

FLEXIBILITY OF ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES OF JHS SCIENCE TEACHERS IN FOSTERING STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT AND TASK COMPLETION

¹Benson R. Corneja, MAEd, ²Julie Rose P. Mendoza, EdD

bensoncorneja4@gmail.com
Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study on the flexibility of assessment strategies of Junior high school science teachers in fostering students' engagement and task completion as rated by teachers is a descriptive method as research designs. The study specifically involves one hundred-eight (108) Junior high school Science teachers that would rate the flexibility of their assessment strategies in student engagement and task completion of their students. The participants are from chapter schools of Maranatha Christian Academy in Laguna with Junior high schools and are all implementing Blended learning modality.

The researcher-made questionnaire was used in gathering data. The data gathered were answered by teachers from Maranatha Christian Academy of Cabuyao, Calamba, Los Baños, Bae and Sta. Cruz chapters specifically teaching science subjects.

The questionnaire was consisted of four variables to evaluate the level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in terms of applicability, engagement, motivation, and collaboration. Those items were rated according to their scales. The data were tallied, tabulated and treated using weighted mean for determining the level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies as rated by the respondents. Standard Deviation was used to determine the dispersion of the ratings of the respondents. On the other hand, F-test was used to determine the significant difference between the level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies as rated by the teachers.

Keywords: Assessment Strategies, Blended Learning, Behavioral Engagement, Cognitive Engagement, Cognitive Flexibility Theory, Distance Learning, Emotional Engagement, Flexible Assessment, Flexible Learning, Flexible Learning, Student Engagement

INTRODUCTION

Since the surge of COVID-19, educational institutions abruptly abandoned traditional face-to-face classes in favor of flexible learning, employing alternative modes of instruction delivery. Distance learning, televised classes, and online classes via Learning Management Systems, where students access their courses and communicate with their instructors, have all become the new normal in all educational settings (Dimaculangan et al., 2021).

As various education institutions have offered certain modalities of education delivery, teachers have also formulated various assessment strategies that would be applicable to certain alternative modes of instruction delivery such as online, modular and home schooling. Though distance learning was already introduced in the Philippines years ago (D H Galeon, 2019), majority of the educational institutions are not used to it, public and private schools. E-learning resources have been also essential in facilitating student learning (Subedi et al., 2020). Though online learning gives students with physical disabilities more freedom to interact in the virtual environment while learning (Basilaia & Kvavadze, 2020) but there is no one-size-fits-all pedagogy for learning delivery. Different methods of online learning are required for

various courses and age groups (Doucet et al., 2020). To make authentic connections with students, teachers and instructors have to change strategies to fit this new age of students (Joan, 2013) as well as their assessment strategies to be able to be suitable and applicable for different learning modalities.

The technique of assessment strategies can potentially enhance the experience of different learning modalities. For all types of learning, appropriate assessment strategies are essential. It might be particularly crucial for distance learning; which students may easily mistake for a "list of tasks to do." (Brookhart, 2020)

In this light, the researcher decided to conduct the study to evaluate the flexibility of the assessment strategies of Junior High school Science teachers in Maranatha Christian Academy schools in Laguna implementing Blended Learning Modality.

The researcher believes that conducting this research will give notion to the MCA schools system to provide effective and applicable assessment strategies in various alternative modalities that will pave the way for the school system to cater the different learning styles and special needs of learners.

This also sought to determine the flexibility of the assessment strategies of teachers on student engagement and tasks completion in JHS Science teachers. Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of teachers' assessment strategies in-terms of:
 - 1.1 Application;
 - 1.2 Engagement;
 - 1.3 Motivation; and
 - 1.4 Collaboration?
2. What is the level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in Students Engagement in terms of:
 - 2.1 Emotional;
 - 2.2 Behavioral; and
 - 2.3 Cognitive?
3. What is the mean level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in Task Completion in terms of:
 - 3.1 Punctuality;
 - 3.2 Content Mastery; and
 - 3.3 Student Autonomy?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the teacher's assessment strategies and students' engagement?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the teachers' assessment strategies and students' Task Completion?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Smith (2016) defines assessment as a process through which data is gathered, analyzed, and evaluated in a methodical manner. Hence, it is possible to use these interpretations to comprehend how the teaching and learning processes are progressing in schools. In the book written by Conrad, D. & Openo, J. (2018), assessment is a central part of the teaching-learning process, which involves the outcome, strategies, and content. In planning process, assessment is an integral part that links all other aspects of the intended learning experience.

Assessments do not have to be used solely to assess what has been learned, they may also be used to encourage pupils to learn while doing the task you have assigned (Rich, J. D., Jr, Colon, A. N., Mines, D., & Jivers, K. L., 2014). The teachers must receive enough instruction, mentoring, and actual implementation of efficient assessment techniques. To give a thorough grasp of formative assessment methodologies, practices, and their implementation in classrooms, educational authorities must create training programs and school-based professional development programs (N. Abdulla, 2019).

Many teachers still administer in-class multiple-choice exams to their pupils, with the primary purpose of determining how much they have previously learned. Teachers must establish ways for students to participate in lessons in order for them to have an opportunity to provide feedback on what they have learned (Jivers, et al., 2014). Thus, teacher's role in designing assessment strategies is crucial.

Students are deprived of the chance to succeed in their academic endeavors if the learning objectives are not met due to inadequate assessment strategies. This is backed by the claim made by McMillan (as mentioned in Said, et al., 2013), who claims that the traditional methods of evaluation are to blame for the lack of topic knowledge that leads to poor academic performance and low competence of learners.

Wiggin (as mentioned in Said, et al., 2013) asserts that in order to overcome this problem, instructors must have the appropriate assistance, training, and support in order to apply and evaluate different types of modern assessment approaches. This will assist teachers in assisting kids in achieving greater academic advancement.

