faculty members ranges from 1 to 29 years. Majority of them have advanced experience in using the Internet (52.9%) and are intermediate (51.8%) in terms of using a computer and with stable internet connection (81.2%). In terms of workload, more than three-fourths of the respondents teach full-time while the rest have administrative work not related to teaching. Results further show that most of the faculty hold

one concurrent position apart from teaching. With regard training and exposure to flexible learning, respondents have an average of 20 training hours.

In terms of experience in the three modalities of flexible learning, most of the respondents have experienced conducting at least more than two modes which are mostly synchronous (n = 75) and asynchronous (n = 73). This further validates that THM faculty in Central Luzon HEIs are indeed delivering flexible learning. The results seemingly show that some faculty members are delivering a combination of two while some are delivering instruction in all three modalities which indicates that flexible learning is not limited to online as it focuses on the learners' unique needs.[64]

Table 3

Distribution of faculty respondents

Variable	Results	
	No.	%
Age (Mean ± SD)	35.98 ± 8.90	
Median	35	
Range	21 - 64	
Educational type		
Public	51	40
Private	34	60
Academic rank		
Instructor	53	62.4
Assistant Professor	20	23.5
Associate Professor	7	8.2
Professor	5	5.9
Employment status		
Permanent	53	62.4
Temporary	8	9.4
Contract-of-Service	24	28.2

---

[64] Joaquin, Biana, and Dacela, "The Philippine Higher Education Sector in the Time of COVID-19"; Parrocha, "HEIs May Hold Limited Face-to-Face Classes in MGCQ Areas."

Variable	Results	
	No.	%
Academic qualification		
Doctorate degree holders	10	11.8
With doctorate academic units	23	27.1
Master's degree holders	27	31.8
With master's academic units	20	23.5
Bachelor's degree holders	5	5.9
Teaching experience (Mean ± SD)	9.40 ± 6.20	
Median	9	
Range	1 - 29	
Experience in using Internet		
Beginner	-	-
Intermediate	35	41.2
Advanced	45	52.9
Expert	5	5.9
Computer proficiency		
Beginner	-	-
Intermediate	44	51.8
Advanced	37	43.5
Expert	4	4.7
Workload		
Full-time teaching	65	76.5
Teaching with administrative work not related to teaching	20	23.5
Extra assigned position not related to teaching (Mean ± SD)	1 ± 1	
Median	1	
Range	0 - 4	
Flexible learning training hours (Mean ± SD)	26.82 ± 29.74	
Median	20	
Range	0 - 130	

Variable	Results	
	No.	%
Internet connectivity		
Full capacity	69	81.2
Limited Capacity	16	18.8
Experience in flexible learning*		
Synchronous	75	
Asynchronous	73	
Modular	53	

IV.2. *Faculty satisfaction towards flexible learning*

IV.2.1. Positive satisfaction towards flexible learning modality

As presented on Table 4, mean ratings of 27 out of 29 items pertaining to THM faculty satisfaction on flexible learning show that the respondents are generally satisfied with the conduct of flexible learning in the new normal. Responses indicate that the respondents are highly satisfied the convenience and affordances brought about by the flexible learning environment (mean=3.27, n=85, 100%) as it can be and is designed such that a course can be accessed at any place and time[65]. Likewise, respondents are highly satisfied with the technology used in the conduct of both synchronous and asynchronous classes (mean=3.18, n=81, 95.3%) and they strongly agree that technology is reliable (mean=3.16, n=82, 96.5%). They are also highly satisfied with their experiences in teaching flexible learning in their respective institutions (mean 3.13, n=80, 94.1%) as well as their personal experiences (mean 3.01, n=77, 90.6%) conducting classes in this mode.

IV.2.2. Lower satisfaction, challenges, and disadvantages in flexible learning

Results show that only few faculty (mean=1.29) miss face-to-face contact with their students as majority or 97.6% (n=83) of them perceive that online learning in their synchronous sessions is tantamount to face-to-face

---

[65] Bolliger and Wasilik, "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education"; Parrocha, "HEIs May Hold Limited Face-to-Face Classes in MGCQ Areas."

