

Instructional Readiness of Teachers in Isabela East District on Face-To-Face Classes Amidst Pandemic

Aldazher J. Ang¹

Bishop Querexeta Elementary School, Isabela City Schools Division, Basilan, Philippines, 7300

Email address: aldazher.ang@deped.gov.ph

Abstract– The goal of the study was to determine teachers' instructional readiness for face-to-face classes in the midst of a pandemic in Isabela East District, Isabela City Division, Isabela City Basilan Province, Philippines. The study employed a descriptive research design, with respondents chosen using stratified random sampling. Out of a total population of 133 teachers in the district, only 100 respondents were randomly selected of which were 15 male teachers and 85 were female teachers. There were 12 respondents aged 20 - 30 years old among the 100 respondents, followed by 26 respondents aged 31 - 40 years old and 51 - 60 years old, 32 respondents aged 41 - 50 years old, and 4 respondents aged 61 - 65 years old. The majority of respondents were Teacher I - III, with 85 regular teachers and 15 Master Teacher I - II. The length of service of 38 respondents was 21 - 30 years followed by 25 respondents for 11 - 20 years of service, 22 respondents for 1 - 10 years of service, 9 respondents for 31 - 40 years of service, and only 6 respondents with less than one year of service. The instructional readiness on face-to-face classes of teachers in Isabela East District overall agrees on the situation on areas of classroom management and layout, classroom traffic management and safety procedures and learning resources. The Mann-Whitney U Test and Kruskal-Wallis H Test were used for the significant differences. The results revealed that when instructional readiness of teachers on face-to-face classes grouped according to gender, position, age and length of service are of no difference.

Keywords– Classroom Layout and Structure, Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures, Learning Resources, Instructional Readiness, Teachers.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the Philippines, the government's Department of Education has issued guidelines for implementing online and modular distance learning instruction delivery. This is done to keep students from becoming infected with the disease. However, the president approved plans to implement limited face-to-face delivery in low-risk areas of COVID-19 transmission in January 2021 but later withdrew due to the threat of the new COVID-19 strain. Concerns have been raised about whether the country is ready to open its schools to students for face-to-face learning, despite having one of the world's longest and strictest lockdowns. The reopening of schools for face-to-face interactions must be carefully planned to ensure the safety of students, teachers, and school staff in a staged manner, particularly in the aftermath of physical distancing. During this pandemic, the planning and execution of school health protocols must be supported by accurate data provided by various institutions. The World Health Organization (WHO) published a checklist on December 11, 2020, to assist with school reopening and preparation for the possible resurgence of COVID-19. According to WHO, "the checklist is aligned with

and builds on, existing COVID-19-related WHO guidelines and is structured around protective measures related to 1) hand hygiene and respiratory etiquette; 2) physical distancing; 3) use of masks in schools; 4) environmental cleaning and ventilation, and 5) respecting procedures for isolation of all people with symptoms." Public health protocols during the pandemic must be observed, school health protocols for face-to-face classes must be carefully planned following national and international guidelines to ensure that students are safe or at least mitigate the effects of COVID-19. After all, students value their lives just as highly as their studies. It is the duty of every government to see to its fulfillment. Roblyer (1999) discovered that a preference for face-to-face classes was related to how much one valued interaction and communication with the instructor and other students, implying that face-to-face classes are perceived to be more interactive.

President Duterte approved on September 20, 2021, the joint proposal of DepEd and DOH for the conduct of pilot face-to-face classes in 100 public and 20 private schools, or a total of 120 schools nationwide. The Department of Education (DepEd) and the National Task Force (NTF) on COVID-19 agreed to accelerate the vaccination of teachers and school personnel. This will be in addition to the current mechanism of teachers registering directly with their respective LGUS. According to DepEd Memorandum 071, s. Pilot schools were chosen in 2021 to conduct the limited face-to-face classes following the DOH's safety and health protocols. As a result, these pilot schools must go through the School Safety Assessment Tools (SSAT) to ensure that they are prepared to cater to limited F2F classes. The Limited F2F Classes piloted in the selected schools were a success.

