Journal of Positive School Psychology http://journalppw.com
2022, Vol. 6, No. 9, 388-412

Learning In The New Normal: Perception Of Students Towards Communication Challenges And Their Satisfaction With 'Asynchronous' Learning Modality

Gerald Paul G. Aquino[1], Darwin G. Delacruz[2], Maria Loida D. Irabagon[3], Danilo S. Vargas[4] , Marife De torres[5]

Central Luzon State University,Philippines[1]
Central Luzon State University,Philippines[2]
Central Luzon State University,Philippines[3]
Central Luzon State University,Philippines[4]
Central Luzon State University,Philippines[5]
aquino.gerald@clsu2.edu.ph[1],dgdelacruz@clsu.edu.ph[2],
mldirabagon@clsu.edu.ph[3], dsvargas@clsu.edu.ph[4]
marifedetorres@clsu.edu.ph[5]

ABSTRACT

This study examined the communication challenges faced by the students and their satisfaction with the asynchronous learning modality. Using the data collected from 131 respondents of the Department of Communication and Development Studies (DCDS) at Central Luzon State University (CLSU), it was found that learners accounting for 57.3% of the respondents have experienced psychological problems. On the other hand, 80.2% of the respondents have experienced semantic problems. Data also reveals that the students seldom experienced technological problems. Based on the findings, 66.4% of the respondents were satisfied with the learning materials and how they were assessed on google classroom, and 52.7% had enough interaction and support from their teachers. However, in terms of peer interaction, over 65.6% and knowledge gained, accounting for 67.2% of the respondents, were unsatisfied based on the statements given. This study also revealed that certain aspects of students' socio-demographic characteristics, such as age and internet connectivity, contributed to students' technological challenges. This study found that older students have technological barriers in this type or mode of learning. Moreover, this study also revealed that problems when it comes to internet connectivity will pose a significant challenge among students during this period as the country begins to embrace the new pedagogical approach to learning today. Furthermore, this study also showed a negative relationship between the psychological barrier and respondents' satisfaction with teachers' and students' interactions. Based on the findings, as the respondents were satisfied with teachers' and peers' support, the students did not experience the psychological barrier.

Keywords: flexible learning; asynchronous mode; communication challenges, satisfaction learning modalities, new normal, psychological problems

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the Corona Virus Disease (COVID-19) pandemic has resulted in holistic disruption in our society, whereas its massive impact has brought the country to shift into the new normal in terms of economic activities, transportation, health system, and especially in education.

In today's learning context, the process to instill knowledge in the minds of learners has changed. From the traditional face-to-face education, students nowadays perform school activities and requirements at home through Flexible Learning. Students, especially in the Higher Education program are encouraged to continue the learning process whether in any form (online or offline) as we are still facing the continuously increasing number of COVID-19 cases in the country. Meanwhile, Flexible Learning as defined in Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order, No. 4, Series of 2020, is a pedagogical approach allowing flexibility of time, place, and audience but is not solely reliant on the use of technological devices since it involves digital and non-digital technologies. In this approach, educators especially the learners have the free will to choose and customize the most accurate mode of learning to be imposed that is convenient to all the students to provide effective and efficient mentoring and teaching mechanisms.

Consequently, flexible learning does not simply equal using various forms of electronic communication to deliver a course. It also includes face-to-face contact, websites with interactive content and/or chat rooms, discussion boards, CD-ROMs, VHS or broadcast video, teleconferencing or videoconferencing, print resources, audio tapes, and field trips (Charles Darwin University, 2011).

Also, as personal or face-to-face interaction is not feasible during this challenging time, most Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) had imposed an Online Learning or E-learning method such as synchronous and asynchronous style or mode of delivery to prevent and not contribute to the rapid spread of the virus.

The synchronous mode of learning is commonly initiated by virtual interaction between learners and teachers like videoconferencing and chats. In a study by Hrastinski (2008), a Synchronous session is an effective way in helping e-learners feel like they are participants rather than isolated. He explained that isolation can be overcome through synchronous education since it generates interactivity and helps individual becomes more aware of themselves as members of a community rather than as isolated individuals communicating with the computer.

Meanwhile, in asynchronous mode, learning materials/modules are instead being sent to a virtual classroom like google classroom which is accessible anytime and anywhere among students and has control over their time upon passing all the requirements. However, there may still be deadlines for work to be submitted for feedback, and there may be a recommended

schedule for students to follow so that they have some idea of what they should be doing (The Open University, 2020).

With the asynchronous mode of learning, students learn from instruction—such as prerecorded video lessons or game-based learning tasks that students complete on their own—that is not being delivered in person or in real-time (EdGlossary, 2013).

Objective/s of the Study

This study aims to know the perception of the students towards the communication challenges and determine their satisfaction with asynchronous learning during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Specific Objective/s:

1. To determine the socio-demographic profile of the respondents.
2. To know the perception of the learners to the communication challenges.
3. To identify the student's level of satisfaction with the asynchronous learning modality implemented by the University.
4. To determine if there is a relationship between the students' socio-demographic profile and communication challenges in asynchronous learning.
5. To determine if there is a relationship between the students' communication challenges and satisfaction with the asynchronous learning modality.

Research Methodology

Correlational research designs were used in this study. A survey questionnaire was used to examine the communication challenges faced by the students on the implementation of asynchronous learning modality in CLSU and the respondents' satisfaction with it. The scope of this study is limited to 131 students who are currently enrolled in the Communication and Development Studies Program at Central Luzon State University using simple random sampling. From the 393 total population size from the said program, the 124 respondents or sample size was calculated using a 95% confidence level and a 7% margin of error.