144

interaction. Two reversed items concerning students being passive in the flexi-learning modality and faculty getting lower course evaluations were disagreed upon (82.4% n=70, 81.2% n=69 respectively) by the THM faculty. This is probably because there are applications available that promote student interaction, and faculty members are becoming skilled since different support groups have arisen to provide teacher training.[66]

It may me noted however, that though the THM faculty expressed their satisfaction, the mean ratings (2.21, 2.26, 2.31) relating to learner's enthusiasm, control of students and interaction with students are particularly lower signifying the lack of human interaction and that there may still be gaps and challenges in flexible learning as underscored in the study of Joaquin et al.[67] To further support these findings, items assessing the level of agreement of the THM faculty, denote that they have a higher workload when teaching a flexible learning course as compared to the traditional one (M = 1.96, 74.1%); preparation time is longer (M = 1.95, 78.8%); not meeting students face-to-face prevents them from knowing their students (M = 1.80, 87.1%); it is more difficult to motivate students in flexible learning (M = 1.75, 95.3%); level of participation of students in class discussion is lower (mean 1.72, 89.4%); they get frustrated due to technical problems (M = 1.60, 96.5%), and they have to be more creative in terms of the resources used for flexible learning (mean 1.44, 100%). Their agreement is in consonance with the findings of Elshami et al.[68] that, in the conduct of flexible learning, faculty members are confronted with higher workload; they devote more time to prepare lessons and materials; they have to incorporate a variety of applications to enhance student engagement and, at times, get frustrated with technical issues.[69]

In this sudden shift, some schools may have had support provided by different sectors of the government, and even the private sector, to cushion the impact by way of training and capacity building for teachers like the CHEd Hi-Ed Bayanihan project[70] where Google Classroom,

---

[66] De Vera III, "Universities, Colleges Gear up for Opening of Classes in August [Press Release]."

[67] Joaquin, Biana, and Dacela, "The Philippine Higher Education Sector in the Time of COVID-19."

[68] Elshami et al., "Satisfaction with Online Learning in the New Normal: Perspective of Students and Faculty at Medical and Health Sciences Colleges."

[69] Wingo, Ivankova, and Moss, "Faculty Perceptions about Teaching Online: Exploring the Literature Using the Technology Acceptance Model as an Organizing Framework."

[70] De Vera III, "Universities, Colleges Gear up for Opening of Classes in August [Press Release]."

initially, became a tool of support.[71] Furthermore, the development or purchase of learning management systems, monetary support to public schools, and agreements with internet providers are among the few means of support that have been extended to ensure quality flexible learning environments.[72]

Table 4

Faculty satisfaction towards flexible learning

No.	Item	Mean	Interpretation	HS/S/ SA/A	HD/D/ SD/D
				% (N)	% (N)
1	I am satisfied with the level of interaction with students in flexible learning is higher than in a traditional face-to-face class.	2.31	Satisfied	36.5% (31)	63.5% (54)
2	I am satisfied with the convenience provided by the flexible learning environment.	3.27	Highly Satisfied	100% (85)	-
3	I am satisfied as I incorporate fewer resources when teaching a flexible learning course as compared to traditional teaching.	2.60	Satisfied	56.5% (48)	43.5% (37)
4	I am satisfied with the technology I use in synchronous and asynchronous tasks in the flexible learning environment.	3.18	Highly Satisfied	95.3% (81)	4.7% (4)
5	The technology I use for teaching in flexible learning is reliable.	3.16	Strongly Agree	96.5% (82)	3.5% (3)

---

[71] Zuniga-Tonio, "Google Classroom as a Tool of Support for Flexible Learning in the New Normal."

[72] Bolliger, Inan, and Wasilik, "Development and Validation of the Online Instructor Satisfaction Measure (OISM)."

146

No.	Item	Mean	Interpretation	HS/S/ SA/A	HD/D/ SD/D
				% (N)	% (N)
6	I have a higher workload when teaching a flexible learning course as compared to the traditional one.	1.96	Agree	74.1% (63)	25.9% (22)
7	I miss face-to-face contact with students when teaching in flexible learning.	1.29	Agree	97.6% (83)	2.4% (2)
8	I am satisfied as I have no problems controlling my students in the flexible learning environment.	2.26	Satisfied	34.1% (29)	65.9% (56)
9	I am satisfied with my students' active communication with me regarding flexible learning course matters.	2.64	Satisfied	63.5% (54)	36.5% (31)
10	I am satisfied that my students in flexible learning are more enthusiastic about their learning than their traditional counterparts.	2.21	Satisfied	28.2% (24)	71.8% (61)
11	I have to be more creative in terms of the resources used for flexible learning.	1.44	Agree	100% (85)	-
12	Teaching in flexible learning is often frustrating because of technical problems.	1.60	Agree	96.5% (82)	3.5% (3)
13	It takes me longer to prepare for a flexible learning course on a weekly basis than for a face-to-face course.	1.95	Agree	78.8% (67)	21.2% (18)

