





## Attitude towards Block Scheduling of the College Students

Alcher J. Arpilleda , Princes Arianne O. Lucero, Van Harold L. Dolera,  
Ninia I. Calaca , Sr. Marie Rosanne Mallillin, SPC  
*St. Paul University Surigao, Surigao City, Philippines*

### Suggested Citation

Arpilleda, A. J., Lucero, P.A.O., Dolera, V.H.L., Calaca, N.I. & Mallillin, M.R.B. (2023). Attitude towards Block Scheduling of the College Students. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 1(4), 174-178.  
DOI: [10.59324/ejtas.2023.1\(4\).18](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2023.1(4).18)

### Abstract:

This study determines the attitude towards block scheduling of St. Paul University Surigao college students and explores the relationship between their attitude and profile. The participants were 200 college students from different departments and were surveyed using an adopted research questionnaire. A 27-item, 4-point Likert scale questionnaire was used to determine the attitude of the participants toward block scheduling. In this study, the results indicate that age matters in block scheduling. Thus, it would be better if teachers use a variety of learning activities and strategies to keep students engaged with the learning episode and also consider the age

bracket of the students in delivering the content, as it was found out that age matters in the attitude towards block scheduling. The authors of this research offer conclusions about attitude on block scheduling, recommendations for further studies, and discussion on the relationship between the attitude and the profile of the participants.

**Keywords:** *attitude, A/B block schedule, block scheduling, student performance, traditional schedule.*

### Introduction

Nowadays, the trend in education moves toward internationalization and globalization to produce globally competitive learners. To provide such learners, the Philippine educational system is geared toward K to 12, which other developed and developing countries are implementing. Another educational shift is the block scheduling St. Paul University Surigao-College Department uses.

Block scheduling has taken America by storm in recent years. School districts tout it as a fantastic way to offer increased instruction time and help students focus on their studies. However, detractors say more extended class periods are ineffective and promote less learning rather than more (Natashalh, 2016). It is an instructional approach that involves longer class periods and

fewer classes per day, allowing for more in-depth exploration of topics and increased student engagement (Vatterott, 2015).

Additionally, block scheduling helped students feel more empowered about learning, and teachers reported more empowerment in their instructional role (McCoy, 1998, as cited by Kaya and Aksu, 2016). These benefits align with the constructivist approach to education, emphasizing active learning and student-centered instruction (Arik & Yilmaz, 2020). In a study conducted by Nariz and Roleda (2019), it was found that students who received instruction under the block schedule scored significantly higher than the previous batch who were taught under the traditional schedule.

The University Research Planning and Development Office conducted surveys.



However, formal research still needs to be done. Thus, this gave light to the researchers to conduct this study to determine the attitude towards block scheduling of Saint Paul University Surigao college students. Specifically, it aims to determine the participant's profile, their attitude towards block scheduling, and its relationship.

The findings of the study will serve as the basis for recommendations to improve, update, or enhance the implementation of the block scheduling to make this more responsive to the needs of the learners.

## Methodology

A descriptive quantitative research design was used in this study in order to allow the researchers to gather more precise and quantifiable information on the attitude toward block scheduling of the college students of St. Paul University Surigao. The design was deemed appropriate because this is the best method available to use in collecting data to determine the attitude of the participants towards block scheduling. The participants of this study were college students of St. Paul University Surigao. They are also the students who have experienced block scheduling since its implementation in the Summer Term of the Academic Year 2015-2016. The main instrument used to solicit information was an adopted questionnaire from the University Research and Planning Development Office. The questionnaire consisted of two (2) parts: (1) the profile of the respondents, which includes the age, year level, and department; and (2) the indicators on the attitude of the participants towards the block scheduling system. In determining the attitude of the college students towards block scheduling, the researchers used Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution, Mean and Standard Deviation, and Pearson-product moment correlation as the statistical tools to analyze the data.

