



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



Working students' academic performance on flexible learning

John Harold Flores Cruz *

Sta. Peregrina High School, Schools Division of Bulacan, Pulilan, Bulacan, Philippines.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2024, 24(02), 2320–2339

Publication history: Received on 16 October 2024; revised on 24 November 2024; accepted on 26 November 2024

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.24.2.3607>

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the working students' academic performance on flexible learning. It looked into the relationship between the working students' academic performance and flexible learning. It also explored the difference between the students' academic performance and their profile. This explanatory-sequential study involved 166 working students of Baliwag Polytechnic College. Findings revealed that highly significant correlations were found between respondents' perceptions on flexible learning and their academic performance. Further, student-respondents affirmed that their self-disciplined was developed in self-regulated learning in this time of flexible learning and they believed that they get to save money from transportation and be able to use it for other school-related dues. Also, significant differences existed between the respondents' gender, task performance, and general weighted average. Further analysis revealed that highly significant differences existed between the respondents' track, year level, and general weighted average. Findings also disclosed that no significant differences were found among the respondents' academic performance, sibling position and hours worked per week. Hence, highly significant differences were revealed between the respondents' strand, monthly family income, and general weighted average.

Keywords: Flexible Learning; Academic Performance; Exploratory-Sequential Study; Self-regulated Learning; Task Performance

1. Introduction

Education is an essential means by which peace and prosperity are accomplished by organized society. For a productive society, education is required. Our population is only growing, and so are our needs, in turn. Training is the secret to traveling around the world, searching for better work, being immersed in various possibilities, and eventually thriving in life. Training is the best venture for everybody and there are more chances for well-educated people to get a job that gives them fulfillment.

As the world is being challenged with the pandemic, it came to have many restrictions in people's way of life, one of which is in Education. To help schools adopt this flexible learning scheme, CHED developed PHL CHED Connect which houses free higher education materials that can be used for teaching, learning, and research purposes. CHED has also been training faculty members through the HiEd Bayanihan program and giving grants to higher education institutions (HEIs) to train teachers with specific needs.

Moreover, COVID-19 has stunned the world across various facets of life, the education sector, considered to have been significantly impacted, was perhaps one area best braced for a rapid change toward a digital world. In the process of moving to a large-scale digital learning environment, many education providers have re-evaluated effective teaching strategies when utilizing digitized platforms. Such re-evaluation has led to modifications in not only course structure and content, but particularly the method of delivery. The lower education, led by DepEd, has also been preparing for

* Corresponding author: John Harold Flores Cruz

remote learning through the DepEd Computerization Program (DCP) which aims to provide equipment to all public schools, and the Public Education Network (PEN) which ensures that all schools and offices are connected.

The terms student and job seem to be two opposite fields within the same arena that are naturally distinct and cannot coexist. Before embarking on the journeys of adults, which is working life, people viewed the first word as an initial life period. The university is, however, the only place where these two contrasting fields can be well executed, with part-time jobs being the key. Indeed, one can coordinate the time when they need to study and when they need to work, with flexible class schedules.

In a special report from the Department of Education about the senior high school graduates, they have highlighted an experience of a working student who was able to graduate for earning his own money. The graduate mentioned that part of his success was because of the training he got from the SHS programs. DepEd envisioned the SHS program to produce graduates prepared for higher education and capable of starting their businesses or landing a job even without a college degree.

Consequently, in the report of ABS CBN news, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) stated that around 216,000 under-studies in the Philippines are right now juggling school and work. The figure is about 8% of the total number of students in the country. CHED said working students today are mostly into food service, entertainment, and sales, apart from their usual stints as a library and research assistants. Lawyer Julito Vitriolo, officer-in-charge at CHED's office of the executive director stated "They need extra income because of a financial crisis." CHED added that only 50% of the working students get to finish college as many cannot cope and cannot concentrate on their studies, while some have poor health, while others give up because of insufficient funds. Moreover, in Davao Region, the low rates of the study accomplishments are the central concern of the Department of Education (DepEd). The study of Ramento (2011), states that the low educational attainments of the students in the City of Davao were due to a low salary which leads the students to combine working and studying. Thus, the students that have financial problems are spending more time working than studying and because of this, they attained poor grades and poor performance in school.

According to Nucum (2018), over the years, a part of the Philippine education community has always been the notion of working while learning. In order to afford the funds required to obtain an undergraduate degree, the choice has always been to seize the opportunity to work. Even if there could be different variables involved. Nevertheless, the financial crisis is also the biggest reason why students are interested in part-time or full-time work. On this day, the number of working students is increasing. On a positive note, it is a good training ground for those who would want to apply the knowledge and skill that they have gained in school. Considering the said realistic situation, one must understand the struggle that a working student faces every day, particularly on catching up with regular students at school. It must emphasize that running from school to work and juggling academic requirements and side-hustles while keeping one's family, social, or love life in check is a truly daunting task.

Berkens et al. (2011) pointed out that student employment is the norm for a large number of youths in many countries, both in secondary and tertiary education. One important reason why many students combine study and work is that it provides them with an income, which may help them to satisfy their consumption aspirations. However, research in multiple disciplines has shown that the effect of students' work decisions may go beyond the short term. For example, from the broad field of sociology, several studies show that student employment is correlated with problem behavior among youths, such as alcohol use, delinquency, and drug use.

Moreover, from the perspective of students themselves, part-time work is often an introduction to the real world which will assist them both in personal and career development, especially in the higher education sector. Higher education institutions should identify opportunities to increase the extent to which students could be more familiar with work and expose them to educational, part-time vocational, and career experiences, Tymon (2013). With the asserted data above, a study on this particular aspect was done in order to determine the working students' academic performance on flexible learning.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to determine the working students' academic performance on flexible learning. Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

- How may the demographic profile of the students be described in terms of:
 - age;
 - sex;

- year level;
 - track;
 - strand;
 - sibling position;
 - hours worked per week;
 - Monthly family income?
 - What are the students' perceptions on flexible learning in terms of:
 - time allotted to study/work; and
 - Balancing school-related tasks and workload?
 - How may the academic performance of the working students be described in terms of:
 - general weighted average;
 - class participation; and
 - Task performance?
 - Is there a significant relationship between the perceptions of working students on flexible learning on their academic performance?
 - Is there a significant difference between the academic performance of the students as to their profile?
 - What program of action for each strand could be crafted based on the findings of the study?
-

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This study utilized the mixed-method, particularly explanatory sequential approach. According to Johnson (2007), mixed methods research is the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration. Moreover, Morse et al. (1991), stated that triangulation design is used when a researcher wants to directly compare and contrast quantitative statistical results with qualitative findings or to validate or expand quantitative results with qualitative data.