No.	Item	Mean	Interpretation	HS/S/ SA/A % (N)	HD/D/ SD/D % (N)
14	I am satisfied with the use of communication tools in the flexible learning environment (e.g., chat rooms, threaded discussions, etc.).	2.86	Satisfied	77.6% (66)	22.4% (19)
15	I am satisfied as I am able to provide better feedback to my flexible learning students on their performance in the course.	2.72	Satisfied	67.1% (57)	32.9% (28)
16	I am more satisfied with teaching in flexible learning as compared to other delivery methods.	2.55	Satisfied	51.8% (44)	48.2% (41)
17	My flexible learning students are somewhat passive when it comes to contacting the instructor regarding course related matters.	2.05	Disagree	82.4% (60)	17.6% (15)
18	It is valuable to me that my students can access my flexible learning course from any place in the world.	3.27	Strongly Agree	97.6% (83)	2.4% (2)
19	The participation level of my students in the class discussions in the flexible learning setting is lower than in the traditional one.	1.72	Agree	89.4% (76)	10.6% (9)
20	My students use a wider range of resources in the flexible learning setting than in the traditional one.	2.94	Agree	80% (68)	20% (17)
21	Technical problems do not discourage me from teaching in flexible learning.	2.94	Agree	72.9% (62)	27.1% (23)

No.	Item	Mean	Interpretation	HS/S/ SA/A % (N)	HD/D/ SD/D % (N)
22	I am satisfied with the compensation I receive for teaching in flexible learning.	2.91	Satisfied	74.1% (63)	25.9% (22)
23	Not meeting my flexible learning students face-to-face prevents me from knowing them as well as my on-site students.	1.80	Agree	87.1% (74)	12.9% (11)
24	I am concerned about receiving lower course evaluations in the flexible learning course as compared to the traditional one.	2.04	Disagree	81.2% (69)	18.8% (16)
25	Teaching in flexible learning is gratifying because it provides me with an opportunity to reach students who otherwise would not be able to take courses.	2.88	Agree	76.5% (65)	23.5% (20)
26	It is more difficult for me to motivate my students in flexible learning environment than in the traditional setting.	1.75	Agree	95.3% (81)	4.7% (4)
27	I am satisfied with teaching in flexible learning in relation to my experiences with students.	2.89	Satisfied	82.4% (70)	17.6% (15)
28	I am satisfied with teaching in flexible learning in relation to my experiences with my institution.	3.13	Highly Satisfied	94.1% (80)	5.9% (5)
29	I am satisfied with teaching in flexible learning in relation to my own personal experiences.	3.01	Highly Satisfied	90.6% (77)	9.4% (8)

IV.3. *Thematic analysis of the open-ended questions*

IV.3.1. Theme 1. Technical issues

This theme emerged from the responses of the respondents when asked about teaching in flexible learning. Most of them identified unstable internet connections, power interruptions and other computer-related problems as frequently identified reasons that contribute to technical issues that they experience. It is a truism that in a flexible mode of teaching, educators are confronted with pressing concerns like internet connectivity problems and hardware- and software-related problems. These findings were supported by earlier studies[73] which focused on the conduct of various learning modalities. Among the responses that support this theme are reflected as follows:

> "The problem in connectivity…" (P46)

> "Internet and power interruption..." (P41)

> "Poor internet connection…" (P85)

IV.3.2. Theme 2. Inability to develop student-teacher rapport

Another area of concern that was raised by the faculty respondents during flexible teaching and learning was linked to the inability to foster rapport with their students. For example, Fabito et al.[74] explore the barriers to online learning among computer students. Their study reveals that difficulties in communications with their respective teachers is one of the pressing challenges in the conduct of online learning. Similar findings were found by Andan and Anwar.[75] Some of the responses based on this theme are the following:

---

[73] Siripipatthanakul et al., "A Review of Educational Adaptation During the COVID-19 Pandemicvia Online Learning"; Fabito, Trillanes, and Sarmiento, "Barriers and Challenges of Computing Students in an Online Learning Environment: Insights from One Private University in the Philippines"; Gocotano et al., "Higher Education Student's Challenges on Flexible Online Learning Implementation in the Rural Areas: A Philippine Case"; Musingafi et al., "Challenges for Open and Distance Learning (ODL) Students: Experiences from Students of the Zimbabwe Open University"; Adnan and Anwar, "Online Learning amid the COVID-19 Pandemic: Students' Perspectives"; Ferri, Grifoni, and Guzzo, "Online Learning and Emergency Remote Teaching: Opportunities and Challenges in Emergency Situations."

[74] Fabito, Trillanes, and Sarmiento, "Barriers and Challenges of Computing Students in an Online Learning Environment: Insights from One Private University in the Philippines."

[75] Adnan and Anwar, "Online Learning amid the COVID-19 Pandemic: Students' Perspectives."