As a result, the DepEd will be able to decide whether to expand face-to-face classes nationwide. DepEd Order 034, s. 2022, the (DepEd) ensures the effective implementation of the K-12 curriculum despite the challenges posed by the pandemic. Throughout the health crisis, it has advocated for the government's initiative to encourage strict adherence to public health protocols while implementing policies that ensure the delivery of accessible, responsive, and quality education. Taking into account the COVID-19 pandemic, the DepEd plans to allow schools ample time to acclimate to the requirement of five days of in-person instruction again. As a result, beginning August 22, 2022, five Isabela East District schools must gradually transition to face-to-face classes. This will also allow other schools using blended learning to transition to 5-day in-person classes.

School readiness skills, which include cognitive, social, attention, and self-regulation abilities, lay the groundwork for future academic success. In addition, social skills, self-control, and attention spans are significant indicators of behavioral and academic results (La Paro and Piantra, 2000; Trentacosta and Izard, 2007; Claessens et al., 2009; Morgan et al., 2016). A school readiness teacher is a childhood educator who is in charge of preparing students and/or learners ranging in age from infancy to five years old and 6 years old to at least 12 years old for elementary school for the Philippine setting. They are able to work in childcare centers and in-classroom settings and other school programs. It is truly indeed important that teachers should be ready especially on the new normal setting of face-to-face classes in the Philippines. DepEd pledges to provide guidelines for the conduct of the said reopening of schools to the public (DO 34, S. 2022). Face-to-face learning, also known as in-person learning, refers to a traditional classroom setting where teachers and students interact in person. It involves direct communication and interaction between teachers and students, as well as among students themselves. Pedagogical skills wherein teachers need to have the skills to deliver effective instruction in a face-to-face setting. Flexibility and adaptability of the teachers should be prepared to adjust their instructional strategies as needed to meet the changing needs of students and respond to any unexpected events or situations. To ensure that teachers are ready for school reopening, schools should provide professional development opportunities that address the above factors. This may include training on effective pedagogy, technology integration, health and safety protocols, and social-emotional support. By providing teachers with the support they need, schools can help ensure that they are ready to provide high-quality instruction in a safe and supportive environment.

As a result, this study was conducted to assess Isabela East District teachers' instructional readiness on face-to-face classes amidst pandemic, as well as to create and craft policies, interventions, and programs that will benefit teachers, administrators, and their students in face-to-face classes during these difficult times.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The main purpose of this study was to determine and identify instructional readiness on face-to-face classes, as perceived by the teachers of Isabela East District. Specifically, it answers to the following questions;

1. What is the respondents' socio-demographic profile, in terms of;
 - a. gender,
 - b. position,
 - c. age,
 - d. length of service?
2. What is the instructional readiness on face-to-face classes of teachers in Isabela East District, in terms of;
 - a. Classroom Layout and Structure,
 - b. Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedure, and
 - c. Learning Resources?
3. Are there significant differences between the instructional readiness on face-to-face classes of teachers when they are grouped according to:

- a. gender,
- b. position,
- c. age,
- d. length of service?

III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Face-to-face Learning: Benefits, Advantages and Disadvantages

Face-to-face learning is an instructional method in which a group of students is taught in person about the course content and learning material (Rajiv, 2002). This allows a learner and an instructor to communicate in real time. It is the most widely used method of learning instruction. Increased interaction with classmates benefits learners as well. Students are held accountable for their progress in face-to-face learning at the specific meeting date and time for the class. Face-to-face learning improves understanding and retention of lesson content while also allowing students to bond with one another. Face-to-face education is primarily a teacher-centered method that varies greatly across cultures. Traditional methods of education have been largely abandoned in many modern educational systems.

The Advantages of Face-to-Face Learning in the Classroom

Because it often incorporates several learning modalities such writing, reading, conversation, presentations, projects, group work, film clips, demonstrations, and practice, face-to-face learning is a very effective way to acquire knowledge and skills Jabr (2012). The Benefits of Face-to-Face Learning in the Classroom include: You'll be able to concentrate harder on your learning because there will be fewer distractions than if you were at home; you'll be able to gain greater understanding, stories, and real-world examples from teachers and other students; you'll have a better chance of completing your course successfully if you do it in a classroom setting; you'll feel more at ease and learn more easily in a familiar, traditional classroom setting; you'll have access to more information and richer understanding.