Ethics Statement

Following the CLSU Student Code of Conduct and Disciple, Section 5 which states that "forging, falsifying public documents, impersonating or giving fictitious names, misrepresentation of facts (Art. 169, 171, Revised Penal Code); erasing substituting or altering by any means of the figures, letters, words or signatures; making untruthful statements in a narration of facts; alteration in a genuine document which changes its meaning;" the researcher accepts all the sanctions and responsibilities which may result to suspension for 1st offense and expulsion for 2nd offense, and presenting copied requirements such as Thesis/Manuscript will result to a 5.00 grade and 1-semester suspension for 1st offense and 5.00 grade and expulsion for 2nd offense.

Moreover, As the study focuses on the common communication challenges of students in an online learning setup, this upholds and promotes human rights since it helps people identify and understand these challenges which can be prevented in the future.

This study also seeks to promote individual's welfare and prevent social harms and risks even if it is mostly done virtually.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-demographic profile of the respondents.

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic profile of 131 respondents from the Development Communication Department at Central Luzon State University. The respondent's ages range from 17 to 25 years old. Based on the findings, most of the respondents that the researcher surveyed are in Generation Z (Gen-Z). According to President Michael Dimock of Pew Research Center, millennials are anyone born between 1981 and 1996. Anyone born from 1997 onward is part of a new generation called Generation Z (Dimock, 2019).

Moreover, 32.06% of the respondents are male, and 89 (67.94%) are female. This implied that the majority of the sample size being the study respondents were female.

Consequently, 59 of the respondents (45.04%) have a family monthly income (FMI) lower than ten thousand pesos (10,000 PHP), and 24.43% have an FMI ranging between 10,001-20,000 PHP, identical to those who have an FMI of 20,001-40,000 Php. Additionally, eight respondents (6.11%) have an FMI of 40,000 PHP. Based on the findings, 45.04% of the respondents fall under the poor class, 24.43% are in the low-income category, 24.3% are in the lower-middle-income class, and 6.11% are in the middle-income category. This suggests that the majority of the respondents have less than the official poverty threshold based on the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (Zoleta, 2021).

Meanwhile, 48 (36.64%) respondents were firstborn children, 25 respondents were second-born, 23 were middle-born, 25 were last born, and 10 ten were only-children.

Subsequently, on the number of household members, 60 or 45.80% have four (4) members and below, and 71 respondents (54.20%) have more than four members in their households with an overall mean of 4.93 and a standard deviation of 1.48.

Table 1. **Socio-demographic profile of the respondents.**

PROFILE	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
17	1	0.76
18	14	10.69
19	42	32.06
20	20	15.27
21	36	27.48

22	15	11.45
23	2	1.53
25	1	0.76
Sex		
Male	42	32.06
Female	89	67.94
Family monthly income (FMI)		
10,000 and below	59	45.04
10,001 – 20,000 Php	32	24.43
20,001 – 30,000 Php	22	16.79
30,001 – 40,000 Php	10	7.63
more than 40,000 Php	8	6.11
Birth Order		
Firstborn	48	36.64
Secondborn	25	19.08
Middle born	23	17.56
Last born	25	19.08
Only child	10	7.63
Household Size		
Four and below	60	45.80
more than 4	71	54.20
Mean	4.93	
SD	1.48	

Distribution of respondents by year and section.

Findings in Table 2, indicated the distribution of respondents by year and section in which BSDC 2-1 had the highest participation in this study with 16.79%, while BSDC 1-3 had the lowest number of respondents with 2.29%. Moreover, the findings illustrate that 25 of the respondents (19.08%) were freshmen (1st year) students, 44 respondents (33.59%) were sophomore (2nd year) students, 23 respondents (17.56%) were in junior class (3rd year), and 39 of the respondents (29.77%) were in the senior class (4th year).

Table 2. **Distribution of respondents by year and section.**

PARTICULAR	Frequency	Percentage
Year and Section		
BSDC 1 – 1	15	11.45

BSDC 1 – 2	7	5.34
BSDC 1 – 3	3	2.29
BSDC 2 – 1	22	16.79
BSDC 2 – 2	8	6.11
BSDC 2 – 3	14	10.69
BSDC 3 – 1	12	9.16
BSDC 3 – 2	11	8.40
BSDC 4 – 1	20	15.27
BSDC 4 – 2	19	14.50

Equipment and internet connection was used by the respondents for online learning.

Figures in Table 3, revealed the internet connectivity and devices used by the respondents. The results indicate that 74.81% of the respondents have Wireless Fidelity (WIFI) connections, while 25.19% rely on mobile data. However, 72.45% of the respondents using WIFI experience moderation when it comes to internet speed, and 42.42% of the respondents who use mobile data experience fair signals.

In the study by Fabito, Trillanes, & Sarmiento (2021), entitled Barriers and Challenges of Computing Students in an Online Learning Environment: Insights from One Private University in the Philippines, one of the top three barriers students have encountered in the new type of learning being performed nowadays was the lack of a good Internet connection for participating individuals in online class and activities.

On the other hand, 48.09% of the total respondents use Laptops and Personal computers (PC), 49.62% use smartphones, and 2.29% use both technologies. This states that all of the respondents have digital technologies that are relevant and essential in today's educational context. According to Asio et al. (2021), the vitality of mobile devices today, such as smartphones, is a great help because of their multiple functions, especially in the new type of learning nowadays.

Table 3. **Equipment and internet connection was used by the respondents for online learning.**

PARTICULARS	Frequency	Percentage
Internet connection used		
WIFI	98	74.81
Internet speed		
Fast	20	20.41
Moderate	71	72.45
Slow	6	6.12
Mobile Data	33	25.19

Signal in the area		
Poor	12	36.36
Fair	14	42.42
Good	7	21.21
Device used		
Laptop/PC	63	48.09
Phone/SmartPhone	65	49.62
Both	3	2.29

The proportion of respondents experiencing communication challenges in each aspect.