The gathering of quantitative data was done through the use of survey questionnaires. Through this survey, working students' academic performance concerning the different sub-variables under this was obtained and measured based on the responses of the students. The data that were collected were organized and interpreted.

This was followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data. Qualitative data were gathered from semi-structured interviews with selected respondents. These data were integrated into quantitative findings during the final phase of the study. The primary focus is to further explain or enrich the quantitative results of the study.

2.2. Research Instruments

For the purpose of collecting the data, a formal letter was sent to the authority requesting permission to administer the survey questionnaire to the respondents.

The collection of data involved two different phases. Phase 1 is quantitative and Phase 2 is qualitative. In phase I, the survey questionnaire was given to the student-respondents. Part I of the questionnaire is intended to measure the students' academic performance was adapted and modified from Tomas Claudio Colleges. The first part of the questionnaire determined the class participation of the respondents and the latter determined the task performance. Moreover, another set of questionnaires was used to determine the working students' perception of flexible learning which is adapted and modified from the journal Learning Effectiveness and Students' Perceptions in a Flexible Learning Course.

The second phase of the study is for the collection of qualitative data. A semi-structured interview was conducted. In line with this, an interview protocol was prepared to ensure that the needed data will be collected. The interview questions were expected to solicit responses about their perception on their academic performance in flexible learning.

2.3. Sampling Procedures

This study utilized the purposive sampling technique. According to Schutt (2006), purposive sampling is the intentional selection of informants based on their ability to elucidate a specific theme, concept, or phenomenon.

Moreover, the respondents of this study are the Senior High School students of Baliwag Polytechnic College who are working and enrolled at the same time for the academic year 2020-2021.

Table 1 Distribution of the Respondents

Strand	Population	Sample Size
ABM	245	44
GAS	211	21
STEM	272	20
HUMSS	306	10
ICT	160	13
HE	200	51
IA	47	7
Total	1,441	166

3. Results and discussion

The socio-demographic profile describes the characteristics of the participants in terms of age, sex, year level, track, strand, sibling position, hours worked per week, and monthly family income.

Table 2 Demographic Profile for Respondents According to Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
27 years old and above	0	0.0%
24 – 26 years old	0	0.0%
21 – 23 years old	10	6.0%
18 – 20 years old	111	66.9%
15 – 17 years old	45	27.1%
Total	166	100%

The age range of the respondents is shown in Table 2. According to the results, nearly 70% of working students are between the ages of 18 and 20, with the remaining 30% falling between the ages of 15 and 17 and 21 to 23. The results revealed that the majority of the students' ages range from 18 to 20 years old.

In conjunction with the findings, an article entitled "Understanding Adolescence," it was emphasized that adults between the ages of 18 and 24 are gradually transitioning into adult roles. They learn the skills required for these roles, as well as how to manage the labor market's multiple demands while transitioning to work.

3.1. Sex

Table 3 Demographic Profile of Respondents According to Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	67	40.4%
Female	99	59.6%
Total	166	100%

As shown in Table 3, there are 99 (59.6%) female student-respondents and 67 (40.4%) male respondents. Among 166 respondents, there are more females than the male who are working students.

According to Cruz (2019), the proportion of Filipino women enrolled in high school is significantly higher than that of men.

3.2. Year level

Table 4 Year Level of the Respondents

Year Level	Frequency	Percentage
Grade 11	47	28.3%
Grade 12	119	71.7%
Total	166	100%

Table 4 displays the year level of the respondents. Based on the result, Grade 12 outnumbered grade 11 with 71.7% with a frequency of 119, and the latter is composed of 28.3% with a frequency of 47.

This finding suggests that the majority of SHS students who are more urged to work while studying are in grade 12.

3.3. Track

Table 5 Demographic Profile of Respondents According to Track

Track	Frequency	Percentage
Academic Track	95	57.2%
Technical Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) Track	71	42.8%
Total	166	100%

The table above shows the profile of the respondents according to track. The academic track is dominant with 57.2% while the TVL track is composed of 42.8%. Thus, the majority of the respondents are under the academic track.

According to the data of the Department of Education, most of the students chose the Academic track followed by the Technical, Vocational, and Livelihood Track.

3.4. Strand

Every track has different strands from which students can choose. Table 6 shows the frequency distribution and percentage as to strand. It is evident that the Home Economics strand has the most number of working students with 30.7%. This is followed by the ABM strand, with 26.5% as its percentage. Hence, the Industrial Arts strand has the least number of working students with 4.2%. This revealed that the majority of the working students are under the Home Economics strand.

Table 6 Demographic Profile of Respondents According to Strand

Strand	Frequency	Percentage
Accountancy, Business, and Management (ABM)	44	26.5%
General Academic Strand (GAS)	21	12.7%
Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS)	10	6.0%
Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)	20	12.0%

Home Economics (HE)	51	30.7%
Industrial Arts (IA)	7	4.2%
Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	13	7.8%
Total	166	100%

3.5. Sibling Position

Table 7 Demographic Profile of Respondents According to Sibling Position

Sibling Position	Frequency	Percentage
Fourth and above	42	25.3%
Third	26	15.7%
Second	49	29.5%
First	49	29.5%
Total	166	100%

Table 7 displays that the first and second children obtained the same percentage of 29.5%. On another note, 42 (25.3%) of the respondents are fourth child and 26 (15.7%) are the third child in the family. According to the findings, more than half of working respondents have the responsibility of working as the first and second child.

3.6. Hours Worked

Table 8 Demographic Profile of Respondents According to Hours Worked per Week

Hours Worked per Week	Frequency	Percentage
19 hrs. and more	21	12.7%
13-18 hrs. a week	15	9.0%
7-12 hrs. a week	51	30.7%
1-6 hrs. a week	79	47.6%
Total	166	100%

Table 8 exhibits that almost half of the total number of respondents work for 1-6 hours a week, with a frequency distribution of 79 (47.6%) followed by 30.7 percent who are working for 7-12 hours a week. Thus, 13-18 hours a week is the least with a frequency of 15 (9.0%). According to the findings, nearly half of the respondents only work part-time for 1-6 hours per week. Statistics from the Department of Education show that students who work less than 12 hours per week have stronger grades, perhaps because working forces them to have better discipline and time management skills.

3.7. Monthly Family Income

The average family income of the respondents is tabulated in Table 4, and it can be seen that nearly 45 percent of the respondents' monthly family income is between 1,000 and 5,000 pesos. Also, 46 of the respondents have a monthly family income of 5,000-10,000 pesos which could imply that nearly half of the respondents are working part-time to add up to their family income.