Student assessments should be in line with curricular goals and educational objectives. Developing curricular material and delivery methods is equally important with determining the assessment strategies required for accurate evaluation of students' progress within individual programs.

The article written in Britannica states that distance learning, also known as distance education, e-learning, or online learning, is a type of education in which teachers and students are physically separated during instruction wherein various technologies are used to enhance student-teacher and student- student interaction (Berg, G. A. and Simonson, M., 2016).

When the COVID-19 pandemic hit the Philippines, higher education institutions (HEIs) established policy measures to combat the outbreak. However, despite Philippine HEIs' innovations in alternative learning modalities and technology for delivering education, there are still gaps and issues in their responses. Policy solutions and educational innovations should base on a better understanding of distance learning to response to the needs of the time (Joaquin JJB, Biana HT and Dacela MA, 2020).

Pappas, C. (2015) described Cognitive Flexibility Theory as the capability of learners to manipulate not only the method through which information and material are represented, but also the processes that are in charge of operating those representations. In flexible assessment, when students are encouraged to create their own representations of knowledge, they are better able to acquire and retain it. Instructional designers can give learners the option to absorb knowledge in a way that better meets their specific needs, hence boosting the effectiveness of their learning (Pappas, C., 2015).

In Distance Education journal published in 2017 titled "How flexible is flexible learning, who is to decide and what are its implications?", flexible learning was described as a state of being in which learning, and

teaching are more liberated from the constraints of time, place, and pace. For teachers, it may entail decisions about how to spend their time, as well as the style and techniques of contact with students and the school. It is a value principle in education and society at large, similar to diversity and equality. Flexibility in learning and teaching is important in any method of education, including face-to-face education on campus (2017).

Defined by Fredricks et al. (2014), cognitive engagement is an aspect of engagement, which is based on student investment in school and the processes of learning. A cognitively engaged student is a student who is thoughtful, strategic, and willing to exert the necessary effort for comprehension of complex ideas or mastery of difficult skills (Christenson, Reschly, & Wylie, 2012). The research on cognitive engagement is often concerned with how much students invest in learning and whether they are willing to work extra to get better academic outcomes. Because of the direct relationship to students' wellbeing, student engagement has recently been one of the goals for education. In particular, previous research had demonstrated significant links between student engagement in learning and such outcomes as school dropout, substance use, mental health, and academic outcomes (Bakker, Vergel, & Kuntze, 2015). Academic success and school dropout risk were found to be lower in learners who were actively engaged in their studies. They were discovered to have internal motivation for learning, attending classes, and involving in study activities. Since it is often believed that student engagement is flexible, it is important to both examine elements that predict school engagement and those that may be stimulated to have a positive impact on it.

Scholars defined student engagement as the intensity with which students apply themselves to learning in school, and it is regarded as an important component of student learning (Loveless, 2015). Students who are engaged are motivated to complete tasks successfully, are focused on the task at hand, often ask follow-up questions, are willing to take risks, and usually take part in rich content-based discussions with their peers (Loveless, 2015). Social engagement involves interaction between students, peers, and instructors that can positively contribute to students' overall learning (Jones & Thomas, 2012).

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study entails the use of Quantitative Descriptive research method to describe a population, situation, or phenomenon accurately and systematically. Since the research requires gathering large volumes of data to analyze frequencies, averages and patterns, the researcher will conduct a survey research design which is very much appropriate for describing the and gauging the level of flexibility of assessment strategies of the teachers (Mc Combes, S. 2020). It is viable and beneficial type of study, which has various benefits for describing and examining variables and constructs of interest. In order to characterize and investigate variables and constructs of interest, it is an effective and acceptable method. (Ponto J. 2015). Through survey, the demographic data of respondents will gather to describe the composition of the sample (DuBenske et al., 2014). Respondents will answer questions with rating scale and will use to confirm the presence of a predicted effect in the sample. The alternative hypothesis is that this effect does occur, and the null hypothesis is that this effect does not occur.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents will be limited to one hundred-eight (108) male and female Junior high school Science teachers aging from 22 to 54 years old. The participants are all from chapters of Maranatha Christian Academy in division of Laguna such as Calamba, Cabuyao, Los Baños, Bae and Sta. Cruz chapters with Junior high schools implementing Blended Learning modality.

The sampling method used is purposive sampling technique in selecting the respondents to determine the flexibility of assessments strategy of teachers. In this sampling method, limited numbers of people, which have expertise in the area researched, are used as the respondents; selected based on suitability for the study (Thought Co., 2020).

Research Procedure

Research is a creative and purposeful activity with a defined framework for discovering new dimensions of knowledge and resolving current issues. A systematic and structured effort to explore a specific problem that requires a solution.

For a systematic conduct of the study, the researcher will guide by array of procedures. In developing questionnaire, questions related to the demographic profile of the respondents are place at the beginning to easily provide data for distinction of the respondents, followed by integral questions that are aligned with criteria to quantify the level of assessment strategies of the respondents. On development of research instrument, questionnaires will be in Google Form format for promptness and convenience of distribution and collection, of data. The research instrument will be evaluated and double-checked for its validity and reliability to utilize in gauging the flexibility of assessment strategies. Prior to the administration of the material, the researcher will secure necessary permit and approval via letter to the School Administrators and Principal of the different chapters of Maranatha Christian Academy in division of Laguna. Upon approval, the questionnaires will administer through Messenger and or Email to the respondents of the study and necessary data will be collected.

Within the specified time frame, research instrument will be administered by the researcher.

Immediately after the test, the researcher will retrieve the duly accomplished testing instrument. Then, the researcher will collate and tabulate the gathered data for statistical treatment and analysis.