Table 4 summarizes the respondents experiencing communication challenges in their asynchronous learning modality for the first semester of A.Y. 2021-2022. The data shows that 57.3% of the respondents experienced psychological challenges while 42.7% did not experience any. However, there is a high frequency in terms of semantic problems who experience such issues. One hundred five respondents accounting for 80.2% of the total sample size, were exposed to semantic barriers. Thus, using clear, concise, unambiguous language in assignments, syllabi, and postings is one of the several design elements that are significant in any course improving communication distance education (Berge, 2013).

Table 4. The proportion of respondents experiencing communication challenges in each aspect.

	Experiencing communication challenges	Not experiencing communication challenges
Psychological Barriers	75 (57.3)	56 (42.7)
Semantic Barriers	105 (80.2)	26 (19.8)
Technological Barriers	54 (41.2)	77 (58.8)

The overall percentage of respondents experiences different barriers to communication.

Results in Table 5, illustrate the mean and remarks based on the experiences of the respondents on different communication challenges. Data shows that learners sometimes experience psychological problems which according to Bakar et al. (2020), are the cause of frustration among the learners and tutors during online classes. On the other hand, semantic problems, based on the study of Adhikary (n.d.), could result in a communication breakdown in the survey which is more likely to occur when words are

perceived differently by the receiver of a specific message.

Meanwhile, data also reveals that technological problems were seldom experienced by the students. Perhaps, according to Anu (2021), students who have been provided access to support devices that can help learners solve technical problems through calls, emails, or live chat are paying attention to their instructors.

Table 5. The overall percentage of respondents experiences different barriers to communication.

Barriers	Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	mean	remarks
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Psychological Barriers	5 (3.8)	12 (9.2)	56 (42.7)	47 (35.9)	11 (8.4)	2.64	Sometimes
Semantic Barriers	10 (7.6)	31 (23.7)	60 (45.8)	28 (21.4)	2 (1.5)	3.15	Sometimes
Technological Barriers	6 (4.6)	12 (9.2)	40 (30.5)	57 (43.5)	16 (12.2)	2.50	Seldom

Note: 1.00-1.79 Never, 1.80-2.59 Seldom, 2.60-3.39 Sometimes, 3.40-4.19 Often, 4.20-5.00 Always

Respondents' experiences on psychological barriers.

Table 6, indicates the psychological problems faced by the learners on their asynchronous learning modality. It shows that three among the five statements to determine the psychological barriers experienced by the respondents have fallen under the interval for "sometimes." Based on the findings, the respondents were sometimes exposed to questions or perhaps discussions on their e-learning modules with uncertainty since the statements described respondents' experiences in terms of having false assumptions about the learnings taught by their teachers, answered questions that might affect their emotional well-being, and were exposed to confusing and not convincing questions.

The complexity of information that people see online on different social media platforms, generates more negative impacts. In a study by Buchanan (2020), individuals who encounter false information on social media may actively spread it further by sharing or otherwise engaging with it. Hence, proofreading and fact-checking are essential for all social media users. According to Leonard, Meban, & Young (2021), fact-checking emphasizes that we should remain skeptical for our survival.

Moreover, as online classes become prevalent and widely used across the country, in terms of emotional status, students who attended the online course reported a higher level of boredom, anxiety, and anger but less enjoyment (Stephan, Markus, & Zekuda, 2019).

Data also shows that the respondents rarely experience threatening questions and defensive overview or comments towards their answers and responses since the mean on these survey statements both fall under the interval for "seldom".

Hence, teachers' comments and their overview of their students have implications for their relationships with each other. Whereas in a study, positive feedback certainly possesses a positive effect on students' behavior, engagement, and self-perceptions, if used effectively while negative feedback, tends to have the opposite effects (Pankonin & Myers, 2022).

Table 6. Respondents' experiences on psychological barriers.

Psychological Barriers	Always n (%)	Often n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Seldom n (%)	Never n (%)	mean	remarks
I have experienced false assumptions about the learnings being shared.	5 (3.8)	19 (14.5)	74 (56.5)	21 (16)	12 (9.2)	2.88	Sometimes
I have answered unapproachable or threatening content and questions.	3 (2.3)	8 (6.1)	35 (26.7)	40 (30.5)	45 (34.4)	2.11	Seldom
I have experienced answering questions emotionally.	19 (14.5)	30 (22.9)	64 (48.9)	15 (11.5)	3 (2.3)	3.36	Sometimes
I have answered not convincing questions.	7 (5.3)	20 (15.3)	41 (31.3)	47 (35.9)	16 (12.2)	2.66	Sometimes
I have experienced defensive feedback towards my responses.	4 (3.1)	14 (10.7)	29 (22.1)	32 (24.4)	52 (39.7)	2.13	Seldom

Note: 1.00-1.79 Never, 1.80-2.59 Seldom, 2.60-3.39 Sometimes, 3.40-4.19 Often, 4.20-5.00 Always

Respondents' experiences on semantic barriers.

On the other hand, Table 7 shows the respondents' experiences concerning semantic problems. Based on the findings, four out of five of the given possible semantic barriers were sometimes experienced by the respondents in their asynchronous learning modality. These statements have all means between 3-3.25 making it all fall under the remark "sometimes". Hence, the respondents occasionally encountered unclear words, different definitions, misinterpretation, and misspelled words.