> "Lack of cooperation with students…" (P9)

> "Not being able to establish personal connections towards the students." (P37)

> "Less interaction and monitoring with students…" (P58)

IV.3.3. Theme 3. Academic dishonesty and integrity

Academic integrity is another theme that emerged from the responses. It is based on the honesty in completing academic tasks required to students. As a concept, it refers to any behavior that affects or specifically undermines academic integrity like cheating in exams and the credibility of submitted materials for assessment (e.g., essays, reflections, etc.) This theme was supported in a literature review conducted by Chen et al.[76] Accordingly, academic dishonesty is a widespread problem particularly in online learning setup although earlier study by Tolman[77] argues the other way around. Nonetheless, this problem extends not only among undergraduate students but also across all academic levels.[78] The responses based on this theme include:

> "The cheating in exams…" (P1)

> "Credibility of student assessments…" (P65)

> "Not seeing students' real reactions and their real output in terms of quiz and term exams." (P71)

IV.3.4. Theme 4. Learning flexibility

The last theme that emerged from the responses is learning flexibility. This refers to the flexibility to conduct classes based on the circumstances that surround the teachers and students.[79] Furthermore, it further extends to the customization of learning experiences to suit the needs of the teachers and students.[80] To support this theme, the following responses are stated below:

---

[76] Chen et al., "Online Academic Dishonesty of College Students: A Review."

[77] Tolman, "Academic Dishonesty in Online Courses: Considerations for Graduate Preparatory Programs in Higher Education."

[78] Paullet, "Student and Faculty Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty in Online Classes."

[79] Cassidy et al., "Flexible Learning Strategies in First through Fourth-Year Courses."

[80] Huang et al., *Handbook on Facilitating Flexible Learning During Educational Disruption: The Chinese Experience in Maintaining Undisrupted Learning in COVID-19*

"Synchronous classes are not performed on a daily basis." (P6)

"It can be more convenient both to the students and with me." (P32)

"Learners' access to materials anytime and opportunity to choose their preferred mode of learning." (P34)

Of the eighty-five THM faculty members, 63 actively responded. The unstable internet connection mostly of students, lack of participation/ interaction, inability to connect with students on a more personal level, cheating in any forms and non-attendance to classes are among the factors that emerged. Clearly, the themes derived here are student-interaction, technology and connectivity, and integrity of assessments are what THM faculty least like about flexi-learning. This is similar to the findings of Jung et al.[81] where student-related and technology-related problems are most common concerns in a study in Tokyo, Japan. As such, these are areas that schools need to plan and improve on.[82]

In terms of flexibility, the respondents mentioned that the flexibility in terms of time, place and mode of delivery, the technological challenges it brings, and ease in adding supplementary materials to enhance learning are key factors. The theme of what is most liked about flexi-learning is its flexibility[83] and ease brought about by technology. As technology plays a vital role in flexible learning, it is seen as both positive and negative depending on the user—its presence or the lack of it.

In addition, it was mentioned that having available modules especially for new subjects and additional resources such as gadgets for faculty would greatly help including having an LMS to lessen incidences of cheating. On the other hand, other respondents said that faculty members should be more patient with students. Aside from the identified themes, there are other challenges disclosed by the respondents such as students give less effort in their studies; students are not committed; more training for faculty is needed; local city colleges lack resources; more training for flexible learning is

---

Outbreak; Wanner and Palmer, "Personalising Learning: Exploring Student and Teacher Perceptions about Flexible Learning and Assessment in a Flipped University Course."

[81] Jung et al., "Faculty as Reflective Practitioners in Emergency Online Teaching: An Autoethnography."

[82] Dayagbil et al., "Teaching and Learning Continuity Amid and Beyond the Pandemic"; Elshami et al., "Satisfaction with Online Learning in the New Normal: Perspective of Students and Faculty at Medical and Health Sciences Colleges."

[83] Almaghaslah and Alsayari, "The Effects of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Outbreak on Academic Staff Members: A Case Study of a Pharmacy School in Saudi Arabia."

needed; if combined with face-to-face it may become a very good method of education; it is more demanding and stressful for both students and faculty members; faculty members should consider students' mental health; it will never compensate the need for exposure students in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry needs; and finally, one reiterated that, "just like any system implemented and used, acceptance will be subjective and relative to persons concerned, but it definitely, has pros and cons worth evaluating, for references and considerations." The THM faculty understand both the strengths and weaknesses of the flexible learning delivery during crises. This necessitates technical support, communication, and capacity building for effective blended or emergency online teaching.[84]

V. Conclusion and recommendations

The study was able to surface the demographic and academic profile of THM faculty who were teaching in flexible learning modalities. There were 85 THM faculty from 27 HEIs responded. Overall, this study showed that THM faculty are generally satisfied with the conduct of flexible learning despite the setbacks. Four themes were also identified in this study which are named as technical issues, inability to develop student-teacher rapport, academic dishonesty and integrity, and learning flexibility.