This was supported by the selected students' answers during the interview, in which they stated that the primary reason they work while studying is to help their family financially.

Table 9 Demographic Profile of Respondents According to Monthly Family Income

Monthly Family Income	Frequency	Percentage
More than 20,000 Php	15	9.0%
15,001 Php - 20,000 Php	10	6.0%
10,001 Php - 15,000 Php	21	12.7%
5,001 Php - 10,000 Php	46	27.7%
1,000 Php - 5,000 Php	74	44.6%
Total	166	100%

3.8. Time allotted to study/work

This is the amount of time to be devoted to school or office regulations. It can be gleaned from the table that item “develop my self-discipline in self-regulated learning” received the highest computed weighted mean of 4.10 with a verbal interpretation of “Agree”. On the other hand, item “manage my time better and miss fewer deadlines since outputs can be submitted online” got the lowest computed weighted mean of 3.57 which is verbally interpreted as “Agree”. The overall mean was recorded at 3.75 which is verbally interpreted as “Agree”. These findings indicated that the student-respondents affirmed that flexible learning made them more active and flexible and more disciplined in their studies as it requires them to manage their time wisely and be cooperative with their instructors.

Table 10 Respondents’ perception on Flexible Learning in terms of Time Allotted to Study/Work

Item Statement	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	VD
Being a working student in flexible learning makes me...							
be more participative to class discussions through online learning platform.	33 19.9%	51 30.7%	65 39.2%	14 8.4%	3 1.8%	3.58	A
manage my time better and miss fewer deadlines since outputs can be submitted online.	27 16.3%	69 41.6%	48 28.9%	15 9.0%	7 4.2%	3.57	A
study learning materials anytime and anywhere since it can be accessed online.	40 24.1%	66 39.8%	48 28.9%	9 5.4%	3 1.8%	3.79	A
a more active participant during the courses as I can communicate to my Instructors and classmates online.	36 21.7%	63 38.0%	52 31.3%	12 7.2%	3 1.8%	3.70	A
develop my self-discipline in self-regulated learning.	60 36.1%	68 41.0%	32 19.3%	6 3.6%	0 0.0%	4.10	A
OVERALL MEAN						3.75	A

Legend: Rating Scale Verbal Description; 4.21 – 5.00 Always (A); 3.41 – 4.20 Often (O); 2.61 – 3.40 Sometimes (S); 1.81 – 2.60 Rarely (R); 1.00 – 1.80 Never (N)

Broadbent (2018) uncovered five self-regulation profiles, with online learners more likely to belong to the more adaptive profiles. Students with the highest grades also had the highest levels of time management, discipline, effort regulation, and motivation, indicating that individual learning styles influence performance.

Additionally, Fuller-Tyszkiewicz (2018) emphasized that students who have better self-regulated learning skills have higher academic performance as well as better self-regulated learning intervention outcomes. Because of individual differences in self-regulated learning, students may respond differently in an emergency remote learning situation: some students may find it difficult to concentrate, whereas others may double their effort.

This suggests that students may be able to develop their self-motivation in this new mode of learning because they could study at their own pace, and they can study anytime and anywhere as the course materials are sent to them.

Moreover, according to the interview conducted with the selected student respondents, they affirmed that being a working student in this flexible learning helped them to develop their self-discipline and they were able to browse and study their course materials as it can be accessed online.

3.9. Balancing school-related tasks and workload

This is a person's ability to balance the work and school-related responsibilities that are expected of him or her. Table 11 reveals the respondents' perceptions on flexible learning with regard to balancing school-related tasks and workload.

It can be seen from the table that the item "save money from transportation and use it for other school-related dues" got the highest computed weighted mean of 4.02. Meanwhile, item "have the flexibility to organize my learning and working time" obtained the lowest computed weighted mean of 3.73. Further analysis of the table shows that all items indicated therein including the computed overall mean of 3.83 yielded the verbal description of "Agree".

Table 11 Respondents' perception on Flexible Learning in terms of Balancing School-related Tasks and Workload

Item Statement	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	VD
Being a working student in flexible learning makes me...							
save money from transportation and use it for other school-related dues.	58 34.9%	66 39.8%	32 19.3%	8 4.8%	2 1.2%	4.02	A
have the flexibility to organize my learning and working time.	33 19.9%	73 44.0%	46 27.7%	11 6.6%	3 1.8%	3.73	A
enthusiast in searching important learning resources.	32 19.3%	75 45.2%	46 27.7%	12 7.2%	1 0.6%	3.75	A
save time as I don't need to travel from my workplace to school..	47 28.3%	58 34.9%	49 29.5%	8 4.8%	4 2.4%	3.82	A
cover the material needed in school while maintaining my workload.	34 20.5%	81 48.8%	42 25.3%	7 4.2%	2 1.2%	3.83	A
OVERALL MEAN						3.83	A

Legend: Rating Scale Verbal Description; 4.21 – 5.00 Always (A); 3.41 – 4.20 Often (O); 2.61 – 3.40 Sometimes (S); 1.81 – 2.60 Rarely (R); 1.00 – 1.80 Never (N)

In terms of balancing school-related tasks and workload, these findings indicate that respondents perceive flexible learning as something that allows them to manage their working and learning time, as well as save money on transportation and use it for other school-related expenses. As this pandemic came with so many restrictions, most especially in the field of education, so many arguments are associated with the new mode of learning. Rieley (2020) stated that online learning is easily accessible and can even reach rural and remote areas. It is regarded as a relatively less expensive mode of education due to lower costs of transportation, lodging, and the overall cost of institution-based learning, allowing students to save money. Therefore, students nowadays are taking advantage of the current system to save money for other expenses because there is no need to travel from home to school. They may be able to use this time to maximize their travel savings and apply it to other expenses.

According to the respondents who were interviewed, they were relieved that the pandemic had resulted in them saving money and time from supposed travel from work to school.

3.10. Task Performance

This is any learning activity or assessment that requires students to demonstrate their knowledge, comprehension, and proficiency. Table 12 reveals that item "manage my time well" got the highest computed weighted mean of 3.66 with a verbal description of "Often". On the other hand, item "actively look for ways to improve my performance" got the lowest computed mean of 3.20 with a verbal description of "Sometimes" and an overall mean of 3.47 yielded the verbal description of "often". This finding implies that the student-respondents agreed that having a part-time job allows them to better manage their time and balance work and school-related activities. Working teaches students about

responsibility and can also reinforce what they are learning in school. Furthermore, they have agreed that working part-time motivates them to grow and learn more by taking on challenging tasks.