Language or semantic barriers in the study of Buarqoub (2019) emerge from different subjects such as meanings and uses of words, symbols, images, gestures, languages, and dialects.

Meanwhile, data shows that the respondents had infrequent exposure to the use of jargon or inaccurate usage of words in every question they answered since the statement has a mean of 2.49 with a "seldom" remark.

Based on one of the seven ways to avoid Jargon in writing by Krueger (2017), to demonstrate understanding among readers, it is the writers' responsibility to translate possible jargons that readers might encounter.

Table 7. **Respondents' experiences on semantic barriers.**

Semantic Barriers	Always n (%)	Often n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Seldom n (%)	Never n (%)	mean	remarks
. I have experienced ambiguous or unclear words during activities	11 (8.4)	43 (32.8)	53 (40.5)	20 (15.3)	4 (3.1)	3.28	Sometimes
2. I have answered confusing questions due to their denotative and connotative meanings.	12 (9.2)	36 (27.5)	61 (46.6)	17 (13)	5 (3.8)	3.25	Sometimes
3. I have answered questions differently due to misinterpretation.	10 (7.6)	23 (17.6)	69 (52.7)	22 (16.8)	7 (5.3)	3.05	Sometimes
4. I have witnessed questions with misspelled words and grammatical errors.	13 (9.9)	22 (16.8)	59 (45)	28 (21.4)	9 (6.9)	3.02	Sometimes

I have witnessed the use of jargon or inaccurate words in every question.	4 (3.1)	18 (13.7)	41 (31.3)	43 (32.8)	25 (19.1)	2.49	Seldom

Note: 1.00-1.79 Never, 1.80-2.59 Seldom, 2.60-3.39 Sometimes, 3.40-4.19 Often, 4.20-5.00 Always

Respondents' experiences with technological barriers

Data in Table 8, shows that 19.8% of the respondents always experience poor internet accessibility, 29% often, and 31.3% sometimes experience such problems. Hence, this suggests that the respondents frequently suffer from poor internet connection as it falls under the interval for "often". Moreover, this happens mostly according to Matte (2020), to students living in rural or remote areas as the lack of high-speed internet remains a major problem that makes it less than optimal for them to study from home.

Meanwhile, data also shows that the majority of the learners that were surveyed have enough knowledge on the use of google-classroom as their new learning environment and had a rare or unintentional encounter of unrelated and harmful content during online activities or assessments since the statements fell under the seldom remarks with 2.09 calculated mean.

However, the data shows that 51% of the respondents had occasional experience in terms of technical difficulties and malfunctions thus, making it fall to the interval for "sometimes".

Meanwhile, the majority of the respondents over 58% did not encounter inappropriate or illegal content as it falls under the 'never" remark with a mean of 1.79. This suggests that the majority of the respondents were not exposed to illegal content online a website of Purdue University Global (2020) states that in an online class, students have certain technological proficiency to successfully understand online communication etiquette and knowing student rights and responsibilities in an online learning environment.

Table 8. **Respondents' experiences with technological barriers.**

Technological Barriers	Always n (%)	Often n (%)	Sometimes n (%)	Seldom n (%)	Never n (%)	mean	remarks
I have experienced poor internet connectivity	26 (19.8)	38 (29)	41 (31.3)	24 (18.3)	2 (1.5)	3.47	Often
I lack knowledge in using the google classroom	6 (4.6)	9 (6.9)	17 (13)	58 (44.3)	41 (31.3)	2.09	Seldom

I have experienced technological malfunctions or difficulties on the device being used	13 (9.9)	28 (21.4)	51 (38.9)	32 (24.4)	7 (5.3)	3.06	Sometimes

Table 5.3 continuation on next page

Table 5.3 continuation

I have witnessed viruses or unrelated contents during activities	5 (3.8)	8 (6.1)	28 (21.4)	43 (32.8)	47 (35.9)	2.09	Seldom
I was unintentionally exposed to inappropriate, different, and illegal contents	4 (3.1)	7 (5.3)	16 (12.2)	28 (21.4)	76 (58)	1.74	Never

Note: 1.00-1.79 Never, 1.80-2.59 Seldom, 2.60-3.39 Sometimes, 3.40-4.19 Often, 4.20-5.00 Always

The proportion of satisfied and unsatisfied respondents in each aspect of the asynchronous learning modality

Figures in Table 9, indicate the proportion among the four aspects/categories to determine the respondents' satisfaction with the asynchronous learning modality. Based on the findings, 66.4% of the respondents feel satisfied with the modules or learning materials and the way they were assessed on google classroom, and 52.7% have enough interaction and support from their teachers.

Hence, these findings support the study of Almusharraf & Khahro (2020), which revealed that learners possess great satisfaction on specific online platforms such as Google Hangouts the most for lecture delivery, and Google Classroom for course management and assessments. Also, with an online learning setup, students can enhance their motivation for such innovation in the academic setup when receiving further guidance from their concerned faculty members (Naseer & Rafique, 2021). However, in terms of the student or peer interaction, 65.6% and knowledge gained accounting for 67.2% of the respondents were unsatisfied based on the statements given or formulated by the researcher.

Table 9. The proportion of satisfied and unsatisfied respondents in each aspect of asynchronous learning modality.

	Satisfied	Unsatisfied
E-Learning Course Modules/Assessments	87 (66.4)	44 (33.6)

Teacher Interaction/Support	69 (52.7)	62 (47.3)
Student Peer/Interaction	45 (34.4)	86 (65.6)
Knowledge Gained	43 (32.8)	88 (67.2)

The overall percentage of respondents in terms of satisfaction in each aspect of learning.

