Analysis of the Impact of Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) Program of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa in the Philippines

Alain J. Anuevo, Christian M. Baña, Alni Gavjaymin B. Casacop*, Rowena G. Dela Cruz, Ricky C. Dimaapi, Maria Victoria G. Solatorio

Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa, University Road, NBP Reservation, Poblacion, Muntinlupa City, Metro Manila, Philippines
*Corresponding author, E-mail: alnigavjaymincasacop@plmun.edu.ph

Abstract

The city's local university Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa (PLMun) has to maintain and increase the quality of education so that the adaptation of a seamless, blended and digital learning has to be implemented by recreating new methods which require inspiration and innovation. The institutional adaptation of a seamless blended digital learning program is a major undertaking. Furthermore, for educators, digital learning has become a valuable resource, enabling a modern paradigm of information sharing in which students have the tools to learn at their own pace. The study aims to perceive the level of faculty and students' acceptance and determine if there is a significant difference in the respondents and the effect of collective variables in Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL), in terms of (1) Quality (2) User Satisfaction (3) Use (4) Perceived Benefits. Implementation as perceived by the faculty and students, (1) Adherence to Policy (2) Online Platforms/Technology (3) Academic Support (4) Monitoring and Evaluation (5) Flexible Learning Modality. Identify the effect of the SBDL implementation on the level of consumers' acceptance. The quantitative research design was used in the study to assess the level of Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) Implementation (Adherence to Policy, Online Platforms/Technology, Academic Support, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Flexible Learning Modality) and its level of acceptance (Quality, User Acceptance, Use and Benefits) assessed by the faculty of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa. Various factors might cause these results which may include the student's awareness of the contents of the policy, the attitude of the students in accepting the policy, the execution of the policy, and/or the policy itself, but are not limited only to these reasons. On the other hand, Online Platforms/Technology was also found to have a significant positive effect only to Use. The standardization of the Learning Management System to be used for the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021 might be difficult for the students, especially for those who cannot afford to go online and attend synchronous sessions. Based on the results and conclusions of the study, the following are recommended: (1) The opinion and concern of all stakeholders both faculty and students; (2) the policy in implementing of SBDL program; (3) all stakeholders for the SBDL program must be represented in the reviewing process; (4) SBDL program another research should be conducted to view the effectiveness of the revised policy; (5) the online platform/technology be highly utilized for further enhancement of the online class; (6) the university administration should continually support and strengthen its commitment; (7) the monitoring and evaluation of the execution program; and (8) the flexible learning modality continually conduct by the faculty for an equal learning opportunity for all students.

Keywords: *seamless blended digital learning, learning management system, virtual learning environment, flexible learning success model*

1. Introduction

Philippines President states no reopening of classes amid this widespread; "No Immunization, No Opening of Classes." But Secretary of the Office of Education (DepEd) demanded embracing an elective new normal approach. The proposed opening of classes, utilizing innovations such as cell phones, tablets, and desktops with web networks, secluded and face-to-face, and other shapes of guidelines materials. Education continuously plays a fundamental portion in the country's growth and improvement (De Guzman). Jessop (2020) recognizes that the moment has come to rethink the future. The teaching methods employed, and summons to action. Fullan, Quinn, Drummy, and Gardner (2020) also point out that the pandemic's disruption demanded swift (re-)thinking and take actions to overcome uncertainty. Learning from this experience has the potential to change the way we think about education and learning. The

instruction framework is one of the offices deeply affected by a coronavirus. Around 1.2 billion understudies in 186 nations are out of school amid the widespread. This COVID-19 changed the instruction scene dramatically (Li & Lalani, 2021). Numerous countries endeavour to open classes after a month of lockdown, but numerous fizzled. For occurrence in Canada, 12 students tried positive in May, and in South Korea, two brothers have the infection on June 29 upon confinement was lifted (Birnhaum, online). In this way, nations like Belgium and Japan adopted an elective school plan and brought down students' numbers per classroom to have space between learners to secure them from contamination. Other nations tried to precede classes utilizing diverse advancements to protect students from COVID-19 spread and were unsuccessful. From putting plastic within the work area serving as a shield to a limited number of understudies to wellbeing, conventions are a few of the many nations' required rules to permit to continue classes this school year.