Research Instrument

This research will be utilizing questionnaires as research instrument, first, to gather the demographic data from the respondents such as age, gender, grade level, and MCA chapter they are studying in. Questionnaires inquires people in a sample or population for their thoughts on topics that are closely associated to the research study's objectives. To gauge the level of flexibility of the teachers' assessment strategies, the researcher will design closed-ended questions with ordered choices to examine each possible response independent of the other choices. Thus, Likert scales will use, since it provides numerical range of choices that are easiest for respondents to answer and for researcher to assess.

Part 1. Questionnaire will provide the mean level of assessment strategies of teachers in terms of applicability, student engagement, motivating and collaborative.

Table 1: Response Statement

Scale	Verbal value	Weighted value
5	Always	(4.00 – 4.99)

4	Often	(3.00 – 3.99)
3	Sometimes	(2.00 – 2.99)
2	Rarely	(1.00 – 1.99)
1	Never	(0.00 – 0.99)

Part 2. Questionnaire will provide the mean level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in respondents' cognitive engagement in terms of emotional, behavioral, and cognitive.

Part 3. Questionnaire will provide the mean level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in respondents' task completion in terms of promptness, content mastery and respondents' autonomy.

Part 4. Questionnaire will provide the mean of the overall rating of the level of flexibility of the teachers' assessment strategies.

Table 2: Response Statement

Scale	Verbal value	Weighted value
5	Highly Flexible	(4.00 – 4.99)
4	Very Flexible	(3.00 – 3.99)
3	Flexible	(2.00 – 2.99)
2	Fairly Flexible	(1.00 – 1.99)
1	Fixed or Not Flexible	(0.00 – 0.99)

Statistical Treatment of Data

Gathered data from the responses of the samples will statistically be treated to help the researcher interpret the result of the study. The statistical treatments to use is Mean, Standard Deviation. With the use of computer technology, statistical treatment will manage.

For sub problem 1, gathered data on the mean level of teachers' assessment strategies in terms of:

- Application
- Engagement
- Motivation
- Collaboration

For sub problem 2, the weighted mean will use to determine the mean level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in students' engagement in terms of emotional, behavioral, and cognitive.

- Emotional
- Behavioral
- Cognitive

For sub problem 3, the weighted mean will provide the mean level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in task completion in terms of:

- Punctuality
- Content Mastery
- Students' Autonomy

For sub problem 4, the weighted mean will use to determine the significant relationship between the teachers' assessment strategies to students' engagement.

For sub problem 5, the weighted mean will use to determine the significant relationship between the teachers' assessment strategies and students' task completion.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Level of teachers' assessment strategies in-terms of application

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
Feedbacks on <i>students' accomplishments</i> can be given in different ways.	4.60	0.68	Great Extent
The assessments adapted to the particularities of the <i>students'</i> environment.	4.56	0.65	Great Extent
The required resources for assessments are made available for students to access and use in different options.	4.44	0.67	Great Extent
The written works can be submitted in different modalities.	4.52	0.65	Great Extent
The performance outputs of students can be accomplished and submitted in various ways.	4.49	0.65	Great Extent
Weighted Mean	4.52		
SD	0.55		
Verbal Interpretation	Very Great Extent		

As shown in Table 1, the teachers always give feedback using various ways on students' accomplishments ($M=4.60$, $SD=0.68$), the assessments were adapted to the students' environment ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.65$), always provide ways on how written works can be submitted in different modalities ($M=4.52$, $SD=0.65$), same as the performance task were accomplished and submitted by students in various ways ($M=4.49$, $SD=0.65$), so as the teachers always made the resources for the assessments accessible in different options ($M=4.54$, $SD=0.67$). The over-all mean of 4.52 revealed that the teachers' assessment strategies is at very great extent of application.

These results are articulated in the study of Schmidt-Hertha (2020) that the student-professor relationship is critical, and distance education, paradoxically, strengthens it, distance education must intelligently combine with face-to-face teaching. As Bozkurt and Sharma (2020) concluded that it is not an option, but a requirement that entails more than simply uploading educational content; learning process gives learners assistance, responsibility, flexibility, and choice.

Table 2. Level of teachers' assessment strategies in-terms of engagement.

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
There is greater commitment and participation of students in the activities.	4.44	0.63	Great Extent
There is prompt and proper execution of the instructions given.	4.63	0.57	Great Extent
There is productive interaction between students and teacher.	4.52	0.62	Great Extent

There is prompt and appropriate answers from students to <i>teachers'</i> questions.	4.56	0.62	Great Extent
Students ask questions and clarifications in cases of confusions.	4.56	0.65	Great Extent
Weighted Mean	4.54		
SD	0.54		
Verbal Interpretation	Very Great Extent		

As shown in Table 2, the teachers always kept the students engaged by promoting prompt and proper execution of instructions ($M=4.63$, $SD=0.57$), asking questions and clarifications in cases of confusions ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.65$), prompt and appropriate answers to teachers' questions ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.62$), productive interaction ($M=4.52$, $SD=0.62$), and greater commitment and participation in the activities ($M=4.44$, $SD=0.63$). The over-all mean of 4.54 revealed that the teachers kept the student engaged at a very great extent.

These results are articulated in the study of Halverson & Graham (2019) it has significant implications for perseverance, in-depth learning, student satisfaction, and academic success. Furthermore, according to Bond & Bedenlier (2019) contextual variations such as learning environments or teacher strategies influence student engagement. As a result, it is critical to investigate how teachers can foster it in specific learning environments.