The interpretations of the responses in the students' satisfaction survey are shown in table 10. The ratings in the first two aspects of learning to determine the learners' satisfaction and its mean fall under the interval for "Agree". This suggests that the majority of the respondents feel that they are highly satisfied in terms of the E-learning course modules and assessments sent or shared on their google classroom and receive constant or enough support from their teachers.

On peer interaction and knowledge gained by the respondents, it shows that the mean falls under the interval for "Neither". Hence, respondents are uncertain between their interactions with their peers and neutral about the learnings they have gained in their online learning through google-classroom as an alternative learning space from the traditional or physical classroom.

As educational institutions embrace the new learning system of imparting knowledge to their students, serving quality e-learning modules/materials, according to Segoe (n.d), isn't still enough as most distance students generally seem to need more peer assistance at some phase of their academic pursuit. Moreover, due to the flexibility in e-learning, in an article written by Milosievski et al. (2020), Online testing is sometimes based on the principle of "work it out yourself" where students might not acquire real and long-lasting knowledge.

Table 10. **The overall percentage of respondents in terms of satisfaction in each aspect of learning.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	mean	remarks
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
E-Learning Course Modules/Assessments	30 (22.9)	69 (52.7)	31 (23.7)	1 (0.8)	0 (0)	3.98	Agree

Teacher Interaction/Support	24 (18.3)	62 (47.3)	36 (27.5)	8 (6.1)	1 (0.8)	3.76	Agree
Student Peer/Interaction	12 (9.2)	46 (35.1)	50 (38.2)	18 (13.7)	5 (3.8)	3.32	Neither
Knowledge Gained	10 (7.6)	51 (38.9)	48 (36.6)	17 (13)	5 (3.8)	3.3359	Neither

Note: 1.00-1.79 Strongly disagree, 1.80-2.59 Disagree, 2.60-3.39 Neither, 3.40-4.19 Agree, 4.20-5.00 Strongly agree

Respondents' satisfaction with E-Learning Course Modules/Assessments

Table 11, shows the respondents' satisfaction with E-learning course modules/assessments. Data reveals that the majority of the respondents are satisfied as shown in table 7 as it falls under the interval for "Agree. This implies that the accessibility of the modules on google classroom is easy, includes learning outcomes, and has an appropriate overall satisfaction base from the way the respondents are assessed.

However, the findings state that terms of the duration and allotted time to accomplish a certain task have fallen under the interval for "Neither". This suggests that respondents are undecided or uncertain about the time allotted in times of assessments or activities to comprehend, understand and submit such responses. This indicates that learners don't know what to expect, and aren't certain of the skills and strategies that will enable them to perform at their best in this online assessment setup (Cengage, n.d.).

Thus, as today's educational system has shifted to online learning, choosing the right online examination platform can help the course makers avert drawbacks in online testing and assessments (Singh, 2021).

Table 11. **Respondents' satisfaction with E-Learning Course Modules/Assessments.**

E-Learning Course Modules/Assessments	Strongly Agree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Neither n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	mean	Remarks
Modules are easy to access on google-classroom	30 (22.9)	61 (46.6)	35 (26.7)	5 (3.8)	0 (0)	3.89	Agree
Every module has learning objectives, goals, and expected outcomes	47 (35.9)	64 (48.9)	17 (13)	3 (2.3)	0 (0)	4.18	Agree

The duration of online activities/quizzes is enough to understand and submit students' responses/answers.	17 (13)	30 (22.9)	60 (45.8)	21 (16)	3 (2.3)	3.28	Neither
Online assessments are announced at appropriate times	14 (10.7)	50 (38.2)	53 (40.5)	12 (9.2)	2 (1.5)	3.47	Agree
5. Online quizzes/activities are relevant and aligned with the learning materials being shared.	29 (22.1)	55 (42)	38 (29)	8 (6.1)	1 (0.8)	3.79	Agree

Note: 1.00-1.79 Strongly disagree, 1.80-2.59 Disagree, 2.60-3.39 Neither, 3.40-4.19 Agree, 4.20-5.00 Strongly agree

Respondents' satisfaction with Teacher Interaction/Support

Results in Table 12 on the other hand, show the respondents' satisfaction with receiving support or having enough interaction with their instructors or professors. Based on the findings, most of the statements concerning teachers' interaction/support fall under the "Agree " interval. Hence, the learners are satisfied based on the service their teachers have offered them emotionally or physically and perhaps in a holistic context.

Meanwhile, the findings also suggest that the majority of the respondents regarding sufficient feedback towards their responses on a specific task has fallen under the "Neither' remark. It indicates that respondents were unsure and not receiving enough comments or any forms of constructive feedback towards their responses.

According to Mullukin (2020), the consistency of communication between teachers and students is how to continue making progress in their learning journey; hence, incorporating steady, consistent, and meaningful feedback into teaching whether they're physically isolated or not is needed.

Table 12. **Respondents' satisfaction with Teacher Interaction/Support.**

Teacher Interaction/Support	Strongly Agree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Neither n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	mean	remarks

. I have received sufficient feedback or comments on my online activities	14 (10.7)	38 (29)	59 (45)	17 (13)	3 (2.3)	3.33	Neither
2. My instructor/professors deliver the e-learning modules effectively.	20 (15.3)	47 (35.9)	53 (40.5)	9 (6.9)	2 (1.5)	3.56	Agree
3. My instructor/professors allot time for online consultations.	19 (14.5)	43 (32.8)	46 (35.1)	21 (16)	2 (1.5)	3.43	Agree
My instructor/professors provide supplemental modules and resources online	27 (20.6)	68 (51.9)	34 (26)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	3.91	Agree
My instructor/professors give motivational support to all their students during Online activities and assessments.	14 (10.7)	57 (43.5)	50 (38.2)	7 (5.3)	3 (2.3)	3.55	Agree

Note: 1.00-1.79 Strongly disagree, 1.80-2.59 Disagree, 2.60-3.39 Neither, 3.40-4.19 Agree, 4.20-5.00 Strongly agree

Respondents' satisfaction with Student Peer/Interaction

Table 13, indicates that in terms of peer interaction and academic relationships with their classmates, data reveals that most of the respondents' responses fell under the interval for "Neither". This implies that, among their interaction with their peers during group activities or assessments, they had a hard time or uncertain feelings upon interacting virtually.