THM programs involve hands-on laboratory activities that cannot be delivered virtually as they are skills-based and require experiential learning where human interaction and the Filipino brand of hospitality are taught. With this, the study surveyed the THM faculty in higher education institutions in the Central Luzon to assess their satisfaction on the delivery of these programs in the flexible learning mode. While findings indicate that the faculty are generally satisfied with the conduct of flexible learning in their institutions, they express agreement on issues from being highly resourceful to relating to having higher workloads, longer preparation time for a course, lack of human interaction by not seeing students face-to-face, lower participation of students, and technical problems. Based on these findings, the study recommends that longitudinal studies should be conducted in order to determine how much has changed specifically after the COVID-19 pandemic. Interventions to specifically address and mitigate the key issues (e.g., inability to develop student rapport, academic integrity) this study identified should also be introduced.

---

[84] Jung et al., "Faculty as Reflective Practitioners in Emergency Online Teaching: An Autoethnography."

Bibliography

Aboagye, Emmanuel, Joseph Anthony Yawson, and Kofi Nyantakyi Appiah. "COVID-19 and E-Learning: The Challenges of Students in Tertiary Institutions." *Social Education Research* 2, no. 1 (2021): 1–8. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37256/ser.212021422.

Absolor, Jocelyn L., Enhelyn L. Morla, Gina Mae C. Villanueva, Marites J. Yacap, and Jerome R. Bueno. "The Preparedness of a Philippine Higher Education Institution on the Implementation of Flexible Learning (FL)." *Technium Social Sciences Journal* 32, no. 102–125 (2022). https://www.techniumscience.com/index.php/socialsciences/article/view/6685/2359.

Adnan, Muhammad, and and Kainat Anwar. "Online Learning amid the COVID-19 Pandemic: Students' Perspectives." *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology* 2, no. 1 (2020): 45–51. https://doi.org/http://www.doi.org/10.33902/JPSP.%202020261309.

Al-Zahrani, Abdulrahman M. "Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching in Saudi Arabia's Higher Education Institutions." In *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, edited by Donald G. Perrin, Elizabeth Perrin, Brent Muirhead, and Muhammad Betz, 12:17–28, 2015. http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Apr_15/Apr15.pdf.

Allen, I. Elaine, and Jeff Seaman. "Changing Course: Ten Years of Tracking Online Education in the United States," 2013. http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/changingcourse.pdf.

———. "Grade Level: Tracking Online Education in the United States," 2015. https://www.bayviewanalytics.com/reports/gradelevel.pdf.

Almaghaslah, Dalia, and Abdulrhman Alsayari. "The Effects of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Outbreak on Academic Staff Members: A Case Study of a Pharmacy School in Saudi Arabia." *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy* 13 (2020): 795–802. https://doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S260918.

Almusharraf, Norah, and Shabir Khahro. "Students Satisfaction with Online Learning Experiences during the COVID-19 Pandemic." *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)* 15, no. 21 SE-Papers (November 16, 2020): 246–67. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i21.15647.

Arciosa, Ramil. "Flexible Learning and Its Effectiveness in Teaching College Subjects amidst Covid 19 Pandemic." *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction* 14, no. 2 (2022): 1343–58. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1340901.pdf.

Bacow, Lawrence S., William G. Bowen, Kevin M. Guthrie, Kelly A. Lack, and Matthew P. Long. "Barriers to Adoption of Online Learning Systems in U.S. Higher Education," 2012. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.22432.

Betts, Kristen, and Amy Heaston. "Build It But Will They Teach?: Strategies for Increasing Faculty Participation & Retention in Online & Blended Education." *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration* 17, no. 2 (2014). https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1036864.

Bilsland, Christine, Helga Nagy, and Phil Smith. "Virtual Internships and Work-Integrated Learning in Hospitality and Tourism in a Post-COVID-19 World." *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning* 21, no. 4 (2020): 425–37. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1271544.pdf.

Blundell, Gregory Edgar. "A Disruption of Online Learning Course Design: Comparing Self-Reported Levels of Faculty Satisfaction with Online Courses Created Applying the 2011-2013 Edition of the Quality Matters™; Rubric Standards to Those Online Courses Created Without." Kent State University, 2015. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=kent1426268368.

Blundell, Gregory Edgar, Daniel A. Castañeda, and Junghyae Lee. "A Multi-Institutional Study of Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning." *Online Learning* 24, no. 4 (2020): 229–53. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i4.2175.