Table 3. Level of teachers' assessment strategies in-terms of motivation

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
Activities gives initiative to students to get high scores.	4.60	0.59	Great Extent
Activities makes students work creatively and give out their ideas.	4.56	0.60	Great Extent
Activities allow students to explore different resources and multimedia.	4.54	0.68	Great Extent
Activities initiates active learning and goal-oriented tasks.	4.56	0.62	Great Extent
Activities prepare <i>students'</i> mood and encourage to do their best.	4.50	0.66	Great Extent
Weighted Mean	4.55		
SD	0.57		
Verbal Interpretation	Very Great Extent		

As shown in Table 3, the activities provided by teachers always gives initiative to students to get high scores ($M=4.60$, $SD=0.59$), always initiates active learning and goal-oriented tasks ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.62$), always makes students work creatively and give out their ideas ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.60$), always allow students to explore different resources and multimedia ($M=4.54$, $SD=0.68$), and prepare students' mood and encourage to do their best ($M=4.50$, $SD=0.66$). The over-all mean of 4.55 revealed that the teachers kept the student motivated at a very great extent.

The results are aligned with the study of Lee, Gardner, and Lau (2019) that teachers can improve students' motivation by drawing students' attention to unique and difficult aspects of language, using group work, building confidence, and promoting learner autonomy. While Lee and Lin (2019) reasoned that teachers could motivate students by helping students recognize their own strength, tell students the usefulness of the knowledge and provide positive feedback on students' performance.

Table 4. Level of teachers' assessment strategies in-terms of collaboration

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
Assessments give opportunity to students to work in pairs or by group.	4.44	0.62	Great Extent
Assessments require students to collaborate with their classmates.	4.40	0.64	Great Extent
Assessments requires various tasks to be executed by more than one student.	4.56	0.59	Great Extent
Assessments delegates roles and tasks for each student to come up with one output.	4.56	0.60	Great Extent
<i>Students'</i> performance tasks are being graded with group participation as one of the criteria in rubrics.	4.50	0.65	Great Extent
Weighted Mean	4.49		
SD	0.56		
Verbal Interpretation	Very Great Extent		

As shown in Table 4, the teachers always provide assessment strategies that delegates roles and tasks for each student to come up with one output ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.59$), and requires various tasks to be executed by more than one student ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.59$). So as the teachers assessment strategies in performance tasks were always being graded with group participation as one of the criteria in rubrics ($M=4.50$, $SD=0.65$), they always give opportunity to students to work in pairs or by group ($M=4.44$, $SD=0.62$), and always require students to collaborate with their classmates ($M=4.40$, $SD=0.64$). The over-all mean of 4.49 revealed that the teachers kept the collaboration among students at a very great extent.

The findings are consistent with the study of K. Regmi & L. Jones (2020) assertion that blended learning interventions simply combine in-person classroom instruction with online instruction to promote independent, interactive, and collaborative learning because of its adaptable and technologically advanced structure. Yet, this strategy is described as being complex and difficult in nature due to its various potential designs and contextual requirements. A flipped or inverted classroom is a type of blended learning where students receive some of their education in-person and some online. This gives students more flexibility about where and how quickly they want to learn. According to Kitching F. (2015), collaboration and the incorporation of e-learning into existing curriculum are essential for the success of these online education or e-learning models.

Table 5. Level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in students' engagement in terms of emotional

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
------------	------	----	----

Students ask for clarification some instructions before doing the activity.	4.49	0.83	Highly Flexible
Students has eye contact and facial expressions while having discussions.	4.55	0.65	Highly Flexible
Students have fun and feel proud of their accomplishments.	4.48	0.66	Highly Flexible
Students show excitement on using different platforms for their activity.	4.57	0.65	Highly Flexible
Students are confident and freely express their selves in their works.	4.51	0.57	Highly Flexible
Weighted Mean	4.52		
SD	0.54		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

As shown in Table 5, the teachers provided assessment strategies were highly flexible in engaging the students emotionally. These were manifested through the excitement of students on using different platforms for their activity ($M=4.57$, $SD=0.65$), they have eye contact and facial expressions while having discussions ($M=4.55$, $SD=0.65$), they were confident and free to express their selves in their works ($M=4.51$, $SD=0.57$), they ask for clarification about some instructions before doing the activity ($M=4.49$, $SD=0.83$), and they have fun and feel proud of their accomplishments ($M=4.48$, $SD=0.66$). The over-all mean of 4.52 revealed that the teachers, assessment strategies were very high flexibility in engaging the students emotionally.

Aligned with the findings, it discovered in the study of Hewson, that older distance learners are more likely to feel happy or excited about their course than younger learners, and students who spent more time studying described more positive emotional states. Similarly, students who felt more a part of a community expressed more emotional positivity, using words like 'excited' or 'energized' to describe their feelings (Hewson, 2018).

Table 6. Level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in students' engagement in terms of behavioral

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
Students raise hand whenever there is queries or clarifications.	4.56	0.59	Highly Flexible
Students submitted work followed the provided instructions and criteria.	4.56	0.60	Highly Flexible
Students has eye contact or turn cameras on, and microphones unmuted during class discussion.	4.47	0.66	Highly Flexible
Students are well prepared having the required resources for every activity.	4.44	0.73	Highly Flexible
Students have initiative in leading the routinary activities.	4.53	0.65	Highly Flexible
Weighted Mean	4.51		

SD	0.56
Verbal Interpretation	Very High

As shown in Table 6, the teachers provided assessment strategies were highly flexible in engaging the students behaviorally. These were displayed in submitted work of students followed the provided instructions and criteria ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.60$), raising of their hands whenever there is queries or clarifications ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.59$), their initiative in leading the routinary activities ($M=4.53$, $SD=0.65$), they have eye contact or turn cameras on, and microphones unmuted during class discussion ($M=4.47$, $SD=0.66$), and their preparedness of the required resources for every activity ($M=4.44$, $SD=0.73$). The over-all mean of 4.51 revealed that the teachers, assessment strategies were very high flexibility in engaging the students behaviorally.

