



Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Technology

Journal homepage: <http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/IJERT/>



Factors Affecting Distance Learning of the Physical Education Students of Sultan Kudarat State University, Mindanao, Philippines

*Erlvira Lu Escomes**, *Chiarel Jean P. Gutierrez*, *Ian Paul C. Sarabia*, *Emy A. Morbo*, *Vivencio L. Calixtro Jr.*

Sultan Kudarat State University, the Philippines

*Correspondence: E-mail: erlvaluescomes@sksu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the factors affecting distance learning for Physical Education students. It used a descriptive method and a survey questionnaire using a google form to gather the data of the thirty-three second-year students. Results revealed that the said students have low motivation in doing their tasks such as assignments, reports, assessments, demonstrations, and oral recitation. In the perception of the students in terms of social presence and social interaction, they were dissatisfied when it comes to online discussions, conversing, interacting, participating, and speaking online. The students also preferred face to face mode of learning and this implies that future researchers should conduct and make a program that will help to make the students motivated in distance learning. The school administration especially the Bachelor of Physical Education department should implement more strategies and programs to increase the level of motivation, social presence, and social interaction of the students in today's distance learning due to the pandemic condition. The Commission on Higher Education should reduce and limit the number of students in each class as to approve the limited face to face class for the Physical Education students so that they may be able to do the task with proper execution and can be a big impact on the level of motivation, social presence and social interaction of the students, especially that these students preferred face to face mode of learning than online learning.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Submitted/Received 28 Okt 2021

First revised 15 Nov 2021

Accepted 12 Dec 2021

First available online 13 Dec 2021

Publication date 01 Des 2021

Keyword:

*Distance learning,
Motivation,
Perception,
Physical education,
Preference.*

1. INTRODUCTION

World Health Organization (2020) declared a pandemic, keeping off face-to-face sports and thrilling in social distancing became part of regular life. The pandemic iatrogenic adjustments in numerous countries' instructional environments as they commenced instituting online classes.

As Philippine schools shifted to online distance learning, Physical Education (PE) has ended up as one of the casualty subjects for some learning institutions). While some needed to cut costs, some found it hard to conduct a PE class that usually requires face-to-face setups and group activities (Ghazi-Saidi *et al.*, 2020). Shin and Hickey, (2021) found out that online environments can generate a sense of anonymity to college students which makes it less complicated for college students to withdraw or take part minimally or disappear from the course.

It is not as easy to inspect the differences in student learning in online settings as in traditional ones. There is a broad range of constructs as proven predictors of academic achievement in online learning environments (OLEs), and these constructs or factors have been classified differently by different researchers (Dias *et al.*, 2020).

Therefore, this study was conducted to determine the level of motivation, perception, and preference of physical education students of Sultan Kudarat State University in distance learning during the academic year of 2020-2021.

2. METHOD

The method in this study uses descriptive quantitative research with total enumeration and uses an adapted questionnaire.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result showed that most of the respondents are lowly motivated in distance learning because of being uninspired to actively do the task, assignments, demonstration, and oral recitation. Also, most of the respondents are dissatisfied with social interaction and social presence. Then, they mostly preferred face to face mode of learning.

Table 1 shows the average weighted mean of the level of motivation in distance learning of physical education students. Based on the findings of the online survey, the overall mean rating is 2.55 or a descriptive rating of low motivation. The respondents averagely motivated into being excited to learn despite pandemic and different modes of learning ranked 1 with an average weighted mean of 2.93 and can easily pay attention, learn and understand every discussion ranked 2 with an average weighted mean of 2.78. Most of the respondents are low motivated in distance learning, which is stated in items; felt confident in every day of class ranked 3 with an average weighted mean of 2.39; constantly prepared in every discussion, activities, and reports ranked 4 with an average weighted mean of 2.36 and Inspired to actively do the task (e.g. assignments, demo, and oral recitation) ranked 5 with an average weighted mean of 2.27.

Based on the findings, this implies that most of the respondents are low motivated in distance learning because of being uninspired to actively do the task, assignments, demonstration, and oral recitation. They are also inconstantly prepared in every discussion, activity, and report and lastly, they don't feel confident in every day of their classes.