The city's local university Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa (PLMun) has to maintain and increase the quality of education so that the adaptation of seamless, blended and digital learning has to be implemented by recreating new methods which require inspiration and innovation. While creativity is often considered destructive and has always been a victim of this (Nelson, 2018), we have seen creativity raised to rescuer (Crawford, 2020) more recently, especially after the epidemic's start. Flexible learning for higher education institutions uses a mix of digital and non-digital technologies to ensure the continuation of equitable and open education when conventional teaching methods are unavailable, such as during national emergencies (Magsambol, 2020).

The institutional adaptation of a seamless blended digital learning program is a major undertaking. Furthermore, for educators, digital learning has become a valuable resource, enabling a modern paradigm of information sharing in which students have the tools to learn at their own pace. Association of Talent Development stated that students now share their instructional direction, optimizing both teaching resources and time, thanks to this student-centered approach. Armellini (2018; 2019) led an institutional reform at the University of Northampton, wherein he developed Active Blended Learning (ABL) in terms of teaching and learning. ABL seeks to create a seamless learning experience and infused mechanisms of independent learning in face-to-face and online settings supported by lecturers, with a focus on student interaction and ability to participate in and outside the classroom, in face-to-face and online settings supported by tutors, allowing academics to adopt ABL in the way that will work in their context and with their students. Therefore, the term "blended learning" was favored in this ponder.

In the meantime, BL may be an advanced instructive methodology that has replaced e-learning steadily in most educational institutions. Practitioner experiences have been written, documenting the realities of those who have made the swift adjustment to digital teaching and learning. Also, include how they have prospered from it. Accepted the challenge, assisted and interacted with their students in challenging situations, and converted it into a possibility for successful development that might influence the future instructional innovations and education and learning modalities (Qamar, 2020; Telles-Langdon, 2020).

People are now all involved in the digital scene, and humans constantly observe, distribute, and make a movie for a myriad of purposes, namely pleasure, education, and evolution. Advanced technologies have empowered someone to become not only viewers. But also digital innovators and manufacturers, and share relevant on the world wide web.

People engage through the same initiatives by typically performing through social networks. People communicate with one another even with notions (Gauntlett, 2018). It has been argued that it is incomprehensible to cultivate individuals' twenty-first-century aptitudes with the traditional instruction approach. In this regard, it is exceptionally critical that education systems, schools and instruction programs ought to be planned in a way that provides students with wealthy openings to procure these abilities. In this respect, it is crucial that the implementation of advanced learning and education approaches meets the desires of the century and cultivates the abilities and gear required by the age. The following four significant aspects have been identified in conceptual and practical pedagogical condition assessment to support the teaching and learning process facilitated by digital technologies in a multitude of blended,

wholly online, and flexible settings: (1) activities, (2) choice, (3) facilitator support, and (4) community, understanding the importance of all these 4 categories can assist educators in focusing their efforts towards from information transmission but towards the establishment of more participatory and proactive educational experiences for their learners. Consider developing seamless and interconnected educational opportunities that combine learning beforehand, through, and then after class with the assistance of computers (Ehlers, 2020; Scott, 2020). The researchers explore the effect of the university's seamless, blended, and digital learning program in pursuit of the university's goal of providing a quality, accessible, and appropriate education as well as to assess the faculty and students' perceptions of the program's consumer acceptance. The study focal points are the perceived level of SBDL in acceptance (1) Quality (2) User Satisfaction (3) Use (4) Perceived Benefits and implementation (1) Adherence to Policy (2) Online Platforms/Technology (3) Academic Support (4) Monitoring and Evaluation (5) Flexible Learning Modality to the faculty and students during 2nd Semester and Short-Term A.Y. 2019-2020 and 1st Semester A.Y. 2020-2021. The research question tries to deal with if there is a significant difference in the respondents and the effect of collective variables of SBDL implementation variables on the (1) Quality (2) User Satisfaction (3) Use (4) Perceived Benefits.

2. Objectives

1) To Assess the perceived level of faculty and students' acceptance of Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) in terms of (1) Quality (2) User Satisfaction (3) Use (4) Perceived Benefits.

2) To Assess the level of Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) implementation as perceived by the faculty and students in terms of (1) Adherence to Policy (2) Online Platforms/Technology (3) Academic Support (4) Monitoring and Evaluation (5) Flexible Learning Modality.

3) To determine if there is a significant difference in the respondents and the effect of collective variables of SBDL implementation variables on the (1) Quality (2) User Satisfaction (3) Use (4) Perceived Benefits.

4) To measure what is and how much is the effect of the SBDL implementation on the level of consumers' acceptance.