Table 12 Respondents Academic Performance in terms of Task Performance

Item Statement	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	VD
Having a part-time job makes me...							
develop my willingness to participate in group activities/discussion.	23 13.9%	59 35.5%	68 41.0%	13 7.8%	3 1.8%	3.52	0
manage my time well.	33 19.9%	63 38.0%	53 31.9%	15 9.0%	2 1.2%	3.66	0
cope to day-to-day activities.	24 14.5%	60 36.1%	64 38.6%	17 10.2%	1 0.6%	3.54	0
willingly take an active part during discussion.	19 11.4%	60 36.1%	65 39.2%	18 10.8%	4 2.4%	3.43	0
actively look for ways to improve my performance.	15 9.0%	37 22.3%	86 51.8%	22 13.3%	6 3.6%	3.20	S
take extra school-related activities.	25 15.1%	55 33.1%	67 40.4%	18 10.8%	1 0.6%	3.51	0
take challenging work tasks, when available.	19 11.4%	60 36.1%	69 41.6%	13 7.8%	5 3.0%	3.45	0
adequately complete assigned duties.	19 11.4%	67 40.4%	60 36.1%	17 10.2%	3 1.8%	3.49	0
keep in mind the work result I needed to achieve.	25 15.1%	56 33.7%	62 37.3%	19 11.4%	4 2.4%	3.48	0
start new tasks when my old tasks were completed on my own initiative.	18 10.8%	54 32.5%	76 45.8%	14 8.4%	4 2.4%	3.41	0
OVERALL MEAN						3.47	0

Legend: Rating Scale Verbal Description; 4.21 – 5.00 Always (A); 3.41 – 4.20 Often (O); 2.61 – 3.40 Sometimes (S); 1.81 – 2.60 Rarely (R); 1.00 – 1.80 Never (N)

In support to the above findings, William S. (2021) stated that the pandemic shined a light on the considerable challenge that acquiring time-management skills presents. Students who were successful time managers in person were often successful because of the scaffolding teachers and schools provided.

In addition, an article entitled “Students and Part-Time Work” believed that students who work are more confident and have better time management skills than students who do not work. Aside from providing a paycheck, some independence, and satisfaction, a part-time job can also provide training and experience. Working teaches students responsibility while also reinforcing what they learn in school. Thus, findings implied that because they were learning remotely, they could be able to manage their time effectively in both studying and working. They can also handle their day-to-day activities.

Furthermore, in an interview with the selected student respondents, they stated that they were able to manage their time in this flexible learning and that they have easier access to submitting their outputs even when they are at work.

3.11. Class Participation

When students speak up and ask questions, they are learning how to obtain information and improve their learning, which is an important aspect of student learning.

Table 13 displays that the highest computed mean of 4.05 falls under the item “attend to class prepared with required class/lesson materials” with a verbal description of “often”, hence, the lowest computed mean is 3.40 under the item “relate the current lesson to other relevant reading materials” and has a verbal description of “sometimes”. The student-respondents agreed that working part-time influences their task performance in the sense that they attend classes with the necessary class materials, actively participate in class discussions, and these help them improve their study habits.

Table 13 Respondents Academic Performance in terms of Class Participation

Item Statement	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	VD
Having a part time job makes me...							
participate actively in the class.	42 25.3%	70 42.2%	34 20.5%	16 9.6%	4 2.4%	3.78	0
improve my study habits	47 28.3%	64 38.6%	34 20.5%	14 8.4%	7 4.2%	3.78	0
incorporate my ideas to others.	41 24.7%	53 31.9%	50 30.1%	17 10.2%	5 3.0%	3.65	0
contribute in a quite significant way to ongoing discussion	21 12.7%	75 45.2%	51 30.7%	15 9.0%	4 2.4%	3.57	0
enthusiast to give insightful comments during class discussions.	59 35.5%	63 38.0%	31 18.7%	10 6.0%	3 1.8%	3.99	0
relate the current lesson to other relevant reading materials.	20 12.0%	62 37.3%	58 34.9%	17 10.2%	9 5.4%	3.40	S
contribute in a quite significant way to class discussions.	34 20.5%	69 41.6%	47 28.3%	11 6.6%	5 3.0%	3.70	0
put together pieces of the discussion to develop new approaches to take the class discussion further.	44 26.5%	51 30.7%	51 30.7%	15 9.0%	5 3.0%	3.69	0
attend to class prepared with required class/lesson materials.	66 39.8%	57 34.3%	31 18.7%	9 5.4%	3 1.8%	4.05	0
proactively contribute to class by offering ideas and/or ask relevant questions.	51 30.7%	66 39.8%	37 22.3%	8 4.8%	4 2.4%	3.92	0
OVERALL MEAN						3.75	0

Legend: Rating Scale Verbal Description; 4.21 – 5.00 Always (A); 3.41 – 4.20 Often (O); 2.61 – 3.40 Sometimes (S); 1.81 – 2.60 Rarely (R); 1.00 – 1.80 Never (N)

In a study conducted by Dobbs et al. (2017), students appreciate the flexibility of distance learning to accommodate work and family schedules, the ability to avoid commuting to the university, and the availability of more online courses. In addition, Zawacki (2019) emphasized that flexible learning allows students in open schedule online courses to work asynchronously with all materials provided digitally. Although there are submission deadlines for assignments, students who work at their own pace have some flexibility in terms of when they complete their coursework. Hence, students may improve their study habits and attend online classes more prepared as a result of a more flexible time schedule.

In an interview with student-respondents, they stated that one of the benefits of this flexible learning is that when their teachers tell them ahead of time that they will meet at a certain date and time, they have more time to prepare the things that are required of them.

3.12. General Weighted Average

This basically pertains to the overall scholastic record of a student used for evaluation.

Table 14 Respondents Academic Performance in terms of General Weighted Average

General Weighted Average	Frequency	Percentage
96% and above	2	1.2%
91-95 %	67	40.4%
86-90 %	36	21.7%
81-85 %	39	23.5%
76-80 %	12	7.2%
71-75 %	5	3.0%
65-70 %	5	3.0%
Total	166	100%

Mean = 4.84 (86-90 %) SD = 1.309

It can be noticed in the table that more than 40% of the respondents have an average of 91-95% with a frequency of 67. On the other hand, GWA of 65-70 and 71-75 both got a percentage of 3%. According to the findings, nearly half of the respondents are on the honor roll.

3.13. Academic Performance

Table 15 summarizes the results of the correlation analyses which were performed to find out if a significant relationship existed between respondents' perception on flexible learning and their academic performance.