According to Chen and Jang, (2019) and Vanslambrouck *et al.*, (2018), the motivation of students has also decreased during online education. Widjaja and Chen, (2017) stated that

students who provide constant positive feedback and interaction towards online lectures show that their levels of motivation towards the learning material are high.

Table 1. Interpretation of the data in the level of motivation in distance learning of physical education second year students.

Level of motivation	Mean	Description
1. Excited to learn despite pandemic and different mode of learning	2.93	Average motivated
2. Can easily pay attention, learn and understand every discussion.	2.78	Average motivated
3. Inspired to actively do the task (e.g. assignments, reports, assessments, demo and oral recitation	2.27	Low motivated
4. Constantly prepared in every discussion, activities, and reports.	2.36	Low motivated
5. I felt confident in every day of my class	2.39	Low motivated
Total mean	2.25	Low motivated

Note. $n = 33$. WM – Weighted Mean. 1.00- 1.49 – Not Motivated; 1.50- 2.49 – Low Motivated; 2.50- 3.49 – Average Motivated; 3.50- 4.49 – Motivated; 4.50- 5.00 – Highly Motivated.

Table 2 shows the average weighted mean of the social presence in Distance Learning of Physical Education students. Based on the findings of the online survey, the overall mean rating is 2.58 or a descriptive rating of dissatisfied. The respondents are satisfied by the instructor-facilitated discussions in this online course, ranked 1 with an average weighted mean of 3.75 and they are comfortable introducing themselves in this online course, ranked 2 with an average weighted mean of 3.51. However, most of the respondents are dissatisfied in social presence in distance learning of Physical Education students with the items "The instructor created a feeling of an online community" ranked 3 with average weighted mean of 2.60; "Messages in this online course were impersonal" ranked 4 with an average weighted mean of 2.57; "I felt comfortable participating in online course discussion" ranked 5 with an average weighted mean of 2.48; " the instructions enabled me to form a sense of online community" ranked 6 with an average weighted mean of 2.39; "I felt comfortable conversing through online discussion, email and chat" ranked 7 with an average score of 2.33; " Discussions using online discussion, email, chat tend be more impersonal than face to face discussions" ranked 8 with an average weighted mean of 2.24; "I felt comfortable interacting with other students in this online course" ranked 9 with an average weighted mean of 2.03 and " Online discussion, email, and chat is an excellent medium for social interaction" ranked 10 with an average weighted mean of 1.93.

Based on the findings, this implies that the respondents are dissatisfied with social presence in distance learning, they agreed that messages in the online course were impersonal, they are also uncomfortable and don't have an excellent medium for social interaction, in conversing through online discussion, email, and chat. The introductions were unable to form a sense of online community. The respondents are also uncomfortable in participating in online discussions and also in interacting with other students in this online course. According to [Lowenthal and Dunlap \(2014\)](#), using social media and even using 'low tech' strategies are used to establish a social presence in online courses. However, despite our efforts, we continue to remain dissatisfied with our social presence endeavors. The

respondents are uncomfortable and not able to have better communication with their peers and instructors especially when having discussions, demonstrations, oral recitations, and reporting and this is being supported by Stavredes (2011), without awareness of other learners' presence, it is nearly impossible to develop relationships with peers. It is perhaps not surprising that courses with high levels of social presence result in a stronger feeling of community among the participants. Kyei-Blankson et al, (2019) suggested, frequent meaningful interaction in an online course motivates learners and promotes a sense of community. According to Baisley-Nodine et al, (2018), this can take manifest in different ways, but the instructor's social presence is an essential element for shaping how learners perceive the role of the instructor within the course.

Table 2. Interpretation of data in social presence in distance learning of physical education second year students.

Social presence	Mean	Description
1. Messages in this online course were impersonal	2.57	Dissatisfied
2. Online discussion, email, and chat is excellent medium for social interaction	1.93	Dissatisfied
3. I felt comfortable conversing through online discussion, email, and chat	2.33	Dissatisfied
4. I felt comfortable introducing myself in this online course	3.51	Satisfied
5. The introductions enabled me to form a sense of online community	2.39	Dissatisfied
6. I felt comfortable participating in online course discussion	2.48	Dissatisfied
7. The instructor created a feeling of an online community	2.60	Dissatisfied
8. The instructor facilitated discussion in this online course	3.75	Satisfied
9. Discussion using online discussion, email, chat end to be more impersonal than face-to-face discussion	2.24	Dissatisfied
10. I felt comfortable interacting with other students on this online course	2.03	Dissatisfied
Total mean	2.58	Dissatisfied

Note. n = 33. WM – Weighted Mean. 1.00- 1.49 – Strongly Disagree; 1.50- 2.49 – Disagree; 2.50- 3.49 – Uncertain; 3.50- 4.49 – Agree; 4.50- 5.00 – Strongly Agree.