3. Materials and Methods

Quantitative research was designed and used to assess the impact of the Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) Program of the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa in the Philippines.

The researchers used a random sampling technique, a non-probabilistic sampling methodology for data gathering. 100 and 147 faculty members participated in the study during the 2nd Semester to the Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020 and 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021 respectively. 2,039 students were used in the study during the 2nd Semester to the Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020 and 4,267 during the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021.

This study used the survey to assess the level of Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) Implementation (Adherence to Policy, Online Platforms/Technology, Academic Support, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Flexible Learning Modality) and its level of acceptance (Quality, User Acceptance, Use and Benefits) assessed by the faculty of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa. Survey Questionnaires were distributed through Google Form. The forms also include open-ended questions to further identify the causes of the data gathered.

Google Form was used to digitally collect the responses of the students on the survey questionnaire. Links to the Google Form were distributed to the colleges in the University to be disseminated to their rosters of faculty members and students.

For the descriptive statistics, the researchers used frequency counts to summarize the demographics of the respondents. Mean was used to measure the central tendency of the responses and determine the respondents' perceived level of SBDL Implementation at its level of acceptance. The Likert Scale used in the questionnaires were: 1-Needs Improvement; 2-Fair; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; and 5-Excellent. In the interpretation of the SBDL's level of implementation the scale is interpreted as 1-Not

Implemented at All; 2-Low Implantation; 3-Moderate Implementation; 4-High Implementation and; 5-Very High Implementation. The same scale was also interpreted in the level of SBDL's acceptance as 1-Not Accepted at All; 2-Low Acceptance; 3-Moderate Acceptance; 4-High Acceptance and; 5-Very High Acceptance. M. For the inferential statistics, the researcher used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to analyze the difference between the responses of the faculty and students. The researchers use Multiple Regression to analyze if there is and how much is the effect of SBDL Implementation variables (Predictor) on the Level of Acceptance (Outcome).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 The perceived level of faculty and students' acceptance of Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) in terms of (1) Quality (2) User Satisfaction (3) Use (4) Perceived Benefits.

Table 1 Mean of the Level of Acceptance of Seamless Blended Learning as Perceived by the Selected Faculty Members and Students of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa

	2nd Semester & Short-Term Period (A.Y. 2019-2020)		1st Semester (A.Y. 2020-2021)	
Faculty	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Mean	Descriptive Rating
Quality	4.2942	Highly Accepted	4.3168	Highly Accepted
User Satisfaction	4.2648	Highly Accepted	4.3230	Highly Accepted
Use	4.4330	Highly Accepted	4.5065	Highly Accepted
Perceived Benefits	4.3975	Highly Accepted	4.4320	Very Highly Accepted
Overall Mean	**4.3474**	**Highly Accepted**	**4.3946**	**Highly Accepted**
Students	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Mean	Descriptive Rating
Quality	3.8781	Highly Accepted	3.8971	Highly Accepted
User Satisfaction	3.7770	Highly Accepted	3.8231	Highly Accepted
Use	3.9611	Highly Accepted	3.9738	Highly Accepted
Perceived Benefits	3.7542	Highly Accepted	3.8383	Highly Accepted
Overall Mean	**3.8426**	**Highly Accepted**	**3.8831**	**Highly Accepted**

Table 1 shows that the students have rated it as Highly Implemented. Four (4) indicators namely Adherence to Policy. Online Platforms/Technology, Academic Support, Monitoring and Evaluation were highly implemented while Flexible Learning Modality was rated as Moderately Implemented.

4.2 The level of Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) implementation as perceived by the faculty and students in terms of (1) Adherence to Policy (2) Online Platforms/Technology (3) Academic Support (4) Monitoring and Evaluation (5) Flexible Learning Modality.

Table 2 Mean of the Level of Implementation of Seamless Blended Learning as Perceived by the Selected Faculty Members and Students of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa

	2nd Semester & Short-Term Period (A.Y. 2019-2020)		1st Semester (A.Y. 2020-2021)	
Faculty	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Mean	Descriptive Rating
Adherence to Policy	4.2537	Highly Implemented	4.2363	Highly Implemented
Online Platforms/Technology	4.2220	Highly Implemented	4.1480	Highly Implemented
Academic Support	4.1616	Highly Implemented	4.1022	Highly Implemented
Monitoring and Evaluation	4.2450	Highly Implemented	4.1304	Highly Implemented
Flexible Learning Modality	3.7850	Highly Implemented	3.7891	Highly Implemented
Overall Mean	**4.1335**	**Highly Implemented**	**4.0812**	**Highly Implemented**
Students	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Mean	Descriptive Rating
Adherence to Policy	4.0990	Highly Implemented	3.9971	Highly Implemented
Online Platforms/Technology	4.0106	Highly Implemented	3.9880	Highly Implemented
Academic Support	3.9963	Highly Implemented	3.9287	Highly Implemented
Monitoring and Evaluation	3.9574	Highly Implemented	3.8966	Highly Implemented
Flexible Learning Modality	3.1618	Moderately Implemented	3.1724	Moderately Implemented
Overall Mean	**3.845**	**Highly Implemented**	**3.7966**	**Highly Implemented**

Table 2 shows that for consecutive semesters, the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa's level of Seamless Blended Learning (SBDL) implementation was rated as Highly Implemented by the selected faculty members. All of the five (5) indicators namely Adherence to Policy. Online Platforms/Technology, Academic Support, Monitoring and Evaluation and Flexible Learning Modality were highly implemented.

4.3 The Difference in the respondents and the effect of collective variables of SBDL implementation variables on the (1) Quality (2) User Satisfaction (3) Use (4) Perceived Benefits.

Table 3 Paired-Sample T-Test between the Responses of the Selected Faculty Members and Students of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa during 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y 2019-2020 and 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021

Faculty		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig.
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval				
					Lower	Upper			
Level of Implementation	1st Semester A.Y. 2020-2021 – 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period A.Y. 2019-2020	-.14273	.81320	.12259	-.38996	.10451	-1.164	43	.251
Level of Acceptance	1st Semester A.Y. 2020-2021 – 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period A.Y. 2019-2020	.02750	.88752	.13380	-.24233	.29733	.206	43	.838

Table 3 Paired-Sample T-Test between the Responses of the Selected Faculty Members and Students of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa during 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y 2019-2020 and 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021 (Continue)

	Students	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig.
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval				
					Lower	Upper			
Level of Implementation	1st Semester A.Y. 2020-2021 – 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period A.Y. 2019-2020	-.03291	.53602	.01538	-.06309	-.00273	-2.139	1213	.033*
Level of Acceptance	1st Semester A.Y. 2020-2021 – 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period A.Y. 2019-2020	.07926	.54942	.01577	.04832	.11020	5.026	1213	.000*

Table 3 shows that the researchers failed to reject H_o1 with a p-value measured at .251 (p-value > 0.05), therefore, no significant difference was found between the faculty members' perceived level of Seamless Blended Learning Implementation during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020 and 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021. There is also no significant difference between the faculty members' perceived level of Seamless Blended Learning Acceptance during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020 and 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021 with a p-value measured at .838 (p-value > 0.05). The researchers rejected H_o2 with a p-value measured at .033 (p-value < 0.05), therefore, there is a significant difference between the students' perceived level of Seamless Blended Learning Implementation during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020 and 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021. With a computed mean of 3.8158 during the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021, students' perceived level of SBDL implementation was found to be lower when compared to the computed mean of 3.8487 during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020. Furthermore, there is also a significant difference between the students' perceived level of Seamless Blended Learning Acceptance during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020 and 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021 with a p-value measured at .000 (p-value < 0.05). With a computed mean of 3.8948 during the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021, students' perceived level of SBDL implementation was found to be higher when compared to the computed mean of 3.8156 during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020.

4.4. The Impact of Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) Program implementation to the level of consumers' acceptance.

Table 4 The Model Summary of the Predictors and the SBDL Acceptance Variables as Perceived by the Faculty of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020

	2nd Semester & Short-Term Period (A.Y. 2019-2020)				1st Semester (A.Y. 2020-2021)			
Variable	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Quality	.347	.121	.074	.71546	.283	.080	.047	.68939
User Satisfaction	.317	.100	.053	.74024	.245	.060	.027	.70566
Use	.295	.087	.039	.72231	.239	.057	.024	.66961
Benefits	.433	.187	.144	.61857	.333	.111	.079	.62499

Table 5 ANOVA of the Predictors and the SBDL Acceptance Variables as Perceived by the Faculty of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020