In the study of Cooper (2014), interactions between students and teachers are important because a strong, positive relationship between the student and teacher is essential for increasing student behavioral engagement. Positive interpersonal climate is positively associated with engagement according to Davis & Mc Partland (2012), so student interactions with their peers are also important for behavioral engagement.

Table 7. Level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in students' engagement in terms of cognitive

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
<i>Students' deeper reflection and personal responses to questions.</i>	4.46	0.63	Highly Flexible
Students demonstrate their know-how from lessons discussed.	4.34	0.66	Highly Flexible
Students share what they have learned about the topic.	4.47	0.68	Highly Flexible
Students engage in self-initiated information-seeking behaviors	4.50	0.63	Highly Flexible
Students make connections of their learnings in real life scenarios.	4.52	0.65	Highly Flexible
Weighted Mean	4.46		
SD	0.57		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

As shown in Table 7, the teachers provided assessment strategies were highly flexible in engaging the students cognitively. These were demonstrated in students' connections of their learnings in real life scenarios ($M=4.52$, $SD=0.65$), their self-initiated information-seeking behaviors ($M=4.50$, $SD=0.63$), sharing of what they have learned about the topic ($M=4.47$, $SD=0.68$), their deep reflection and personal responses to questions ($M=4.46$, $SD=0.63$), and demonstration of their know-how from lessons discussed ($M=4.34$, $SD=0.66$). The over-all mean of 4.46 revealed that the teachers, assessment strategies were very high flexibility in engaging the students cognitively.

The result is supported by the study of Barlow, Brown, and Lutz, indicating that cognitive engagement can measure in the context of a student's activities. Example, movement from misconception to knowledge, interacting with peers, taking notes, or processing newly introduced material (Barlow et al., 2020). It has been also demonstrated by Wang & Eccles (2011) that students who are emotionally and cognitively engaged in learning are more willing to invest time and effort in their studies, are more likely to be efficient in dealing with the demands of studying, and exhibit greater persistence when confronted with problems than students who are not emotionally and cognitively engaged.

Table 8. Level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in task completion in terms of punctuality

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
Students meet the established deadlines of submissions.	4.55	0.65	Highly Flexible
Students can follow the set schedule of tasks for each activity of final performance task.	4.55	0.65	Highly Flexible
Students do not cramming on the submission of their activities.	4.49	0.63	Highly Flexible
Students do not ask for extensions in submission of their output.	4.46	0.66	Highly Flexible
Students manage to use the allotted time given to them productively	4.43	0.80	Highly Flexible
Weighted Mean	4.49		
SD	0.60		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

As shown in Table 8, the teachers provided assessment strategies were highly flexible in terms of punctuality in task completion. These were established as students follow the set schedule of tasks for each activities of final performance task and meet the established deadlines of submissions ($M=4.55$, $SD=0.65$), they do not cramming on the submission of their activities ($M=4.49$, $SD=0.63$), they do not ask for extensions in submission of their output ($M=4.46$, $SD=0.66$), and they productively manage to use the allotted time given to them ($M=4.43$, $SD=0.80$). The over-all mean of 4.49 revealed that the teachers, assessment strategies were very high flexibility in students' punctuality in students' task completion.

The result is aligned with the study of McLoughlin C. (2015) that full attention and engagement, good classroom discipline determines student success in completing tasks. His findings confirmed that there are specific issues concerning the teacher, assessment, learning environment or venue, and classroom management, as well as classroom materials. Mangali & Cababa (2019) said that the submission deadline, students' emotional and personal state, concurrent performance tasks, teacher subjectivity, and grouping of students all contribute to uncompleted performance tasks.

Table 9. Level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in task completion in terms of content Mastery

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
Students use learned ideas and strategies to accomplish given tasks.	4.51	0.69	Highly Flexible

Students construct outputs showing concepts from topics discussed.	4.54	0.63	Highly Flexible
Students use the learned skills in given tasks.	4.46	0.70	Highly Flexible
Students can cite other examples out from what the teacher has given.	4.39	0.78	Highly Flexible
Students get high scores every summative tests.	4.52	0.59	Highly Flexible
Weighted Mean	4.49		
SD	0.59		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

As shown in Table 9, the teachers provided assessment strategies were highly flexible in terms of content mastery in task completion. These were recognized as students construct outputs showing concepts from topics discussed ($M=4.54$, $SD=0.63$), they get high scores every summative test ($M=4.52$, $SD=0.59$), they use learned ideas and strategies to accomplish given tasks ($M=4.51$, $SD=0.69$), they use the learned skills in given tasks ($M=4.46$, $SD=0.70$), and they can cite other examples out from what the teacher has given ($M=4.39$, $SD=0.78$). The over-all mean of 4.49 revealed that the teachers, assessment strategies were very high flexibility in students' content mastery in students' task completion.

These results are articulated in the study of Swanson (2014) that student performance in the sequential content is dependent on a basic standard in scaffolded arithmetic topics. If specific requirements are learned, student achievement in the classroom in terms of mastering the standards should improve overall. This method of teaching the standards should result in an increase in content mastery. Standardized assessment of student success should also show a considerable gain for students in courses that use a standards-based mastery approach to teaching.