Table 15 Relationship between Respondents Perception on Flexible Learning and Their Academic Performance

Perception on Flexible Learning	Academic Performance		
	Class Participation	Task Performance	General Weighted Average
Time Allotted to Study/Work	0.585** (0.000)	0.574** (0.000)	0.286** (0.000)
Balancing School-Related Tasks and Workload	0.481** (0.000)	0.496** (0.000)	0.355** (0.000)

Legend: ** highly significant relationship ($p \leq 0.01$); * significant relationship ($p \leq 0.05$); ns no significant relationship ($p > 0.05$); numbers in the upper entry are r-values; numbers enclosed in parentheses are p-values

It can be noted from the table that a highly significant relationship was found between respondents' perception on flexible learning and their academic performance. Both variables such as time allotted to work/study and balancing school-related tasks and workload were found to have a highly significant relationship in terms of class participation, task performance, and general weighted average.

A closer look at the table shows that a direct relationship existed between the aforementioned variables. This meant that the level of correlations between the respondents' perception on flexible learning and their academic performance has a strong correlation. This implied that as the learner's perception about flexible learning increases, the level of their academic performance also increases.

In support of the above findings, a study conducted by Khan, M. (2020) entitled "Students' Perception Towards E-Learning during Covid-19 Pandemic" showed that the majority of the students who have a positive perception about e-learning are the ones who are taking it as an aid for their learning. It is expected that students' perception would impact their satisfaction and performance positively.

3.14. Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Age

In this part of the study, the results of the ANOVA analyses are presented in Table 16. These analyses were done to determine if significant differences existed between the respondents' academic performance and their age.

Table 16 Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Age

ANOVA						
	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Class Participation	Between Groups	1.250	2	0.625	1.359ns	0.260
	Within Groups	74.924	163	0.460		
	Total	76.173	165			
Task Performance	Between Groups	0.582	2	0.291	0.493ns	0.611
	Within Groups	96.092	163	0.590		
	Total	96.673	165			
General Weighted Average	Between Groups	4.515	2	2.257	1.323ns	0.269
	Within Groups	278.094	163	1.706		
	Total	282.608	165			

Legend: ns no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)

Results of the analysis revealed that there were no significant differences found in class participation, task performance, and general weighted average with computed probability values of 0.260, 0.611, and 0.269 respectively. These findings suggest that respondents' academic performance has nothing to do with age differences.

In the same vein, a study conducted by Voyles M. (2011) entitled "Student Academic Success as related to Age and Gender" revealed that there was no significant difference in test scores between the youngest and oldest students. According to the findings of the study, student age was not a factor in student academic success. Therefore, findings revealed the respondents' age could not be a predictor of their academic success.

3.15. Independent t-test on respondents Academic Performance as to their Gender

Table 17 exhibits the result of the analysis that was performed to determine if significant differences existed between the respondents' academic performance and their gender.

Table 17 Independent t-test on respondents Academic Performance as to their Gender

Variable		Male (n=67)	Female (n=99)	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value
Class Participation	Mean SD	3.36 (0.721)	3.54 (0.642)	-0.18	-1.743ns	0.083
Task Performance	Mean SD	3.59 (0.872)	3.87 (0.666)	-0.28	-2.219*	0.028
General Weighted Average	Mean SD	4.52 (1.470)	5.05 (1.146)	-0.53	-2.475*	0.015

Results of the analysis showed that significant differences were found between task performance and general weighted average as to the respondents' gender with computed probability values of 0.028 and 0.015 respectively. Meanwhile, no significant differences were found in the class participation aspect because of its 0.083 computed probability values which are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. This implied that gender has no connection to student participation in class. Gender does, however, play a role in task performance and respondents' GWA.

Gender differences in achievement have long been studied, resulting in a substantial body of literature. According to Atovigba et al. (2012), there is no significant gender difference in students' academic achievement and retention in various subjects. Hence,

3.16. Independent t-test on respondents Academic Performance as to their Year Level

Table 18 reveals the result of the analysis that was performed to determine if significant differences existed between the respondents' academic performance and their year level.

Table 18 Independent t-test on respondents Academic Performance as to their Year Level

Variable		Grade 11 (n=47)	Grade 12 (n=119)	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value
Class Participation	Mean SD	3.35 (0.846)	3.52 (0.599)	-0.17	-1.243ns	0.218
Task Performance	Mean SD	3.61 (0.941)	3.81 (0.680)	-0.20	-1.338ns	0.186
General Weighted Average	Mean SD	4.34 (1.356)	5.03 (1.241)	-0.69	-3.157**	0.002

Legend: ** highly significant difference ($p \leq 0.01$); ns no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)

The table shows that a highly significant difference was observed when the respondents' year level was compared to their general weighted average, with a computed p-value of 0.002. Meanwhile, no significant differences in class participation or task performance were found. These findings inferred that the respondents' year level ominously influences their GWA, while it has nothing to do with respondents' class participation and task performance.

In a study conducted by Conley (2007) about the predictors of secondary success, there was little evidence that suggests that students' year level can be a predictor of their progress in school.

3.17. Independent t-test on respondents Academic Performance as to their Track

This part of the study, it reveals the result of the analysis that were performed to determine if significant differences existed between the respondents' academic performance and their track.

Table 19 Independent t-test on respondents Academic Performance as to their Track

Variable		Academic (n=95)	TVL (n=71)	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value
Class Participation	Mean SD	3.45 (0.705)	3.50 (0.648)	-0.05	-0.526ns	0.083
Task Performance	Mean SD	3.78 (0.872)	3.72 (0.666)	0.06	0.524ns	0.028
General Weighted Average	Mean SD	5.31 (1.470)	4.21 (1.146)	1.10	5.838**	0.000

Legend: ** highly significant difference ($p \leq 0.01$); ns no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)

The table reveals that when the respondents' track was compared to their general weighted average, a highly significant difference was observed, with a computed p-value of 0.000. A closer look at the same table reveals that there was no significant difference between respondents' academic performance, class participation, and task performance. This implied that these variables have no connection with the respondents' track.

Contrary to the present findings, a study conducted by Cheung A., et al., (2015) revealed that there is no significant difference in the GWA when the respondents are grouped by the program. Thus, the GWA is about the same for all groups of respondents. In essence, regardless of how hard or easy they think their program is, their perseverance and passion for their goals are the same. Hence, the findings of this study could imply that the respondents chosen track or program may influence their study skills.

3.18. Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Strand

This section of the study reveals the findings of the analyses conducted to determine whether or not there were significant differences between the academic performance of the respondents and their strand.