Bolliger, Doris U, Fethi A Inan, and Oksana Wasilik. "Development and Validation of the Online Instructor Satisfaction Measure (OISM)." *Journal of Educational Technology & Society* 17, no. 2 (December 21, 2014): 183–95. http://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.17.2.183.

Bolliger, Doris U, and Oksana Wasilik. "Factors Influencing Faculty Satisfaction with Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education." *Distance Education* 30, no. 1 (May 1, 2009): 103–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910902845949.

Cassidy, Alice, Guopeng Fu, Will Valley, Cyprien Lomas, Eduardo Jovel, and Andrew Riseman. "Flexible Learning Strategies in First through Fourth-Year Courses." *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching* 9 (2016): 83–94. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22329/celt.v9i0.4438.

Chen, Changsheng, Jingyun Long, Junxiao Liu, Zongjun Wang, Lifeng Wang, and Jing Zhang. "Online Academic Dishonesty of College Students: A Review." In *Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Advanced Education, Management and Social Science (AEMSS2020)*, edited by Wadim Striełkowski, 156–61. Atlantis Press, 2020. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200723.121.

Dachner, Alison M., and Brian M. Saxton. "If You Don't Care, Then Why Should I? The Influence of Instructor Commitment on Student Satisfaction and Commitment." *Journal of Management Education* 39, no. 5 (2014): 549–71. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/10525629145555.

Daniel, Sir John. "Education and the COVID-19 Pandemic." *PROSPECTS* 49, no. 1 (2020): 91–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09464-3.

Dayagbil, Filomena T, Daisy R Palompon, Laurence L Garcia, and Michelle Mae J Olvido. "Teaching and Learning Continuity Amid and Beyond the Pandemic." *Frontiers in Education* 6 (2021): 269. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.678692.

Department of Tourism Philippines. "DOT Banners 'Filipino Brand of Service'; Assists over 35,000 Tourists amid Pandemic," 2020. http://tourism.gov.ph/news_features/FilipinoBrandofService.aspx.

Elshaer, Abdallah M., and Asmaa M. Marzouk. *Labor in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry*. Apple Academic Press, 2019. https://www.routledge.com/Labor-in-

the-Tourism-and-Hospitality-Industry-Skills-Ethics-Issues-and/Elshaer-Marzouk/p/book/9781774634158.

Elshami, Wiam, Mohamed H Taha, Mohamed Abuzaid, Coumaravelou Saravanan, Sausan Al Kawas, and Mohamed Elhassan Abdalla. "Satisfaction with Online Learning in the New Normal: Perspective of Students and Faculty at Medical and Health Sciences Colleges." *Medical Education Online* 26, no. 1 (January 1, 2021): 1920090. https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2021.1920090.

Eom, Sean B, and Nicholas Ashill. "The Determinants of Students' Perceived Learning Outcomes and Satisfaction in University Online Education: An Update*." *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education* 14, no. 2 (April 1, 2016): 185–215. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/dsji.12097.

Fabito, Bernie S., Arlene O. Trillanes, and Jeshnile Sarmiento. "Barriers and Challenges of Computing Students in an Online Learning Environment: Insights from One Private University in the Philippines." *International Journal of Computing Sciences Research* 5, no. 1 (2021): 441–58. https://doi.org/10.25147/ijcsr.2017.001.1.51.

Ferri, Fernando, Patrizia Grifoni, and Tiziana Guzzo. "Online Learning and Emergency Remote Teaching: Opportunities and Challenges in Emergency Situations." *Societies*, 2020. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc10040086.

Gocotano, Thessalou E., Mae Anthoneth L. Jerodiaz, Jenny Claire P. Banggay, Harold B. Rey Nasibog, and Marivel B. Go. "Higher Education Student's Challenges on Flexible Online Learning Implementation in the Rural Areas: A Philippine Case." *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research* 20, no. 7 (2021): 262–90. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.7.15.

Hebert, Edward. "Faculty Morale: A Perspective for Academic Leaders." *Kinesiology Review* 8, no. 4 (2019): 305–11. https://doi.org/10.1123/kr.2019-0040.

Hettiarachchi, Sujeewa, B W R Damayanthi, Shirantha Heenkenda, DMSLB Dissanayake, Manjula Ranagalage, and Lalith Ananda. "Student Satisfaction with Online Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Study at State Universities in Sri Lanka." *Sustainability*, 2021. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132111749.