Meanwhile, in terms of encouragement and helping them participate in online group activities, the respondents are satisfied with getting support from their peers as it falls under the interval for "Agree." This implies the study of Kardam (2021), which states that students feel better when interacting with their peers, who provide academic assistance and increase their self-esteem, which is labeled as **esteem support**.

Table 13. **Respondents' satisfaction with Student Peer/Interaction.**

Student Peer/Interaction	Strongly Agree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Neither n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Mean	Remarks
Virtual interaction with classmates is easier	6 (4.6)	31 (23.7)	50 (38.2)	30 (22.9)	14 (10.7)	2.89	Neither
My classmates help me participate in online group activities	18 (13.7)	48 (36.6)	54 (41.2)	6 (4.6)	5 (3.8)	3.52	Agree
Online activities with classmates encourage me to express my opinion freely.	13 (9.9)	43 (32.8)	49 (37.4)	22 (16.8)	4 (3.1)	3.30	Neither
I get constructive feedback from my peers based on my online participation	11 (8.4)	42 (32.1)	52 (39.7)	22 (16.8)	4 (3.1)	3.26	Neither
Virtual activities make me more attentive and active in my groupmates' chatgroup.	7 (5.3)	34 (26)	55 (42)	23 (17.6)	12 (9.2)	3.01	Neither

Note: 1.00-1.79 Strongly disagree, 1.80-2.59 Disagree, 2.60-3.39 Neither, 3.40-4.19 Agree, 4.20-5.00 Strongly agree

Respondents' satisfaction in terms of knowledge gained in asynchronous learning.

Additionally, Table 14, states that respondents could not improve and develop such communication-related skills in this mode of learning. Four out of the five statements to assess the learnings and knowledge gained by the respondents show that they are uncertain about what has been taught to them as it falls under the interval for "Neither'.

Meanwhile, based on the findings, the respondents have certainly improved their technical abilities since it falls under the interval for "Agree'. This implies that the Development Communication students had made progress in terms of technology since contemporary learning today requires them to develop such skills to catch up with the learning process. Additionally, most of the surveyed students have reported that online learning offers an environment that develops confidence and provides a more flexible learning approach compared to traditional classroom learning (Li and Lee, 2016).

Table 14. Respondents' satisfaction in terms of knowledge gained in asynchronous learning.

Knowledge Gained	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	mean	remarks
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
1. I was able to learn more useful and advanced	8 (6.1)	39 (29.8)	56 (42.7)	22 (16.8)	6 (4.6)	3.16	Neither
2. My skills as a DevCom student were further improved because of relevant learnings from asynchronous learning	9 (6.9)	30 (22.9)	58 (44.3)	27 (20.6)	6 (4.6)	3.00 77	Neither
3. I have developed my communication skills and abilities	10 (7.6)	37 (28.2)	53 (40.5)	23 (17.6)	8 (6.1)	3.14	Neither
I was able to improve my technological literacy in this learning modality	20 (15.3)	61 (46.6)	39 (29.8)	8 (6.1)	3 (2.3)	3.66	Agree
I felt competent in this type of mode of learning information related to the course through the use of an online learning modality.	7 (5.3)	29 (22.1)	48 (36.6)	37 (28.2)	9 (6.9)	2.91	Neither

Note: 1.00-1.79 Strongly disagree, 1.80-2.59 Disagree, 2.60-3.39 Neither, 3.40-4.19 Agree, 4.20-5.00 Strongly agree

Correlation analysis between students' demographic profile and communication challenges in learning

Findings in Table 15, revealed the correlation analysis between students' demographic profiles and communication challenges in learning. Based on the findings, Age and Technological Barriers have a certain relationship which reveals that older students are having technological barriers in this type or mode of learning. This suggests that older students' educational experience might be different from other learners as they possess greater responsibilities in their daily lives (Cercone, 2008).

Moreover, the finding showed a statistically significant relationship between

the types of internet use by the students as they are experiencing technological barriers in learning. This suggests that problems when it comes to internet connectivity will pose a big challenge among students during this period as the country begins embracing the new pedagogical approach to learning today. Hence, in the study of Rahiem (2020), technology barriers and challenges in using ICT included: device issues, internet connectivity, technology costs, and lack of technology skills are the ones that need to be improved, thus, to better students' learning experience during this challenging time.

Table 15. Correlation analysis between students' demographic profile and communication challenges in learning.

Profile	Psychological Barriers	Semantic Barriers	Technological Barriers
Age [a]	0.120	0.074	0.226*
Sex [b]	0.141	0.140	0.197
Family monthly income [b]	0.179	0.197	0.201
Birth Order [b]	0.182	0.180	0.129
Household Size [b]	0.131	0.246	0.157
Internet connection used [b]	0.217	0.192	0.336*

Note: * p-value less than 0.05 is significant at 5%. [a] Spearman rank coefficient. [b] Cramer's V effect size

Correlation analysis between students' communication challenges and satisfaction with the asynchronous learning modality.