		2nd Semester & Short-Term Period (A.Y. 2019-2020)					1st Semester (A.Y. 2020-2021)				
Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Quality	Regression	6.593	5	1.319	2.576	.031*	5.813	5	1.163	2.446	.037*
	Residual	48.117	94	.512			67.011	141	.475		
	Total	54.710	99				72.824	146			
User Satisfaction	Regression	5.754	5	1.151	2.100	.072	4.485	5	.897	1.801	.116
	Residual	51.508	94	.548			70.212	141	.498		
	Total	57.262	99				74.697	146			
Use	Regression	4.692	5	.938	1.799	.121	3.834	5	.767	1.710	.136
	Residual	49.043	94	.522			63.222	141	.448		
	Total	53.735	99				67.055	146			
Benefits	Regression	8.295	5	1.659	4.336	.001*	6.869	5	1.374	3.517	.005*
	Residual	35.967	94	.383			55.076	141	.391		
	Total	44.262	99				61.945	146			

Table 4 shows that only the regression models of all of the predictor variables with the level of quality and benefits have significant relationships. The set of predictors (Adherence to Policy, Online Platforms/Technology, Academic Support, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Flexible Learning Modality), taken as a set, account for 12.1% of the variance in the perceived quality of Seamless Blended Learning (R2=.121). The overall regression model of the set of predictors to perceived quality was found to be significantly supported by the p-value measured at .031 found in 5 (F(5, 94), p < .05, R2=.121) during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020. During the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021, the set of predictors also accounts for 8% of the variance in the perceived quality of Seamless Blended Learning (R2=.080). The overall regression model of the set of predictors to perceived quality was found to be significantly supported by the p-value measured at .037 found in Table 5 (F(5, 141), p < .05, R2=.080). The set of predictors, taken as a set, also accounts for 18.7% of the variance in the perceived user satisfaction of Seamless Blended Learning (R2=.187). The overall regression model of the set of predictors to perceived quality was found to be significantly supported by the p-value measured at .001 found in Table 5 (F(5, 94), p < .05, R2=.187) during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020. During the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021, the set of predictors also accounts for 11.1% of the variance in the perceived user satisfaction of Seamless Blended Learning (R2=.111). The overall regression model of the set of predictors to perceived quality was found to be significantly supported by the p-value measured at .005 found in Table 28 (F(5, 141), p < .05, R2=.111).

Table 6 The Model Summary of the Predictors and the SBDL Acceptance Variables as Perceived by the Students of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020

	2nd Semester & Short-Term Period (A.Y. 2019-2020)				1st Semester (A.Y. 2020-2021)			
Variable	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Quality	.631	.399	.397	.44477	.535	.287	.286	.54075
User Satisfaction	.568	.323	.321	.56338	.523	.274	.273	.62979
Use	.543	.294	.293	.52028	.491	.241	.240	.59029
Benefits	.544	.296	.295	.59550	.509	.259	.258	.62834

Table 7 ANOVA of the Predictors and the SBDL Acceptance Variables as Perceived by the Students of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020

		2nd Semester & Short-Term Period (A.Y. 2019-2020)					1st Semester (A.Y. 2020-2021)				
Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Quality	Regression	266.513	5	53.303	269.451	.000*	500.731	5	100.146	342.490	.000*
	Residual	402.167	2033	.198			1245.943	4261	.292		
	Total	668.680	2038				1746.674	4266			
User Satisfaction	Regression	307.631	5	61.526	193.849	.000*	637.983	5	127.597	321.695	.000*
	Residual	645.260	2033	.317			1690.078	4261	.397		
	Total	952.891	2038				2328.062	4266			
Use	Regression	229.539	5	45.908	169.593	.000*	471.326	5	94.265	270.530	.000*
	Residual	550.319	2033	.271			1484.734	4261	.348		
	Total	779.857	2038				1956.060	4266			
Benefits	Regression	303.658	5	60.732	171.261	.000*	588.025	5	117.605	297.880	.000*
	Residual	720.931	2033	.355			1682.273	4261	.395		
	Total	1024.590	2038				2270.298	4266			

Tables 6 and 7 show that all of the regression models of all of the predictor variables were found to have significant relationships with all of the variables of the level of acceptance as perceived by the students. During the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020, the set of predictors account for 39.9% of the variance in the perceived quality of SBDL supported by a p-value measured at .000 ($F(5, 2033)$, $p < .05$). The predictors also accounted for 32.3%, 29.4%, and 29.6% of variances to the levels of User Satisfaction, Use and Benefits respective by all p-values measured at .000 ($F(5, 2033)$, $p < .05$). While during the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021, the set of predictors accounts for 28.7% of the variance in the perceived quality of SBDL supported by a p-value measured at .000 ($F(5, 4261)$, $p < .05$). The predictors also accounted for 27.4%, 24.1% and 25.9% of variances to the levels of User Satisfaction, Use and Benefits respective by all p-values measured at .000 ($F(5, 4261)$, $p < .05$).