Table 10. Level of flexibility of teachers' assessment strategies in task completion in terms of student autonomy

STATEMENTS	Mean	SD	VI
Students submit their outputs in various ways.	4.47	0.65	Highly Flexible
Students use their choice of resources for their projects.	4.40	0.68	Highly Flexible
Students creatively use original ideas and strategies to accomplish tasks.	4.40	0.71	Highly Flexible
Students demonstrate use of given resources effectively and creatively.	4.36	0.75	Highly Flexible
Students present their reports in the way they are more comfortable with.	4.38	0.71	Highly Flexible
Weighted Mean	4.40		
SD	0.62		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

As shown in Table 10, the teachers provided assessment strategies were highly flexible in promoting student autonomy in task completion. These were showcased by students by way of submitting their outputs in various ways ($M=4.47$, $SD=0.65$), creatively use of original ideas and strategies to accomplish

tasks ($M=4.40$, $SD=0.71$), using their choice of resources for their projects ($M=4.40$, $SD=0.68$), presenting their reports in the way they are more comfortable with ($M=4.38$, $SD=0.71$), and effectively and creatively demonstrating use of given resources ($M=4.36$, $SD=0.75$). The over-all mean of 4.40 revealed that the teachers' assessment strategies were very high flexibility in developing student autonomy in task completion.

The result is supported by the study of Nez and León (2019) saying that learners' basic mental needs will sustained and addressed when the educator provides autonomy support in the classroom, which will predict the degree of class participation. While Deci and Ryan (2016) claimed in their examination of the Self-determination theory that competence, autonomy support, and relatedness are among the most important aspects promoting learner autonomy.

Table 11. Significant effect of the teachers' assessment strategies to its flexibility

Teachers' Assessment Strategies	Flexibility	Beta Coefficient	t - value	p - value	Analysis
Application	Students Engagement	0.4249	4.1738	0.000	Significant
Engagement		-0.053	-0.483	0.6303	Not Significant
Motivation		0.2194	2.2815	0.0246	Significant
Collaboration		0.3676	5.4002	0.000	Significant
Adjusted R		0.8476			
SquareF-Value		149.8			
Sig		0.000			
Application	Task Completion	0.264	1.7154	0.0893	Not Significant
Engagement		0.1917	1.1531	0.2515	Not Significant
Motivation		0.206	1.4166	0.1596	Not Significant
Collaboration		0.2773	2.6941	0.0082	Significant
Adjusted R		0.6936			
SquareF-Value		61.545			
Sig		0.000			

The students' flexibility in terms of engagement was influenced by the teachers' assessment strategies as to applicability ($t=4.17$, $p=0.00$), motivation ($t=2.28$, $p=0.025$), and collaboration ($t=5.40$, $p=0.00$). The adjusted R square value indicate that 84.76% the variation in students' engagement was explained by the teachers' strategies on application, motivation and collaboration. The F-value of 149.8 is significant at absolute probability. While the students' flexibility in terms of student engagement was turn out to be not significant to the teachers' assessment strategies as to engagement ($t=-0.483$, $p=0.63$).

Even if there is an effect, the variable may turn out not significant because of the sample size. It might need more samples to achieve its significant result but since the study is limited to MCA schools only, it turned out to be not significant or might be the random variation is too large, or it is correlated with other variables, which makes it not possible to determine how much of the effect of each correlated variable is

attributable to each individual variable. Anyway, its insignificance does not disqualify the probability of the effect, it just indicates that the data do not support the existence of one (C. Hennig, 2022).

From the findings above, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis “There is no significant effect of the teachers’ assessment strategies to its flexibility” is rejected. Thus, the alternative should be accepted which incites that there is a significant effect between them.

These results are in accordance with the findings of Al-Sudani, S. (2021) that the flexible assessment was enjoyable, useful, and interesting, that it promoted collaborative learning, and that it helped develop students’ employability skills. It also increased students’ maturity and self-awareness. This type of assessment encouraged independent and lifelong learning, and students gained the ability to design their research findings. It further shows that flexible assessment strategy enabled students to take an active role in their learning. This assessment strategy was effective in developing higher order thinking skills when the assessment activities were designed to develop creativity and critical analysis.

The students’ flexibility in terms of task completion was turn out to be not significant to the teachers’ assessment strategies as to application ($t=1.72$, $p=0.09$), engagement ($t=1.15$, $p=0.25$), and motivation ($t=1.42$, $p=0.16$). While the students’ flexibility in terms of task completion was turn out to be significant to the teachers’ assessment strategies as to collaboration ($t=-2.69$, $p=0.01$). The adjusted R square value indicate that 69.36% the variation in task completion was explained by the teachers’ strategies on application, engagement, and motivation. The F-value of 61.545 is significant at absolute probability.

It can’t tell that there is no effect, but it can tell that an effect, if it exists, is likely to be of negligible practical or theoretical significance. Maybe there are characteristics of the population that caused the results to turn out differently than expected. Or perhaps there were outside factors that did not control that could explain the findings.

This result in terms of application is in support with the theory of Schmidt-Hertha, 2020 stating that the student-professor relationship is critical, and distance education, paradoxically, strengthens it, distance education must intelligently combine with face-to-face teaching and does not merely on a single modality. According to Kahu & Nelson, 2018, improved framework contributes to the explanation of why some students with demographic traits linked to lower completion rates are retained and do go on to successfully complete their studies, while similar others do not. While in the study of Wong, 2014, claimed that effective motivational strategies include: adequate preparation and assistance, recognizing success, and reminding students of the instrumental value. These factors were missed to consider by the researcher of which might affect the its significance. The researcher suggests for more research may be needed to reconcile these differences and future researchers may conduct profounder research to help shed more light on the topic.

CONCLUSION

Based from the results and interpretation of data, a conclusion was drawn, which shows that the level of teachers’ assessment strategies of in terms of Applicability, Engagement, Motivating and Collaborative were all interpreted as “Very High Extent”. While the ratings of the flexibility of teachers’ assessment strategies in terms of Student Engagement and Task Completion were all interpreted as “Very High”.