Table 16 shows the relationship between the student's satisfaction with the asynchronous learning modality and the different aspects of communication barriers. It states that the psychological barrier has a negative relationship between the respondents' satisfaction with teachers and student interaction. This indicates that as the respondents are satisfied with teachers' and peers' interaction on asynchronous learning modality, the psychological barrier is not being experienced by the students.

In fact, through social interaction, students gain some sort of psychological well-being whereas Sandstrom and Dunn (2014) found out that students will experience greater happiness and greater feelings of belonging on days when they interact with more classmates than usual. Furthermore, according to Gray and DiLoreto, (2015), students feel that they are more acquainted or familiar with their classmates and professors when the opportunity allowed them to participate in interactive sessions.

Table 9. **Correlation analysis between students' communication challenges and satisfaction with the asynchronous learning modality.**

	Psychological Barriers	Semantic Barriers	Technological Barriers
E-Learning Course Modules/Assessments	-0.143	-0.171	-0.012
Teacher Interaction/Support	-0.273**	-0.266*	-0.106
Student Peer/Interaction	-0.193*	-0.034	-0.020
Knowledge Gained	-0.139	-0.083	0.135

Note: * p-value less than 0.05 is significant at 5%. Values are the spearman rank coefficient.

Conclusions

This study rejects the first null hypothesis. It revealed that parts of the respondents' socio-demographic profiles are significantly associated with the communication barriers they experienced in today's mode of learning. The researcher concludes that Age and Internet connectivity are the proponents of the technological obstacles which, according to

Meanwhile, this study supports the second null hypothesis, which revealed a negative relationship between the psychological barrier and respondents' satisfaction with teachers' and students' interactions. The researcher concludes that as the respondents are satisfied with teachers' and peers' interaction on asynchronous learning modality, the psychological barrier is not being experienced by the students.

Recommendations

After a thorough analysis of the data, the following recommendations are drawn:

1. As some students experience psychological barriers, requirements/ activities can be adjusted based on the "new normal" guidelines.
2. Faculty members should also improve their course contents as there is a high number of students experiencing semantic problems such as ambiguity, misspelled words, and incorrect interpretation due to confusing choice of words.
3. The university should also make extra efforts and assistance towards students with difficulties with the online class setup since there were more than 40% of students experience technological barriers like internet connectivity.

4. Shifting to more interactive-collaborative sessions and activities online should be implemented since students were physically isolated from their peers resulting in a lack of communication and interaction.
5. As many students are not satisfied with the knowledge they accumulated, the University, Faculty members, and/or course content makers should improvise better and a comprehensive tests, quizzes, and activities for the students so they would be assessed fairly and critically.
6. The integration of other entities' perspectives, such as instructors/teachers and parents, should be included for better comparative study and another angle to be focused on.
7. Thorough research on the items or statements used by the researcher affecting student satisfaction.
8. To wider the scope for more reliable and accurate sample size or population.

REFERENCES

1. Adhikary, S. (n.d.). Types of Barriers to Communication. Economicdiscussion.net
2. (https://www.economicsdiscussion.net)
3. Alawamleh M., Al-Twait LM., & Al-Saht GR. (2020). The effect of online learning on
4. Communication between instructors and students during the Covid-19 pandemic. Researchgate.net (https://www.researchgate.net)
5. Musharraf, NM. & Khahro, SH. (2020). Students' Satisfaction with Online Learning
6. Experiences during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Online-journals.org
7. (https://doi.org)
8. Anu, V. (2021). Online Learning Challenges & Solutions. Embibe.com
9. (https://www.embibe.com)
10. Asio, J. M. et. al. (2021). Internet Connection and Learning Device Availability of
11. College Students: Basis for Institutionalizing Flexible Learning in the New Normal. Internet Connection and Learning Device Availability of College Students: Basis for Institutionalizing Flexible Learning in the New Normal, 2. (https://doi.org/)
12. Averia, L. (2020, October 7). Security challenges in the online learning environment.
13. Manila Times (https://www.manilatimes.net)
14. Bakar, A. et. al. (2020). The Effect Of Communication Barriers On
15. Distance Learners' Achievements. The Effect Of Communication Barriers On Distance Learners' Achievements, Xxix. (https://doi.org)

16. Berge, ZL. (2013, January). Barriers to communication in distance education.
17. Researchgate.net. (https://www.researchgate.net)

18. Berge, Z.L. and Collins, M.P. (1995). Computer-Mediated Communication and the On-
19. line Classroom, Volumes I-III. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
20. (https://www.cedu.niu.edu)

21. Buarqoub, I. (2019). Language barriers to effective communication. Redalyc.org
22. (https://www.redalyc.org)

23. Buchanan, T. (2020). Why do people spread false information online? The effects of
24. Message and viewer characteristics on the self-reported likelihood of sharing social media disinformation. Journal.plos.org (https://journals.plos.org)

25. Cengage (n.d.). Tips for Taking Online Exams. Cengage Blog (https://blog.cengage.com

26. Cennimo, M. D. (2021, June 16). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Practice
27. Essentials, Background, Route of Transmission. (https://emedicine.medscape.com)

28. Charles Darwin University (2011). Modes of Flexible Learning. Learnline.cdu.edu.au
29. (http://learnline.cdu.edu.au)

30. CHED (2020). Guidelines on the Implementation of Flexible Learning. ched.gov.ph
31. (https://ched.gov.ph)

32. CLSU-DHTM-Registrar (2020, September 8). Guidelines on Flexible Learning. Facebook.com (https://www.facebook.com)

33. Cercone, K. (2008). Characteristics of Adult Learners with Implications for Online Learning Design. AACE Journal, 16(2), 137–159. (https://www.learntechlib.org)