Huang, Ronghuai, Junfeng Yang, Ahmed Tlili, and Ting-Wen Chang. *Handbook on Facilitating Flexible Learning During Educational Disruption: The Chinese Experience in Maintaining Undisrupted Learning in COVID-19 Outbreak*. Smart Learning Institute of Beijing Normal University, 2020. https://iite.unesco.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Handbook-on-Facilitating-Flexible-Learning-in-COVID-19-Outbreak-SLIBNU-V1.2-20200315.pdf.

INDUSTRY.GOV.PH. "Services." Securing The Future of Philippine Industries. Accessed January 18, 2023. https://industry.gov.ph/category/services/.

Joaquin, Jeremiah Joven B, Hazel T Biana, and Mark Anthony Dacela. "The Philippine Higher Education Sector in the Time of COVID-19." *Frontiers in Education* 5 (2020): 208. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.576371.

Jung, Insung, Sawa Omori, Walter P Dawson, Tomiko Yamaguchi, and Seunghun J Lee. "Faculty as Reflective Practitioners in Emergency Online Teaching: An

Autoethnography." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 18, no. 1 (2021): 30. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00261-2.

Littlefield, Jamie. "The Difference Between Synchronous and Asynchronous Distance Learning." ThoughtCo, 2018. https://www.thoughtco.com/synchronous-distance-learning-asynchronous-distance-learning-1097959.

McGee, Patricia. "Supporting Academic Honesty in Online Courses." *Journal of Educators Online,* 10, no. 1 (2013). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1004890.pdf.

Moralista, Rome B., and Ryan Michael F. Oducado. "Faculty Perception toward Online Education in a State College in the Philippines during the Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19) Pandemic." *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 8, no. 10 (2020): 4736–42. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081044.

Musingafi, Maxwell C.C., Barbra Mapuranga, Kudzai Chiwanza, and Shupikai Zebron. "Challenges for Open and Distance Learning (ODL) Students: Experiences from Students of the Zimbabwe Open University." *Journal of Education and Practice* 6, no. 18 (2015): 59–66. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079750.pdf.

Olmos-Gómez, María D, Mónica Luque-Suárez, Concetta Ferrara, and Jesús M Cuevas-Rincón. "Quality in Higher Education and Satisfaction among Professors and Students." *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 2021. https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe11010017.

Ortan, Florica, Ciprian Simut, and Ramona Simut. "Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction and Teacher Well-Being in the K-12 Educational System." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18, no. 23 (2021): 12763. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182312763.

Parrocha, Azer. "HEIs May Hold Limited Face-to-Face Classes in MGCQ Areas." Philippine News Agency, 2020. https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1105160.

Paul, Jasmine, and Felicia Jefferson. "A Comparative Analysis of Student Performance in an Online vs. Face-to-Face Environmental Science Course From 2009 to 2016." *Frontiers in Computer Science* 1 (2019): 7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2019.00007.

Paullet, Karen. "Student and Faculty Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty in Online Classes." *Issues in Information Systems* 21, no. 3 (2020): 327–33. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48009/3_iis_2020_327-333.

Penuliar, Aaron Jhoe M., Vemma Mae R. Guinto, Agnes D. Oclay, Paz Cheri Ann V. Soriano, Maricris M. Sison, Jun S. Camara, John Rommel T. Retuya, and John V. Bernardo8. "Offline or Online?: How Should Biology Be Taught in a Flexible Learning Modality in the Philippines." *Southeast Asian Journal of Science and Technology* 6, no. 1 (2021): 30–38. https://sajst.org/online/index.php/sajst/article/download/162/97/.

Philippine Statistics Authority. "Employment Rate in October 2022 Is Estimated at 95.5 Percent," 2022. https://psa.gov.ph/statistics/survey/labor-and-employment/labor-force-survey/table.

———. "GDP Expands by 7.6 Percent in the Third Quarter of 2022," 2022. https://psa.gov.ph/foreign-investments/technical-notes.

Robinson, Rebecca S. "Purposive Sampling." In *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*, 227. SpringerLink, 2014. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2337.

Sebby, Angela G., and Carroll Brown. "Experiential Learning in Hospitality Management Curriculum: Case Study in Rural Southeast U.S." *Research in Higher Education Journal* 38 (2020). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1263668.pdf.

Singh, Vandana, and Alexander Thurman. "How Many Ways Can We Define Online Learning? A Systematic Literature Review of Definitions of Online Learning (1988-2018)." *American Journal of Distance Education* 33, no. 4 (October 2, 2019): 289–306. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2019.1663082.

Siripipatthanakul, Supaprawat, Pichart Kaewpuang, Tamonwan Sitthipon, and Patcharavadee Sriboonruang. "A Review of Educational Adaptation During the COVID-19 Pandemicvia Online Learning." *International Journalof Computing Sciences Research* 7 (2023): 1514–30. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25147/ijcsr.2017.001.1.114.