Table 20 Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Strand

ANOVA						
	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Class Participation	Between Groups	2.113	6	0.352	0.756ns	0.605
	Within Groups	74.060	159	0.466		
	Total	76.173	165			
Task Performance	Between Groups	2.411	6	0.402	0.678ns	0.668
	Within Groups	94.262	159	0.593		
	Total	96.673	165			
General Weighted Average	Between Groups	77.438	6	12.906	10.002**	0.000
	Within Groups	205.170	159	1.290		
	Total	282.608	165			

Legend: ** highly significant difference ($p \leq 0.01$); ns no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)

When the respondents' strand was compared to their overall weighted average, the table shows a highly significant difference, with a computed p-value of 0.000 while there were no statistically significant differences in class participation or task performance. According to these findings, respondents' strand has no connection to class participation or task performance. However, the students' overall weighted average is significantly influenced by their strand.

In the same light, a study conducted by Alipio, M. (2020) revealed that significant differences between students in different SHS strands suggest that the academic adjustment and performance of students differ depending on the SHS strand taken. The interaction between academic adjustment and the SHS strand influenced academic performance, according to the study. In this regard, it is critical to understand which SHS track the students will choose because it can predict academic success.

3.19. Multiple Comparisons among Means (General Weighted Average)

Table 20 shows the multiple comparison analysis that was performed to see if there were any significant differences between the strands.

Table 21 Multiple Comparisons among Means (General Weighted Average)

Group	Mean	Tukey's HSD Comparisons						
		ABM	GAS	HUMSS	STEM	HE	IA	ICT
ABM	5.52	-	-1.04** (0.001)	-0.52ns (0.191)	0.33ns (0.287)	-1.48** (0.000)	-0.95** (0.041)	-0.83** (0.022)
GAS	4.48	1.04** (0.001)	-	0.52ns (0.232)	1.37** (0.000)	0.44ns (0.140)	0.09ns (0.848)	0.21ns (0.591)
HUMSS	5.00	0.52ns (0.191)	-0.52ns (0.232)	-	0.85ns (0.055)	-0.96* (0.016)	-0.43ns (0.445)	-0.31ns (0.521)
STEM	5.85	-0.33ns (0.287)	-1.37** (0.000)	-0.85ns (0.055)	-	-1.81** (0.000)	-1.28* (0.011)	-1.16** (0.005)
HE	4.04	1.48** (0.000)	0.44ns (0.140)	0.96* (0.016)	1.81** (0.000)	-	0.53ns (0.247)	0.65ns (0.066)
IA	4.57	0.95**	-0.09ns	0.43ns	1.28*	-0.53ns	-	0.12ns

		(0.041)	(0.848)	(0.445)	(0.011)	(0.247)		(0.821)
ICT	4.69	0.83** (0.022)	-0.21ns (0.591)	0.31ns (0.521)	1.16** (0.005)	-0.65ns (0.066)	-0.12ns (0.821)	-

Legend: numbers in the upper entry are the MEAN DIFFERENCE numbers enclosed in parentheses are p-values; ** highly significant difference ($p \leq 0.01$); * significant difference ($p \leq 0.05$); ns no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)

These results indicated that when the respondents from the ABM strand were compared to the respondents from other strands in terms of General Weighted Average, highly significant differences were found between the ABM students and GAS, HE, IA, and ICT students with computed p-values of 0.001, 0.000, 0.041 and 0.022 respectively, while no significant difference was determined from the rest of the strands.

When the respondents' GWA from the GAS strand was compared to the other strands, a highly significant difference was observed in ABM with a p-value of 0.001 and STEM with a computed p-value of 0.000, while no significant differences were revealed from the other strands.

In terms of the respondents' GWA from the HUMSS strand being compared from the other strands, a significant difference was observed in the HE strand with a p-value of 0.016, and no significant differences between the other strands were found.

Moreover, when the respondents' GWA from the STEM strand were compared to the rest of the strands, a highly significant difference was shown in the GAS, HE, and ICT strand with computed probability values of 0.000, 0.000, and 0.005 respectively. Also, a significant difference was revealed in the IA strand with p-values of 0.011. Further, there was no significant difference found between the other strands.

Thus, the respondents' GWA from the HE strand was found to have a highly significant difference in the ABM and STEM strand with the same computed p-values of 0.000 while no significant difference was found between the other strands.

The findings also revealed that when the respondents' GWA from the IA strand as compared to the respondents from the other strands, a highly significant difference was found in the ABM strand with a computed p-value of 0.041. A significant difference was found in the STEM strand, with a computed p-value of 0.011, but no significant difference was found in the other strands.

Finally, the ICT strand was found to have a highly significant difference in GWA to ABM and STEM strand with computed p-values of 0.022 and 0.005, while the other strands had no significant difference.

These results implied that in terms of GWA, each strand does have significant and highly significant differences with either one or more strands. These findings revealed that the GWA of students from a specific strand could not be completely comparable to those from other strands. Thus, there will always be a distinction between the strands.

In a study conducted by Alipio (2020) he revealed that the SHS strand moderates the relationship between academic adjustment and performance and this could substantially extend other theories that may be conceptualized in future studies pertaining to the performances of students.

3.20. Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Sibling Position

This part of the study reveals the result of the analysis that was performed to determine if significant differences existed between the respondents' academic performance and their sibling position.

Results of the analysis showed that when the respondents' Academic Performance was compared to their sibling position, no significant differences were found in class participation, task performance, and general weighted average because of their computed p-value ranging from 0.051 to 0.587 which are greater than 0.05 level of significance. The results of the analysis revealed that the respondents' birth order is unrelated to their academic performance.

A study conducted by Mercado, J. (2015) entitled "Non-Cognitive Factors affecting the Academic Performance of the Students" revealed that the respondents' birth order does not significantly affect the students' academic achievement.

Table 22 Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Sibling Position

ANOVA						
	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Class Participation	Between Groups	2.023	3	0.674	1.473ns	0.224
	Within Groups	74.150	162	0.458		
	Total	76.173	165			
Task Performance	Between Groups	4.508	3	1.503	2.641ns	0.051
	Within Groups	92.165	162	0.569		
	Total	96.673	165			
General Weighted Average	Between Groups	3.334	3	1.111	0.645ns	0.587
	Within Groups	279.274	162	1.724		
	Total	282.608	165			

Legend: ns no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)**3.21. Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Hours Worked per Week**

This section of the study reveals the findings of the analysis performed to determine whether there were any significant differences between the respondents' academic performance and their hours of work per week.

When the respondents' academic performance was compared to their weekly hours worked, no significant differences in class participation, task performance, and general weighted average were found due to computed p-values ranging from 0.116 to 0.155, which are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. The results inferred that the respondents' hours of working per week are irrelevant to their academic performance.