34. Dabaj, F. & Yetkin, A. (2011). Analysis of Communication Barriers to Distance
35. Education: A Review Study. Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies. (https://www.ojcmt.net)

36. Dimbleby, R. et al., (1992). “More than words: An Introduction to Communication”.
37. Routledge in New York. (https://files.eric.ed.gov)

38. Dimock, M. (2019). Defining generations: Where Millennials end and Generation Z
39. begins. Pewresearch.org. (https://www.pewresearch.org)

40. Edglossary (2013, August 29). Asynchronous learning. Edglosarry.org
41. (https://www.edglossary.org)

42. Eun, JL. & Soo, YO. (2017). Computer-Mediated Communication. Oxford
43. Bibilographies.com ()https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com

44. Fabito, B.S., Trillanes, A.O., & Sarmiento, J.R. (2021). Barriers and challenges of
45. computing students in an online learning environment: Insights from one private university in the Philippines. International Journal of Computing Sciences Research, 5(1), 441-458. (https://doi.org)

46. Finol, MO. (2020). Asynchronous vs. Synchronous Learning: A Quick Overview. Bryn
47. Mawr College. (https://www.brynmawr.edu)

48. Hrastinski, S. (2008, January). Asynchronous and synchronous e-learning. KTH Royal Institute of Technology (https://www.researchgate.net)

49. Hammond, M. (2005). A Review of Recent Papers on Online Discussion in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. University of Warwick – University of Warwick. (https://www.researchgate.net)
50. Kardam, N. (2021). What Do Students Need from other Students? Peer Support During
51. Remote Learning. Asee.org (https://www.google.com)

52. Krueger, V. (2017). 7 ways to avoid jargon in your writing. Poynter.org
53. (https://www.poynter.org)

54. Lalani, F. & Li, C. (2020, April 29). The COVID-19 pandemic has changed education forever. World Economic Forum.(https://www.weforum.org)

55. Lawless, C. (2020, April 23). Synchronous vs Asynchronous Learning: Which is Right
56. For Your Learners? Learn Upon Blog (https://www.learnupon.com)

57. Leonard, A., Meban, A. & Young, O. (2021). What is fact-checking and why is it
58. important? Co-inform.EU (https://coinform.eu)

59. Li, LY. & Lee, LY. (2016). Computer Literacy and Online Learning Attitude toward
60. GSOE Students in Distance Education Programs. Eric.ed.gov
61. (http://dx.doi.org)

62. Magsambol, B. (2020, July 22). FAST FACTS: CHED's flexible learning. Rappler. (https://www.rappler.com.)
63. Mark (2020). Top 6 Advantages of Traditional Education. The University of the Potomac. (https://potomac.edu)

64. Mateo, J. (2021, May 23). CHED: Flexible learning to stay even after the pandemic. PhilStar Global (https://www.philstar.com)

65. Milosievski, M. et. al (2020), Learning Online: Problems and Solutions. UNICEF Young
66. Reporters

(https://www.unicef.org)

67. Matte, R. (2020). Students with poor Internet left behind in the online learning atmosphere. Fulcrum (https://thefulcrum.ca)

68. Müller, C., & Mildenberger, T. (2021, June 8). Facilitating flexible learning by replacing classroom time with an online learning environment: A systematic review of blended learning in higher education. Educational Research Review. (https://www.sciencedirect.com)

69. Mullukin, J. (2020). Focusing on Feedback in Distance Learning. Edutopia.org
70. (https://www.edutopia.org)

71. Naseer, S. and Rafique, S. (2021). Moderating Role of Teachers' Academic Support
72. between Students' Satisfaction with Online Learning and Academic Motivation in Undergraduate Students during COVID-19. Hindawi.com
73. (https://www.hindawi.com)

74. Owlgen (2020). How Education is Considered as a Continuous and Lifelong Process. Owlgen.com (https://www.owlgen.in)

75. Pankonin, A & Myers, R. (2022). Teachers' use of positive and negative Feedback:
76. implications for student behavior. wp.nyu.edu (https://wp.nyu.edu)

77. Picciano, A. G. (2017). Theories and frameworks for online education: Seeking an integrated model. Online Learning, 21(3), 166-190. (https://files.eric.ed.gov)

78. Rahiem, M. (2020). Technological Barriers and Challenges in the Use of ICT during the
79. COVID-19 Emergency Remote Learning. ResearchGate (https://www.researchgate.net)

80. Scheiderer, J. (2021). What's the Difference Between Asynchronous and Synchronous Learning? Ohio State Online ()https://online.osu.edu

81. Singh, M. (2021). The Advantages and Disadvantages of an Online Examination System.
82. Mettl.com (https://blog.mettl.com)

83. Segoe, B. (n.d.). Peer Support: The Traits and Perceptions Of Open Distance Learning
84. (Old) Students. Eric.ed (https://files.eric.ed.gov)

85. Sandstrom, G. & Dunn, E. (2014). Social Interactions and Well-Being: The Surprising
86. Power of Weak Ties. Sagepub (https://journals.sagepub.com)

87. Stephan, M., Markus, S., & Zikuda, M (2019). Students' Achievement Emotions and
88. Online Learning in Teacher Education. Frontiersin.com
89. (https://www.frontiersin.org)

90. The Open University (2020). 1 Synchronous and asynchronous modes of teaching. Open.edu

(https://www.open.edu)

91. Wrench, JS. et. al., (2020, December). Theories of Computer-Mediated Communication.
92. Socialsci.libretexts.org ()https://socialsci.libretexts.org
93. Zoleta, V. (2021). Understanding Social Class in the Philippines: Which Class Do You
94. Belong to? Moneymax.ph (https://www.moneymax.ph)