Stack, Steven. "Learning Outcomes in an Online vs Traditional Course." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 9, no. 1 (2015): 5. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2015.090105.

Stickney, Lisa T, Regina F Bento, Anil Aggarwal, and Veena Adlakha. "Online Higher Education: Faculty Satisfaction and Its Antecedents." *Journal of Management Education* 43, no. 5 (May 2, 2019): 509–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562919845022.

Talosa, Arlene D, Billy S Javier, and Estela L Dirain. "The Flexible-Learning Journey: Phenomenological Investigation of Self-Efficacy Influencing Factors among Higher Education Students." *Linguistics and Culture Review* 5, no. S3 SE- (October 23, 2021): 422–34. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS3.1590.

Tarrayo, Veronico N, Rafael Michael O Paz, and Emejidio C Gepila. "The Shift to Flexible Learning amidst the Pandemic: The Case of English Language Teachers in a Philippine State University." *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, June 20, 2021, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1944163.

Thompson, Alisun, Lina Darwich, and Lora Bartlett. "Not Remotely Familiar: How COVID-19 Is Reshaping Teachers' Work and the Implications for Teacher Education." *Northwest Journal of Teacher Education* 15, no. 2 (2020): 1–10. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15760/nwjte.2020.15.2.2.

Tolman, Steven. "Academic Dishonesty in Online Courses: Considerations for Graduate Preparatory Programs in Higher Education." *College Student Journal* 51, no. 4 (2017): 579–84. https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/prin/csj/2017/00000051/00000004/art00014.

Toropova, Anna, Eva Myrberg, and Stefan Johansson. "Teacher Job Satisfaction: The Importance of School Working Conditions and Teacher Characteristics." *Educational Review* 73, no. 1 (January 2, 2021): 71–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247.

Tuomi, Aarni, Iis P Tussyadiah, and Jason Stienmetz. "Applications and Implications of Service Robots in Hospitality." *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (May 25, 2020): 232–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965520923961.

United Nations Philippines. *Diversification, Jobs and the COVID-19 Recovery: Exploring Opportunities for Economic Diversification and Productive Employment in the Philippines*, 2021. https://philippines.un.org/sites/default/files/2021-08/Diversification%2C Jobs and the COVID-19 Recovery.pdf.

Vera III, J. Prospero E. De. "Expansion of Limited Face-to-Face Classes to Other Degree Programs Approved by PRRD - CHED [Press Release]." Commission on Higher Education | Republic of the Philippines, 2021. https://ched.gov.ph/expansion-of-limited-face-to-face-classes-to-other-degree-programs-approved-by-prrd-ched/.

———. "Universities, Colleges Gear up for Opening of Classes in August [Press Release]." Commission on Higher Education | Republic of the Philippines, 2020. https://ched.gov.ph/universities-colleges-gear-up-for-opening-of-classes-in-august/.

Wanner, Thomas, and Edward Palmer. "Personalising Learning: Exploring Student and Teacher Perceptions about Flexible Learning and Assessment in a Flipped University Course." *Computers & Education* 88 (2015): 354–69. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.07.008.

Wingo, Nancy Pope, Nataliya V. Ivankova, and Jacqueline A. Moss. "Faculty Perceptions about Teaching Online: Exploring the Literature Using the Technology Acceptance Model as an Organizing Framework." *Online Learning* 12, no. 1 (2017): 15–35. https://doi.org/10.10.24059/olj.v21i1.761.

Zuniga-Tonio, Jimmylen. "Google Classroom as a Tool of Support for Flexible Learning in the New Normal." *Journal of Education, Management and Development Studies* 1, no. 2 (2021): 25–39. https://doi.org/10.52631/jemds.v1i2.20.

About the authors

JOHN PAUL P. MIRANDA (corresponding author, jppmiranda@dhvsu.edu.ph), MIT, is an assistant professor IV at Don Honorio Ventura State University (DHVSU) Mexico Campus, Philippines. He is presently the Program Head for International Linkages and Partnerships for the Office for International Partnerships and Programs by the same university and was awarded as researcher of the year in 2020. A graduate of Master of Information Technology and presently on his writing his dissertation writing for the degree Doctor of Information Technology at the University of the East – Manila. His publications are in data science, data mining, computer science/IT education, and software development.

MARIA ANNA D. CRUZ (madcruz@dhvsu.edu.ph), PhD, is a faculty member of Don Honorio Ventura State University (DHVSU) and the current area chairperson for Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management and Bachelor of Science in Industrial Technology programs at DHVSU Mexico Campus in the Philippines. Her research interests are in hospitality and tourism management.