## Results and Discussion

### Profile of the participants

As presented in Table 1, as to the *age* of the participants, it can be gleaned that the highest number of participants is 19 years old (60 or 30.00%), followed by 20 years old (42 or 21.00%), 21 years old (23 or 11.50%), 22 years old (18 or 9.00%), 18 years old (17 or 8.50%), 23 years old (13 or 6.50%), 24 years old (11 or 5.50%), 25 years old (9 or 4.50%), and 17 years old (7 or 3.50%). As to the participants' *year level*, most of the participants are Third year (91 or 45.50%), followed by the Fourth year (63 or 31.50%), and the Second year (46 or 23.00%). As to the *college* where the participants belong, most of the participants were from the College of Business and Technology (84 or 42.00%), followed by the College of Education, Culture and Arts (42 or 21.00%), College of Engineering (26 or 13.00%) and College of Criminal Justice Education and College of Health and Sciences (24 or 12.00%).

**Table 1. Profile of the participants**

Profile Variables	f	%
<b>Age</b>		
17 years old	7	3.50
18 years old	17	8.50
19 years old	60	30.00
20 years old	42	21.00
21 years old	23	11.50
22 years old	18	9.00
23 years old	13	6.50
24 years old	11	5.50
25 years old	9	4.50
<b>Year Level</b>		
Second Year	46	23.00
Third Year	91	45.50
Fourth Year	63	31.50
<b>College</b>		
College of Education, Culture, and Arts	42	21.00
College of Business and Technology	84	42.00
College of Health Science	24	12.00
College of Engineering	26	13.00
College of Criminal Justice Education	24	12.00

## Attitude of the Participants towards Block Scheduling

As to the attitude of the participants towards block scheduling, the item *Some of my classmates have found difficult time in keeping up with the faster pace that is inherent to block scheduling* got the highest computed mean ( $\bar{M}=3.33$ , and  $SD= 0.59$ ) which is described as *Strongly Agree*; followed by the items *Our teacher finds it harder to conduct make-up classes*, *We find it harder to make up absences*, and *There are greater chances that we get bored easily especially if teaching approach is more teacher-focused* with a computed mean ( $\bar{M}=3.30$ , and  $SD= 0.64$ ,  $0.72$ ,  $0.61$ , respectively), which is also described as *Strongly Agree*. Based on the findings, it can be inferred that it is not only the students who are affected by the block scheduling but also the teachers. This is true because it also corroborates with the findings in the study of Roberts (2016), where block scheduling can adversely affect students. Two of the items which have the highest computed mean in this study were also reported by Roberts (2016) included the following: (1) They find it harder to make up absences; (2) Some students have a more difficult time keeping up with the faster pace that is inherent to block scheduling.

Meanwhile, the items *Generally, I can say that dropout cases in class have decreased*, and *I have more*

*time and energy to integrate or internalize the lesson* got the lowest computed mean ( $\bar{M}= 3.07$ , and  $SD= 0.75$ ,  $0.83$ , respectively), which is described as *Agree*. This is true because dropout cases decreased due to longer periods of classes, and committing absences for two sessions, with four hours per session, will result in a dropout status, especially without a valid reason. According to Queen (2000), as cited by Morris (2022), block scheduling positively affected student achievement and helped students retain key curriculum concepts. Block scheduling can create a supportive learning environment that promotes student persistence and reduces dropout cases.

On average, the attitude of the participants towards block scheduling is described as *Agree* ( $\bar{M}= 3.21$ , and  $SD= 0.68$ ), which is described as *Agree*. This means that although there were items with the highest computed means, it is generally affected by means of the majority of the items, in which it can be inferred that block scheduling has an adverse positive and negative effect on the attitude of the students, which may also lead to an effect to their performance as well as of the teachers.

## Significant Relationship between the Attitude Towards Block Scheduling and Participant's Profile

**Table 2. Significant Relationship between the Attitude Towards Block Scheduling and Participant's Profile**

Dependent Variable	Grouping/ Independent Variable	r	p-value	Decision
Attitude towards Block Scheduling	Age	0.25	0.0021	Reject $H_0$
	Year Level	0.11	0.1769	Do not reject $H_0$
	College	0.05	0.5178	Do not reject $H_0$

Table 2 shows the significant relationship between the attitude of the participants towards block scheduling and their profile.