This implies that the teachers of Maranatha Christian Academy in Laguna chapters are implementing Very High Extent of assessment strategies in terms of Applicability, Engagement, Motivating and Collaborative. This also entails that their implemented assessment strategies in Student Engagement and Task Completion are “Highly Flexible” and the teachers’ assessment strategies have significant effect to the level of its flexibility.

The researcher therefore needs to reject the null hypothesis in terms of the significant difference between the teachers’ assessment strategies to its flexibility in Student Engagement and Task Completion, as it was found out that the ratings of the teachers have significant difference in all of the variables.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A Flexible Assessment Matrix is proposed in Teachers’ Guide Format to be used as guide for alternative assessment strategies in various modalities such as online, modular and face-to-face. It could be used not only to cater students’ needs different learning styles and modalities but also in times of cancellations, suspensions, and even lockdowns and quarantines due to certain environmental hazards and natural calamities.
2. Teachers continue and develop more flexible assessment strategies applicable in various modalities that would augment students’ engagement and task completion.
3. However, it is still recommended that teachers have updated and upgraded skills and knowledge in technology in teaching in order to know and learn how to put various types of teaching strategies into practice in order to ensure the quality of learning.
4. It is also suggested that more research be conducted on pure online, hybrid, and hyflex content design and assessment strategies in order to provide students with a variety of modality options in order to increase learning opportunities and make learning more convenient for individuals who are unable to attend traditional schooling due to disabilities or environmental constraints.
5. It is recommended that future researchers conduct similar studies to reconcile discrepancies in findings and the insignificant variables and use different population or look for different set of variables.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher wishes to express her profound gratitude to all those who extended their undying support and cooperation for the completion of this study:

Laguna State Polytechnic University, for their commitment to academic excellence research has greatly contributed to the successful completion of this study;

Dr. Mario R. Briones, President of the Laguna State Polytechnic University for this good leadership that encouraged the researcher to aspire and finish this study;

Dr. Rosario G. Catapang, the Dean of College of Teacher Education, for her undying support and guidance to the researcher.

Julie Rose P. Mendoza, EdD, GSAR Coordinator and Thesis Adviser, for her unwavering encouragement and for her invaluable guidance to the researcher as she pursued her graduate studies. Her consistent support served as a great motivation for the researcher to successfully complete her thesis., as well;

To the Administrators and Principals of MCA Cabuyao, **Ptbr. Rowena G. Marbida**, MCA Calamba, **Dr. Uzziel Capunpon**, MCA Los Baños, **Ptr. Lorna D. Colico**, MCA Bae, **Ptbr. Gemma B. Villanueva** and **Ptr. Catherine M. De Luna** and **Mr. Reymel A. Mallari**, MCA Sta. Cruz;

To all the **Science Teachers** of **MCA Cabuyao**, **MCA Calamba**, **MCA Los Baños**, **MCA Bae** and **MCA Sta. Cruz** for giving their precious time in participating on the research as respondents; The members of the committee for oral examination who knowledgeably, skillfully, and competently shared their insights as a reflection of their distinguished expertise in their own fields, her Subject Specialist, **Regina E. Gloria, PhD**, her English Critic, **Aileen M. Daran, EdD**, her Technical Editor, **Vilma M. Geronimo, PhD**, her Internal Statistician, **Merilyn P. Juacalla, EdD**, her External Statistician, **Benjamin O. Arjona, EdD**, and her External Panel Member, **Lyrma C. Hife, EdD**, for their valuable suggestions, comments, and efforts in checking and having this study revised.

The researcher offers his regards and blessing to all those who helped him in any respect during the completion of the project, and most of all to:

Almighty God, the fountain of wisdom, knowledge, confidence, strength and skills, for the profound inspiration and courage.

REFERENCES

- [1] Mealy, B. (2019). Enhancing Student Success Using Flexible Assessment. Retrieved from: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Enhancing-Student-Success-Using-Flexible-Assessment-Mealy/e23e6b0b8cdd0bb20cc829d88ace82d99de3b108>
- [2] Wenger E (1998) Communities of Practice, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [3] Conrad, D., & Openo, J. (2018). Assessment strategies for online learning: Engagement and authenticity. Athabasca University Press. Page 160 Retrieved from: <https://books.google.com.ph/books?hl=en&lr=&id=p29IDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=assessment+strategies+for+online+learning>
- [4] Rich, J. D., Jr, Colon, A. N., Mines, D., & Jivers, K. L. (2014). Creating learner-centered assessment strategies for promoting greater student retention and class participation. *Frontiers in psychology*, 5, 595. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00595>
- [5] Berg, G. A. and Simonson, M., (2016). Distance learning. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/distance-learning>
- (2017) How flexible is flexible learning, who is to decide and what are its implications? *Distance Education*, 38:3, 269-272, DOI: 10.1080/01587919.2017.1371831
- [6] Brian Irwin & Stuart Hepplestone (2012) Examining increased flexibility in assessment formats, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37:7, 773-785, DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2011.573842
- [7] Joaquin JJB, Biana HT and Dacela MA (2020) The Philippine Higher Education Sector in the Time of COVID-19. *Front. Educ.* 5:576371. doi: 10.3389/educ.2020.576371
- [8] McCombes, S. (2020) Introduction to Research Methods. Descriptive. Retrieved from: <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/descriptive-research/>
- [9] Thought Co. (2020). Understanding Purposive Sampling. Retrieved from: <https://www.thoughtco.com/purposive-sampling-3026727>