Table 8 Multiple Regression Result Summary of the Predictor Variables with the Quality and Benefits of Seamless Blended Learning as Perceived by the Faculty of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020

		Quality				Benefits			
		2nd Semester/Short-Term Period (A.Y. 2019-2020)		1st Semester (A.Y. 2020-2021)		2nd Semester/Short-Term Period (A.Y. 2019-2020)		1st Semester (A.Y. 2020-2021)	
	Model	B	Sig.	B	Sig.	B	Sig.	B	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.301	.013	3.339	.000	1.515	.057	2.967	.000
	Adherence to Policy	-.025	.812	-.080	.396	-.170	.065	-.244	.005*
	Online Platforms / Technology	-.080	.561	-.048	.698	.077	.517	.151	.178
	Academic Support	.309	.008*	.322	.002*	.165	.099	.196	.035*
	Monitoring and Evaluation	-.053	.671	-.184	.074	.120	.269	-.052	.576
	Flexible Learning Modality	.364	.129	.252	.169	.552	.008*	.338	.043*

Table 8 shows that only Academic Support has a significant positive effect on the level of quality of SBDL during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020 and 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021 with a p-value of .008 (β=.309) and .002 (β=.322) respectively ($p < .05$). On the other hand, only Flexible Learning Modality has a significant positive effect on the level of benefits of SBDL during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020 and 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021 with a p-value of .008 (β=.552) and .043 (β=.338) respectively ($p < .05$). Additionally, Adherence to Policy and Academic Support has a significant effect on the level of benefits during the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021. Adherence to Policy harms the level of benefits with a p-value of .005 (β=-.244) while Academic Support has a positive impact on the level of benefits with a p-value of .035 (β=.196) ($p < .05$). The negative impact was observed when the Flexible Learning Policy was implemented.

Table 9 Multiple Regression Result Summary of the Predictor Variables with the Level of Acceptance of Seamless Blended Learning as Perceived by the Students of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020

		Quality		User Satisfaction		Use		Benefits	
	Model	B	Sig.	B	Sig.	B	Sig.	B	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.685	.000	.429	.000	.993	.000	.392	.001
	Adherence to Policy	.183	.000*	.056	.124	.182	.000*	.088	.022*
	Online Platforms / Technology	.098	.003*	.131	.001*	.091	.017	.154	.000*
	Academic Support	.186	.000*	.284	.000*	.157	.000*	.260	.000*
	Monitoring and Evaluation	.118	.000*	.145	.000*	.112	.000*	.094	.007*
	Flexible Learning Modality	.266	.000*	.280	.000*	.250	.000*	.307	.000*

Table 10 Multiple Regression Result Summary of the Predictor Variables with the Level of Acceptance of Seamless Blended Learning as Perceived by the Students of Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa during the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021

		Quality		User Satisfaction		Use		Benefits	
	Model	B	Sig.	B	Sig.	B	Sig.	B	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.385	.000	1.026	.000	1.516	.000	1.144	.000
	Adherence to Policy	-.048	.019*	-.062	.010*	-.055	.015*	-.057	.017*
	Online Platforms / Technology	.021	.408	-.025	.406	.138	.000*	-.017	.577
	Academic Support	.165	.000*	.238	.000*	.086	.004*	.220	.000*
	Monitoring and Evaluation	.135	.000*	.171	.000*	.113	.000*	.158	.000*
	Flexible Learning Modality	.455	.000*	.487	.000*	.425	.000*	.476	.000*