As to the hypothesis, which states that there is no relationship between the attitude and the profile of the participants, the finding reveals that the *age* of the participants has a bearing on the attitude towards block scheduling (computed  $r= 0.25$ , and  $p\text{-value}= 0.0021$ ), thus rejecting the

null hypothesis. Based on the findings, there is a *weak positive correlation* between the age of the participants and their attitude toward block scheduling. The findings of the current study supported the idea on owlcation.com on Research Shows Block Scheduling Does not Work, which stated that it is very difficult to keep students engaged for even an hour and a half because the attention span of students changes

very little, even into adulthood. Some adolescents can barely pay attention for 15 minutes.

From the same Table, the year level of the participants and their attitude towards block scheduling has no significant relationship (computed  $r= 0.11$ , and  $p\text{-value}= 0.1769$ ). This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between the attitude of the participants towards block scheduling and their profile. The statistical computations also reveal a *weak positive correlation* between the year level of the participants and their attitude toward block scheduling. This means that whether the student is in the lower or higher years, their attitude towards the block schedule is almost the same, and it does not affect their learning experience.

As regards the college/ department where the participants belong and their attitude towards block scheduling, the same Table presented that there is no relationship between the two variables (computed  $r= 0.05$ , and  $p\text{-value}= 0.5178$ ), which leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between the attitude of the participants towards block scheduling and their profile. The findings also show a *weak positive correlation* between the college/ department where the participants belong and their attitude toward block scheduling. The students' attitude from the different colleges is almost the same; thus, it does not bear any relationship between the variables.

Table 2 also presents that there is no significant relationship between the program/course taken by the participants and their attitude towards block scheduling (computed  $r= 0.12$ , and  $p\text{-value}= 0.1731$ ), leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between the attitude of the participants towards block scheduling and their profile. The findings also show a *weak positive correlation* between the program/course taken by the participants and their attitude toward block scheduling. This finding contrasts with Gullatt's (2006) findings, which showed that the schedule's impact on various subjects/ courses offered within the

school varies. The block schedule was favored for courses such as science, seeking to involve more students in learning and allowing teachers to act as facilitators.

## Conclusions and Recommendation

Based on the findings revealed in this study, it is concluded that age is the only variable that relates to the attitude toward block scheduling. Students found it difficult to keep up with block scheduling, especially in the teaching pace and making up for absences. They also needed help to integrate or internalize the lesson given the schedule for the block system. Moreover, as viewed by the students, teachers found it challenging to keep students engaged and harder to conduct make-up classes. Given such, it is recommended that the school may give trainings and seminars on block scheduling to both students and teachers. Similar studies may be conducted to further look into the effectiveness of block scheduling.

## References

- Arik, S., & Yilmaz, M. (2020). The effect of constructivist learning approach and active learning on environmental education: a meta-analysis study. *International Electronic Journal of Environmental Education*, 10(2), 44-84.
- Kaya, S., & Aksu, M. (2016). The Advantages and Disadvantages of Block Scheduling as Perceived by Middle School Students. *Online Submission*, 6(1), 50-59.
- Gullatt, D. (2006). Block Scheduling: The Effects on Curriculum and Student Productivity. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0192636506292382>
- McCoy, M. H. S. (1998). Proceedings from Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association: *Block Scheduling: Does It Make a Difference? A High School Case Study*. Houston, TX, USA.

Morris, R.C. (2022). Block Scheduling and Its Gift of Time: A Comprehensive Review. *Educational Planning*, 29(2), 61-77.

Nariz, M.A., & Roleda, L.S. (2019). Proceedings from DLSU Research Congress 2019: *Effects of Block Scheduling on Grade 12 STEM Students' Academic Performance in General Physics*. De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines

Natashalh. (2016). What Is High School Block Scheduling? Block vs Traditional Schedules.

Queen, J.A. (2000). Block scheduling revisited. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(3), 214-222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170008200307>