The empirical evidence in the study of Vassiliou et al., (2008) did not support the assumption that a full time working student will show a lower academic performance relative to a part-time working student or a full-time student because other variables affect academic performance such as talent, motivation, ambition, and efficiency of study time.

This agrees with the findings of Hijazi and Naqvi's (2009) study, which found that the amount of time spent working and studying had no direct influence on academic performance.

Table 23 Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Hours Worked per Week

ANOVA						
	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Class Participation	Between Groups	2.419	3	0.806	1.771ns	0.155
	Within Groups	73.755	162	0.455		
	Total	76.173	165			
Task Performance	Between Groups	3.105	3	1.035	1.792ns	0.151
	Within Groups	93.568	162	0.578		
	Total	96.673	165			
General Weighted Average	Between Groups	10.084	3	3.361	1.998ns	0.116
	Within Groups	272.524	162	1.682		
	Total	282.608	165			

Legend: ns no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)

3.22. Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Monthly Family Income

This part of the study reveals the results of the analysis performed to determine if significant differences existed between the respondents' academic performance and their monthly family income. Results of the analysis revealed that when the respondents' academic performance was compared to their monthly family income, no significant differences were found in class participation and task performance because of their computed p-value of 0.395 and 0.850 respectively which are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Hence, a highly significant difference was determined between the respondents' monthly family income and their general weighted average with a computed p-value of 0.007.

According to these findings, respondents' family income has no bearing on class participation or task performance. However, the students' overall weighted average is significantly influenced by their family income. Family income becomes an educational controlling factor globally. Tissington (2011) investigated the impact of financial factors on academic achievement. They concluded that poverty has a direct impact on academic achievement due to a lack of resources available for students' success; thus, low academic achievement is closely related to a lack of resources, with a focus on financial resources.

Table 24 Difference in respondents Academic Performance as to their Monthly Family Income

ANOVA						
	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Class Participation	Between Groups	1.894	4	0.474	1.026ns	0.395
	Within Groups	74.279	161	0.461		
	Total	76.173	165			
Task Performance	Between Groups	0.811	4	0.203	0.340ns	0.850
	Within Groups	95.863	161	0.595		
	Total	96.673	165			
General Weighted Average	Between Groups	23.307	4	5.827	3.618**	0.007
	Within Groups	259.302	161	1.611		
	Total	282.608	165			

Legend: ** highly significant difference ($p \leq 0.01$); ns no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)

3.23. Multiple Comparisons among Means (General Weighted Average)

Table 25 shows the multiple comparison analysis that was performed to see if there were any significant differences between the monthly family income. When the respondents' family income was compared in relation with the general weighted average, the respondents whose family income is 20,000 and up had a significant difference with the respondents whose monthly family income is 1,000-5,000 pesos, as shown by its computed p-value of 0.016 which is less than 0.05 level of significance while no significant difference was found with the rest due to the fact that their computed p-value ranged from 0.292 to 0.912 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance.

The findings also revealed that when the respondents whose family income is 15,200-20,000 were compared as to the general weighted average, a significant difference was determined in the family with 1,000-5,000 monthly income with a computed p-value of 0.016 while no significant difference was revealed from the others.

Similarly, a family with a monthly income of 10,000-15,000 was found to have a highly significant difference with a monthly income of 1,000-5,000 with a p-value of 0.009, while no significant difference was established with the rest.

Thus, a significant difference was found between respondents whose family monthly income is 5,000-10,000 pesos and respondents whose family monthly income is 1,000-5,000 pesos, with a computed p-value of 0.048, and no significant difference was found between the rest.

Lastly, the family who earns 1,000 to 5,000 pesos per month were found to have a highly significant difference with family whose family income is 10,000-15,000 pesos a month with computed p-value of 0.009, while a significant

difference were determined with the families who have monthly income of more than 20,000 pesos, 15,000-20,000 pesos and 5,000-10,000 pesos with p-values of 0.016, 0.016 and 0.048 respectively.

Table 25 Multiple Comparisons among Means (General Weighted Average)

Group	Mean	Tukey's HSD Comparisons				
		More than 20,000 Php	15,001 Php - 20,000 Php	10,001 Php - 15,000 Php	5,001 Php - 10,000 Php	1,000 Php - 5,000 Php
More than 20,000 Php	4.46	-	0.167ns (0.748)	-0.048ns (0.912)	-0.399ns (0.292)	-0.874* (0.016)
15,001 Php - 20,000 Php	4.93	-0.167ns (0.748)	-	-0.214ns (0.661)	-0.565ns (0.204)	-1.041* (0.016)
10,001 Php - 15,000 Php	5.29	0.048ns (0.912)	0.214ns (0.661)	-	-0.351ns (0.295)	-0.826** (0.009)
5,001 Php - 10,000 Php	5.50	0.399ns (0.292)	0.565ns (0.204)	0.351ns (0.295)	-	-0.475* (0.048)
1,000 Php - 5,000 Php	5.33	0.874* (0.016)	1.041* (0.016)	0.826* (0.009)	0.475** (0.048)	-

Legend: numbers in the upper entry are the MEAN DIFFERENCE numbers enclosed in parentheses are p-values; ** highly significant difference ($p \leq 0.01$); * significant difference ($p \leq 0.05$); ns no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)

These results implied that in terms of GWA, each respondents' family income does have significant and highly significant difference with the other range of family income. These findings revealed that the GWA of students with a certain amount of monthly family income could not be completely comparable to those of other students. Inevitably, there will always be a distinction between these.

In the same vein, Yousefi et al. (2010) examined the effect of family income on academic achievement. The findings showed that family income significantly affected academic achievement of students. It was recommended that in enhancing academic achievement in school setting, support strategies such as improving family income among families by government must be focused on.

4. Conclusion

- Researchers concluded that highly significant correlations were found between respondents' perceptions on flexible learning and their academic performance. Further, student-respondents affirmed that their self-disciplined was developed in self-regulated learning in this time of flexible learning and they believed that they get to save money from transportation and be able to use it for other school-related dues.
- Also, significant differences existed between the respondents' gender, task performance, and general weighted average. Further analysis revealed that highly significant differences existed between the respondents' track, year level, and general weighted average.
- Findings also disclosed that no significant differences were found among the respondents' academic performance, sibling position and hours worked per week. Hence, highly significant differences were revealed between the respondents' strand, monthly family income, and general weighted average

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

I, John Harlod Flores Cruz, hereby declare that I have no conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, that could compromise the objectivity or integrity of this research. I have no affiliations with any organizations or entities that may benefit from the results of this study.

I certify that all sources of funding for this research have been disclosed, and that there are no undisclosed relationships or commitments that could influence the research process or its outcomes.