Table 3 shows the average weighted mean of the Social Interaction in Distance Learning of Physical Education students. Based on the findings of the online survey, the overall mean rating is 2.59 or a descriptive rating of dissatisfied. The respondents are only satisfied with the item “My environment is feeling lighter with the good atmosphere when having interaction with my instructors and classmates”, ranked 1 with an average weighted mean of 3.63. Most of the respondents were dissatisfied with the items “I felt comfortable to see and interact with my classmates through online medium” ranked 2 with an average weighted

mean of 2.57; "I felt comfortable and confident to speak every discussion especially using online medium" ranked 3 with an average weighted mean of 2.54; "Better understanding of discussions with online medium" ranked 4 with an average weighted mean of 2.24; "I felt comfortable learning without the presence of my classmates" ranked 5 with an average weighted mean of 1.96.

Based on the findings, this implies that most of the respondents are dissatisfied with social interaction in distance learning, the students are not comfortable seeing and interacting with their classmates through online medium and without their presence, there's no better understanding of discussions with online medium and they are only satisfied and agreed with the environment is feeling lighter with the good atmosphere when having interactions with my instructors and classmates.

According to Hirumi *et al.*, (2012), meaningful interactions can reduce isolation and anonymity in online courses that might otherwise result in student dissatisfaction, poor performance, and dropping out. Lack of feedback, communication, and interaction with their instructor leads to student dissatisfaction with their online course, as well as higher withdrawal rates from that course Abdous and Yen, (2010). Quality interactions between instructor and students lead to student satisfaction (Malik *et al.*, 2010; Martínez-Argüelles & Batalla-Busquets, 2016). Thus, Otter *et al.*, (2013) found that students in online-only classes felt more disconnected from their peers and lecturers, more obliged to be self-directed in their studies, and less aided by their lecturer than their lecturers believe them to be.

Table 3. Interpretation of data of social interaction in distance learning of physical education second year students.

Social interaction	Mean	Description
1. I felt comfortable to see and interact with my classmates through online medium	2.57	Dissatisfied
2. A better understanding of discussions with the online medium	2.24	Dissatisfied
3. I felt comfortable and confident to speak every discussion especially using the online medium	2.54	Dissatisfied
4. I felt comfortable learning without the presence of my classmate	1.96	Dissatisfied
5. My environment is feeling lighter with the good atmosphere when having interactions with my instructors and classmates	3.63	Satisfied
Total mean	2.59	Dissatisfied

Note. $n = 33$. WM – Weighted Mean. 1.00- 1.49 – Strongly Disagree; 1.50- 2.49 – Disagree; 2.50- 3.49 – Uncertain; 3.50- 4.49 – Agree; 4.50- 5.00 – Strongly Agree.

Table 4 shows the majority of the respondents prefer a face-to-face mode of learning (78.79%). 5 respondents prefer online (15.15%) and 2 respondents prefer modular (6.06%). Based on the findings of the online survey, the majority of the respondents prefer a face-to-face mode of learning which is contrary to the findings of Henriksen *et al.*, (2020) Results of the studies show that the students perform much better online learning than traditional learning. However, there are also reasons for which students might prefer more traditional,

in-class activities. Although social connectedness can be derived online as mentioned by Grieve et al, (2013), most students feel that face-to-face contact is essential for building a sense of community. This is important since satisfaction with online classes is frequently somewhat lower than face-to-face classes (Lazarevic & Bentz, 2021). In addition, Cole et al, (2021) revealed that online students tend to prefer face-to-face, yet their course satisfaction is independent of their preferences for face-to-face interaction and is rather related to their communication satisfaction with instructors.

Table 4. Interpretation of data of student's preference in distance learning of physical education second year students.