- [10] Ponto J. (2015). Understanding and Evaluating Survey Research. *Journal of the advanced practitioner in oncology*, 6(2), 168–171.
- [11] Bist, Resham. (2015). Research Procedure: An Introduction. *Journal of NELTA Surkhet*. 4.10.3126/jns.v4i0.12858.
- [12] Gonczi, Andrew; Hager, Paul; Athanasou, James A. The development of competency-based assessment strategies for the professions.
- [13] Brookhart, S. (2020, May). Five formative assessment strategies to improve distance learning outcomes for students with disabilities (NCEO Brief #20). National Center on Educational Outcomes
- [14] Clay Hutama Basera (2019). Learners' Perceptions of Assessment Strategies in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 6(2): 76-81.
- [15] DeVito, M. (2016). Factors Influencing Student Engagement . Unpublished Certificate of Advanced Study Thesis, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, CT. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/edl/11>
- [16] Rotgans JJ, Schmidt HG. Cognitive engagement in the problem-based learning classroom. *Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract*. 2011 Oct;16(4):465-79. doi: 10.1007/s10459-011-9272-9. Epub 2011 Jan 18. PMID: 21243425; PMCID: PMC3167368.
- [17] Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149–172). Springer.
- [18] Alam, M & Nor, Siti & Rashid, Millah. (2013). A Study on Time Management and Punctuality Issues among Students at Secondary School, Kedah. 2013. 52-56. 10.5923/c.economics.201301.10.
- [19] Ponto J. Understanding and Evaluating Survey Research. *J Adv Pract Oncol*. 2015 Mar-Apr;6(2):168-71. Epub 2015 Mar 1. PMID: 26649250; PMCID: PMC4601897.
- [20] Li, Y., Lerner, R.M. Interrelations of Behavioral, Emotional, and Cognitive School Engagement in High School Students. *J Youth Adolescence* 42, 20–32 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9857-5>
- [21] Kitching F, Winbolt M, MacPhail A, Ibrahim JE. Web-based social media for professional medical education: perspectives of senior stakeholders in the nursing home sector. *Nurse Educ Today*. 2015;35:1192–8.
- [22] I-Sudani, S. (2021). The Impact of Flexible Assessment on Students' Engagement and Learning During COVID-19 Pandemic. *European Journal of Teaching and Education* 3(4), 29-41
- [23] Wu, Y., & Drazkowski, A. (2019, June), Standard-based Grading In Introductory Physics Laboratory Courses Paper presented at 2019 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition , Tampa, Florida. 10.18260/1-2—33281
- [24] Laksitowening, K. A., Santoso, H. B., & Hasibuan, Z. A. (2017). E-Learning Personalization Using Triple-Factor Approach in Standard-Based Education. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 801(1), 1-9.
- [25] Nasser, R., Zaki, E., Allen, N., Mula, B. A., Mutawaha, F. A., Ali, H. A. B., Kerr, T. (2014). Alignment of teacher developed curricula and national standards in Qatar's national education reform. *International Education Studies*, 7(10), 14-24
- [26] Jared Stein, Charles R. Graham (2020) *Essentials for Blended Learning, 2nd Edition: A Standards-Based Guide Essentials of Online Learning*
- [27] Owston R, York D and Murtha S 2013 Student perceptions and achievement in a university blended learning strategic initiative *Internet & Higher Educ*. 18 pp 34-46

- [28] Huong May Truong, Integrating learning styles and adaptive e-learning system: Current developments, problems and opportunities, *Computers in Human Behavior*, Volume 55, Part B, 2016, Pages 1185-1193,
- [29] Nimfa G. Dimaculangan, Christian P. San Luis, Christine Gay C. Gabitanan (2021). Teachers' Self-Assessment of their Online Teaching Readiness and Attitude. *International Journal of Innovative Science, Engineering & Technology*, Vol. 8 Issue 3, March 2021
- [30] Irwin, B., & Hepplestone, S. (2012). Examining increased flexibility in assessment formats. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(7), 773–785.
- [31] Steventon, G. J. (2012) Finding their voice: podcasts for teaching, learning and assessment. In L. Clouder, C. Broughan, S. Jewell and G. Steventon (Eds.) *Improving Student Engagement and Development through Assessment: Theory and practice in higher education*, 86-98, Oxford: Routledge
- [32] Gordon, N. A. (2014). Flexible Pedagogies: technology-enhanced learning. In *The Higher Education Academy*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.2052.5760>
- [33] Stefan Hrastinski (2019). What Do We Mean by Blended Learning? Division of Digital Learning, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Osquars backe 31, SE-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden. Published online: 7 February 2019
- [34] Lockee, B. B., & Clark-Stallkamp, R. (2022). Pressure on the system: increasing flexible learning through distance education. *Distance Education*, 43(2), 342–348.
- [35] Smith, K., & Hill, J. (2019). Defining the nature of blended learning through its depiction in current research. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(2), 383–397.
- [36] Vanslambrouck, S., Zhu, C., Lombaerts, K., Philipsen, B., & 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.
- [37] Li, K. C., & Wong, B. Y. Y. (2018). Revisiting the definitions and implementation of flexible learning. In K. C. Li, K. S. Yuen, & B. T. M. Wong (Eds.), *Innovations in open and flexible education* (pp. 3–13). Springer.
- [38] Barlow, A., Brown, S., Lutz, B. et al. Development of the student course cognitive engagement instrument (SCCEI) for college engineering courses. *IJ STEM Ed* 7, 22 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00220-9>
- [39] Heddy, B. C., Taasobshirazi, G., Chancey, J. B., & Danielson, R. W. (2018). Developing and validating a conceptual change cognitive engagement instrument. *Frontiers in Education*, 3(June), 1–9.
- [40] Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*. 38(5), 758-773. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2011.598505
- [41] Abdulla, Najma. (2019). Effectiveness of Assessment for Learning: Teachers Perception. *Maldives National University*
- [42] Said, H. B., Ahmed, I., Khan, F., Awang, Z., Yasin, M. A.-m., & Summintono, B. (2013). The Effect of Training on Teachers' Attitude Toward Assessment as Learning. *World Applied Science Journal*, 1-6.