Table 9 shows that during the 2nd Semester/Short-Term Period, Adherence to Policy has a significant positive effect on Quality (β=.183), Use (β=.182) and Benefits (β=.088) of SBDL with computed p-values of .000, .000 and .022 respectively ($p < .05$). Online Platforms/Technology has a significant positive effect on Quality (β=.098), User Satisfaction (β=.131), Use (β=.091) and Benefits (β=.154) of SBDL with computed p-values of .003, .001, .017 and .000 respectively ($p < .05$). Academic Support, on the other hand, was also found to have a significant positive effect on Quality (β=.186), User Satisfaction (β=.284), Use (β=.157) and Benefits (β=.260) of SBDL with all p-values computed at .000 respectively ($p < .05$). Furthermore, Monitoring and Evaluation have a significant positive effect on Quality (β=.118), User Satisfaction (β=.145), Use (β=.112) and Benefits (β=.094) of SBDL with computed p-values of .000, .000, .000 and .007 respectively ($p < .05$). Lastly, Flexible Learning Modality has a significant positive effect on Quality (β=.266), User Satisfaction (β=.280), Use (β=.250) and Benefits (β=.307) of SBDL with all p-values computed at .000 respectively ($p < .05$).

Table 10 shows that during the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021 the impact of the predictors on the SBDL's acceptance was changed. Adherence to Policy was found to have a significant negative effect on Quality (β=-.0418), User Satisfaction (β=-.062), Use (β=-.055) and Benefits (β=-.057) of SBDL with computed p-values of .019, .010, .015 and .017 respectively ($p < .05$). Various factors might cause these results which may include the student's awareness of the contents of the policy, the attitude of the students in accepting the policy, the execution of the policy, and/or the policy itself, but are not limited only to these reasons. On the other hand, Online Platforms/Technology also has a significant positive effect only to Use (β=.138 with computed p-values of .000 ($p < .05$). The standardization of the Learning Management System to be used for the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021 might be difficult for the students, especially for those who cannot afford to go online and attend synchronous sessions. Some of these students expected that the USB OTG Flash Drives will be distributed during the semester containing the modules and learning materials they will be using in offline learning. It had a significant positive effect on the SBDL's Quality, User Satisfaction, Use and Benefits during the 2nd Semester – Short Term Period of A.Y. 2019-2020 when there are no standardized platforms to be used in its implementation. During the 1st Semester of A.Y. 2020-2021, it is found to have a significant positive impact only on the perceived use of SBDL. On the other hand, online platforms/technology does not have a significant effect on the SBDL's level of acceptance. And also Academic Support has a significant positive effect on Quality (β=.165), User Satisfaction (β=.238), Use (β=.086) and Benefits (β=.220) of SBDL with all p-values computed at .000 ($p < .05$). The university administration's commitment to the implementation of SBDL was clearly seen and appreciated by the students. It is found to have a significant positive effect on the Quality, User Satisfaction, Use and Benefits of the SBDL program. On the other hand, online platforms/technology do not have a significant effect on the SBDL's level of acceptance. Additionally, Monitoring and Evaluation also have a significant positive effect on Quality (β=.135), User Satisfaction (β=.171), Use (β=.113) and Benefits (β=.158) of

SBDL with all p-values computed at .000 ($p < .05$). The efforts of the Colleges to monitor the performance and execution of both synchronous and asynchronous learning sessions were witnessed by the students. It is found to have a significant positive effect on the Quality, User Satisfaction, Use and Benefits of the SBDL program. On the other hand, online platforms/technology do not have a significant effect on the SBDL's level of acceptance. Lastly, Flexible Learning Modality was found to have a significant positive effect on Quality ($\beta=.455$), User Satisfaction ($\beta=.487$), Use ($\beta=.425$) and Benefits ($\beta=.476$) of SBDL with all p-values computed at .000 ($p < .05$). The students have affirmed that the faculty members are conducting their learning sessions in both synchronous and asynchronous modalities giving equal opportunity to all students. It is found to have a significant positive effect on the Quality, User Satisfaction, Use and Benefits of the SBDL program.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, there is a high level of implementation of the Seamless Blended Digital Learning (SBDL) at Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa and highly accepted by both faculty and students. It found that the level of implementation and acceptance of the SBDL in two (2) consecutive rating periods were the same as perceived by the faculty. However, the students rated the level of implementation of the SBDL higher during the second rating period but the level of acceptance was rated lower which were both statistically significant. Academic Support also has a consistently significant effect on the level of acceptance of the SBDL program. Flexible Learning Modality Academic Support and Adherence to Policy also have an impact on the SBDL's level of acceptance, however, the latter has a negative impact brought by the implementation of the formulated Flexible Learning Policy during the second rating period.