I understand that any potential conflicts of interest, if discovered, could lead to the withdrawal of this research.

References

- [1] Alipio, M. (2020). Academic adjustment and performance among Filipino freshmen College Students in the Health Sciences: Does senior high school strand matter. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/FACULTY/Downloads/Academic%20Adjustment%20and%20Performance%20among%20Filipino%20Freshmen%20College%20Students%20in%20the%20Health%20Sciences%20(1).pdf
- [2] Atovigba M.V., (2012). Gender Trends in Nigerian Secondary School Students' Performance in Algebra. *Research Journal of Mathematics and Statistics* 4(2):42-44, 2012.
- [3] Bachman, J. G., Staff, J., O'Malley, P. M., Schulenberg, J. E., and Freedman-Doan, P. (2011). Twelfth-grade student work intensity linked to later educational attainment and substance use: New longitudinal evidence. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(2), 344.
- [4] Baert, S., Neyt, B., Omev, E., and Verhaest, D. (2017). Student work, educational achievement and later employment: A dynamic approach. Mimeo.
- [5] Beerkens, M., Mägi, E., and Lill, L. (2011). University studies as a side job: Causes and consequences of massive student employment in Estonia. *Higher Education*, 61(6), 679–692.
- [6] Baum, S. (2010). Student work and the financial aid system. In L. W. Perna (Ed.), *Understanding the working college student*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing
- [7] Bozick, R. (2012). Making it through the first year of college: The role of students' economic resources, employment, and living arrangements. *Sociology of Education*, 80(3), 261–285.
- [8] Broadbent, J. (2018). Comparing online and blended learner's self-regulated learning strategies and academic performance. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 33, 24-32
- [9] Buscha, F., Maurel, A., Page, L., and Speckesser, S. (2012). The effect of employment while in high school on educational attainment: A conditional difference-in-differences approach. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 74(3), 380–396.
- [10] Cheng, M. (1995). "Issues related to student part-time work: What did research find in the Toronto situation and other contexts?" Toronto Board of Education Research Department.
- [11] Conley, D. T. (2007). *Redefining college readiness*. Eugene, OR: Educational Policy Improvement Center Retrieved from https://ccrcenter.org/sites/default/files/CCRS%20Center_Predictors%20of%20Postsecondary%20Success_final_0.pdf
- [12] Cheung A. (2015). Correlation of the academic performance and grit among the college of arts and sciences. Retrieved from: <https://lpulaguna.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/CORRELATION-OF-THE-ACADEMIC-PERFORMANCE-AND-GRIT-AMONG-THE-COLLEGE-OF-ARTS-AND-SCIENCES-BATCH-2014-STUDENTS-OF-LPU-LAGUNA.pdf>
- [13] Darolia, R. (2014). Working (and studying) day and night: heterogeneous effects of working on the academic performance of full-time and part-time students. *Economics of Education Review*, 38(1), 38–50.
- [14] Dobbs, R., del Carmen, A., and Waid-Lindberg, C. (2017). Students' perceptions of online courses: The effect of online course experience. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 18(1), 98–109 Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ864039>.
- [15] Fuller-Tyzkiewicz, M. (online first 2018). Online learners are not the same: Profiles in Self-Regulated Learning and their correlates. *Educational Technology Research and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-018-9595-9>
- [16] Gil, N. (2014). One in seven students work full-time while they study. Retrieved May 7, 2017 from: <https://www.google.com.kh/amp/s/amp.theguardian.com/education/2014/aug/11/students-work-parttime-employability>

- [17] Hijazi, S. and Naqvi, S. (2006). Factors affecting student's performance: A case of private colleges. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*, 3(1). Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/1HXGzqxq>.
- [18] <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/06/19/june-19-2020-do-012-2020-adoption-of-the-basic-education-learning-continuity-plan-for-school-year-2020-2021-in-the-light-of-the-covid-19-public-health-emergency/>
- [19] Jewell, S. (2014). The Impact of Working While Studying on Educational and Labour Market Outcomes. Retrieved May 5, 2017 from: <https://www.omicsonline.com/open-access/business-and-economicsjournal-2151-6219.1000110.php?aid=31717>
- [20] Khan, M. (2020). Students' Perception towards E-learning during Covid-19 Pandemic. Retrieved from <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/1/57>
- [21] Mercado, J. (2015). Non-Cognitive Factors Affecting the Academic Performance of Fourth Year College Students of a Private College in Manila. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329038742_NonCognitive_Factors_Affecting_the_Academic_Performance_of_Fourth_Year_College_Students_of_a_Private_College_in_Manila
- [22] Passaretta, G. and M. Triventi, (2015), "Work experience during higher education and post-graduation occupational outcomes: A comparative study on four European countries", *International Journal of Comparative Economics*, 56:232-253.
- [23] Quirk, T. (2001). Employment during high school and student achievement: Longitudinal analysis of national data.
- [24] Rieley, J. B. (2020). Corona Virus and its impact on higher education. Research Gate.
- [25] Sahin, I., and Shelley, M. (2008). Considering Students' Perceptions: The Distance Education Student Satisfaction Model. *Educational Technology and Society*, 11(3), 216–223.
- [26] Singh, K. (2007). Part-time employment in high school and its effect on academic achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 91, 131-9.
- [27] Singh, K., Chang, M., and Dika, S. (2007). Effects of part-time work on school achievement during high school. *Journal of Educational Research*, 101(1), 12–23.
- [28] Stahl et.al, (2018) Learning Effectiveness and Students' Perceptions in a Flexible Learning Course. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331525252_Learning_Effectiveness_and_Students'_Perceptions_in_A_Flexible_Learning_Course
- [29] Tissington, D. (2011) The effects of poverty on academic achievement. Retrieved from https://academicjournals.org/article/article1379765941_Lacour%20and%20Tissington.pdf
- [30] Triventi, M. (2014). Does working during higher education affect students' academic progression? *Economics of Education Review*, 41, 1–13.
- [31] Tymon, A. (2013). The student perspective on employability. *Studies in Higher Education*,
- [32] Tymon, A. (2013). The student perspective on employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(3), 411-425.
Tymon, A. (2013). The student perspective on employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(6), 841-856
- [33] Vassiliou, E. (2008) The impact of employment and physical activity on academic performance. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277737414_The_Impact_Of_Employment_And_Physical_Activity_On_Academic_Performance
- [34] Voyles, M. (2011). Student Academic Success as related to age and gender. Retrieved from: <https://scholar.utc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1085andcontext=theses>
- [35] Williams, S. (2021) Remote Learning in time Management. Retrieved from <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-remote-learning-makes-time-management-even-harder/2021/02>