Preference	Frequency	Percentage
1. Face to face	26	78.79%
2. Online	5	15.15%
3. Modular	2	6.06%
Total	33	100%

4. CONCLUSION

The level of motivation is low but they are averagely motivated to learn through different modes of learning despite the pandemic. With regards to the perceptions of the students in terms of social presence, they were only satisfied with the instructor's facilitated discussions. They revealed that they felt lighter when they had a good atmosphere while interacting in the class. Lastly, the more preferred class setting by the students in the face to face mode of learning.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank the respondents' schools and research coordinator, dean, friends, and our family for their guidance and support in doing this research. Importantly, to our research adviser who always shares her immense knowledge on how to succeed in our paper.

6. AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. Authors confirmed that the paper was free of plagiarism.

7. REFERENCES

- Abdous, M. H., and Yen, C. J. (2010). A predictive study of learner satisfaction and outcomes in face-to-face, satellite broadcast, and live video-streaming learning environments. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13(4), 248-257.
- Baisley-Nodine, E., Ritzhaupt, A. D., and Antonenko, P. D. (2018). Exploring social presence within an online course using Twitter. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 15(5), 235-253.
- Chen, Y. H., and Jang, S. J. (2019). Exploring the relationship between self-regulation and TPACK of Taiwanese secondary in-service teachers. *Journal of educational computing research*, 57(4), 978-1002.

- Cole, A. W., Lennon, L., and Weber, N. L. (2021). Student perceptions of online active learning practices and online learning climate predict online course engagement. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 29(5), 866-880.
- Dias, S. B., Hadjileontiadou, S. J., Diniz, J., and Hadjileontiadis, L. J. (2020). DeepLMS: A deep learning predictive model for supporting online learning in the Covid-19 era. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 1-17.
- Ghazi-Saidi, L., Criffield, A., Kracl, C. L., McKelvey, M., Obasi, S. N., and Vu, P. (2020). Moving from face-to-face to remote instruction in a higher education institution during a pandemic: Multiple case studies. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 4(4), 370-383.
- Grieve, R., Indian, M., Witteveen, K., Tolan, G. A., and Marrington, J. (2013). Face-to-face or Facebook: Can social connectedness be derived online?. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 604-609.
- Henriksen, K., Schinke, R., Moesch, K., McCann, S., Parham, W. D., Larsen, C. H., and Terry, P. (2020). Consensus statement on improving the mental health of high performance athletes. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 18(5), 553-560.
- Hirumi, A., Sivo, S., and Pounds, K. (2012). Telling stories to enhance teaching and learning: The systematic design, development and testing of two online courses. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 11(2), 125-151.
- Kyei-Blankson, L., Ntuli, E., and Donnelly, H. (2019). Establishing the importance of interaction and presence to student learning in online environments. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 30(4), 539-560.
- Lazarevic, B., and Bentz, D. (2021). Student perception of stress in online and face-to-face learning: the exploration of stress determinants. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 35(1), 2-15.
- Lowenthal, P. R., and Dunlap, J. C. (2014). Problems measuring social presence in a community of inquiry. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 11(1), 19-30.
- Malik, M. E., Danish, R. Q., and Usman, A. (2010). The impact of service quality on students' satisfaction in higher education institutes of Punjab. *Journal of Management Research*, 2(2), 1-11.
- Martínez-Argüelles, M. J., and Batalla-Busquets, J. M. (2016). Perceived service quality and student loyalty in an online university. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(4), 264-279.
- Otter, R. R., Seipel, S., Graeff, T., Alexander, B., Boraiko, C., Gray, J., and Sadler, K. (2013). Comparing student and faculty perceptions of online and traditional courses. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 19, 27-35.
- Shin, M., and Hickey, K. (2021). Needs a little TLC: Examining college students' emergency remote teaching and learning experiences during COVID-19. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(7), 973-986.

- Stavredes, T. (2011). Overcoming physical separation in the online environment to help learners persist. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, 6(1), 9-13.
- Vanslambrouck, S., Zhu, C., Lombaerts, K., Philipsen, B., and Tondeur, J. (2018). Students' motivation and subjective task value of participating in online and blended learning environments. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 36, 33-40.
- Widjaja, A. E., and Chen, J. V. (2017). Online Learners' Motivation in Online Learning: The Effect of Online-Participation, Social Presence, and Collaboration. *Learning Technologies in Education: Issues and Trends*, 12, 72-93.