Based on the results and conclusions of the study, the following are recommended: (1) The opinion and concerns of all stakeholders both faculty and students should be taken into consideration in the implementation of the policy of the SBDL program; (2) the policy in implementing of SBDL program should be revisited for improvement; (3) all stakeholders for the SBDL program must be represented in the reviewing process to ensure that the redeveloped policy will fit the needs of all its stakeholders; (4) after the revision of the revised policy in the SBDL program, another research should be conducted to view the effectiveness of the revised policy to the concerned stakeholders; (5) the online platform/technology used in the SBDL program be highly utilized for further enhancement of the online class; (6) the university administration should continually support and strengthen its commitment to the betterment of the SBDL program; (7) the monitoring and evaluation of the execution of the SBDL program should continually enhance to uplift the quality and the benefits of the program to its stakeholders; and (8) the flexible learning modality should continually conduct by the faculty for an equal learning opportunity for all students.

6. Acknowledgements

To begin with, we would like to thank our All-powerful God for assuring us to total this research and make strides ourselves in a circumstance that we never envisioned that the research outperformed. The strengths to form this work done quality, time, and exertion of effort of the researchers. We would like to precise our most profound appreciation to the faculty and students of the institution for giving sufficient data. Especially to the head of administration with their full bolster in this endeavour within the adaptation of the Seamless Blended Digital Learning.

7. References

Armellini, A. (2019). An update on active blended learning at the University of Northampton, 17 July 2019. Retrived from https://alejandroarmellini.wordpress.com/2019/07/17/abl-blog-post-july-2019/

Armellini, A. (2018). The (large) lecture theatre is dead, Jisc interview, 11 January 2018. Retrived from https://www.jisc.ac.uk/news/the-large-lecture-theatre-is-dead-11-jan-2018

Association of Talent Development. (online). Top 5 Benefits of Online Learning for Teachers. Retrieved March 20, 2021, from https://www.td.org/professional-partner-content/top-5-benefits-of-online-learning-for-teachers

Birnhaum, M. (online). Reopened Schools in Europe and Asia have Largely Avoided Coronavirus Outbreaks. They have Lessons for the US. Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/

BonzMagsambol. (2020). FAST FACTS: CHED's flexible learning. Retrieved March 20, 2021, from https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/iq/things-to-know-ched-flexible-learning

Crawford, P. (2020). Coronavirus – an outbreak of creativity, Arts and Minds Blog, Arts and Humanities Research Council, 22 May 2020. Retrived from https://ahrc9blog.com/2020/05/22/coronavirus-an-outbreak-ofcreativity/

De Guzman, S. S. (online). Reshaping Education amidst COVID19. Retrieved March 21, 2021, from https://www.philstar.com/reshaping-education-amidst-covid-19

Ehlers, U-D. (2020). Future Skills. The future of learning and higher education, translated by Ulf-Daniel Ehlers, Patricia Bonaudo, Laura Eigbrecht Karlsruhe. Retrived from https://nextskills.org/library/futureskills/

Fullan, M., Quinn, J., Drummy, M., & Gardner, M. (2020). Education reimagined: The future of learning, position paper on a paradigm shift for education, Microsoft and New Pedagogies for Deep Learning, a global partnership. Retrived from https://edudownloads.azureedge.net/msdownloads/Microsoft-EducationReimagined-Paper.pdf

Gauntlett, D. (2018). *Making is connecting. The social power of creativity, from craft and knitting to digital everything*, Cambridge: Polity press

Jessop, T. (2020) Let's lose the deficit language about online education, 2 June 2020, WonkHE, available at https://wonkhe.com

Li, C., Lalani, F. (2020). The COVID-19 Pandemic has Changed Education Forever: This is how. The hybrid online model: Good practice. *Educause Quarterly, 26*(1), 18–23. Retrieved March 22, 2021, from https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/04/coronavirus-education-global-covid19-online-digital-learning/

Nelson, R. (2018). Creativity Crisis. Towards a post-constructivist educational future. Clayton, Victoria: Monash University Publishing.

Qamar, A. H. (2020). Quarantined-at-home teaching experience: My e-learning plan and implementation, Journal of Teaching and Learning. *Digital learning in higher education, 14*(1), 120-132, DOI: https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v14i1.6250

Scott, G. (2020). Can we plan for a socially distanced campus?, WonkHE, 6 May 2020. Retrieved from https://wonkhe.com/blogs/can-we-plan-for-a-socially-distanced-campus/

Telles-Langdon, D. M. (2020). Transitioning university courses online in response to COVID-19, in: Journal of Teaching and Learning, *Digital learning in higher education, 14*(1). https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v14i1.6262