Social Presence

The limitations imposed by delivery technologies or mechanisms are regarded as insufficient substitutes for actual face-to-face communication (Ciampa, 1989; Palmer, 1995; Rafaeli, 1988; Schudson, 1978). The concept of social presence arose from this perspective of both immediate and non-mediated learning (Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976; Rice, 1993). To what extent does a user feel another's social presence?" asks Biocca (1997). (Being with Another Body: Designing the Illusion of Social Presence section, para. 4). Many distance education theorists are attempting to answer this question.

Face-to-Face Learning

Face-to-face learning is defined as the instructional method of teaching a group of students learning material and course content. There is a live interaction between the instructor and the learner in this type of learning. Students also learn from one another. This is one of the most common and traditional methods of imparting knowledge. Face-to-face learning has a set time and date for the session, and students are responsible

for their own progress. This type of learning assists students in better understanding and recalling classroom lessons. In face-to-face learning, a teacher-centered method is used, and it varies according to culture. Several educational systems have now shifted away from this type of learning in response to changing student needs. This type of learning has several advantages. A person feels more at ease in familiar surroundings and in the classroom. This type of learning allows a person to gain more information from teachers as well as interact with other students. A person can connect with students from various backgrounds, solve problems, and build a network. With technological advancements, this type of learning does not have to be as traditional; there are brilliant online teaching platforms that allow teachers to connect with students in real time and interact with them. Because there is less distraction in this type of learning, a person can concentrate more.

Classroom Interaction Multidisciplinary Perspectives

With recent media and political attention focused on how little (allegedly) students learn, the concept of student engagement, or the extent to which learners enter or engage in their education, has long been elusive, but is now commanding more attention. The advantages of student engagement are undeniably numerous. Grissom et al. (2003) discovered, for example, that the amount of student engagement increases learning. Similarly, Carini, Kuh, and Klein (2006) demonstrated that various strategies can improve student engagement and have a positive impact on academic learning and critical thinking. Furthermore, Tinto (2000) linked student engagement with their institutions to tenacity and perseverance, emphasizing its critical role in preventing students from dropping out before completing their degrees (see also Flynn, 2014; Jackling & Natoli 2011). Engagement, in turn, has a positive impact on learner persistence, which leads to learners being more likely to complete a degree, which only 58% of all undergraduates achieve within six years at public institutions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). Young (2002), citing a 2002 NSSE report indicating that only 12% of freshmen at four-year residential colleges reported spending as much time studying outside of class as professors felt they should, emphasizes that "colleges should try to engage students and persuade them to study in earnest." Recent findings in the 2014 NSSE are also noteworthy because they remind institutions that student success is not solely the responsibility of students. Rather, the institution and its faculty must create an environment conducive to student success while constantly striving to increase student engagement. Without a doubt, student engagement is dynamic and evolves over time (Coates, 2007). If a well-educated and skilled population is essential to a functioning society, then understanding how to increase student engagement is critical. Active learning has been shown to be effective in a variety of courses and domains, including several student-engaging pedagogical models that make students more responsible for their learning (Gatch, 2010; McConnell, 1996). According to Bonwell and Eison (1991), in order to learn, students must read, write, discuss, or engage in problem-solving rather than simply listening. As it deviates from the student - as passive vessel context (e.g., Felder & Brent, 2009; Collins & O'Brien, 2003), the professor is able to

spend significantly more time with the students who are engaged in active learning (Gannod, Burge, & Helmick, 2008).

Classroom Spaces

When considering the positive effects of student-centered pedagogies like active learning and immediacy on student engagement, we must also consider how well physical classroom spaces support such endeavors. Despite faculty efforts to embrace student-centered pedagogies, face-to-face classes held in traditional, linearly oriented spaces (which make up the majority of classrooms) can pose unique challenges. These traditional spaces are not naturally designed to foster discussions, student group work, other forms of collaborative learning, or even instructor mobility, all of which promote student engagement and immediacy. Unsurprisingly, there have been concerns raised about the effectiveness of traditional classroom settings. There has also been a call for physical changes to traditional learning spaces (e.g., Harris, 2010; Kuuskorpi & Cabellos González, 2011; Harvey & Kenyon, 2013) as well as studies examining both specific design features of the physical learning environment (such as movable furniture and display spaces such as whiteboards) that support collaborative, project-based learning (Wolff, 2003) and "teacher and student initiatives in different ways" (Blackmore, Bateman, Loughlin, O'Mara, & Aranda, 2010, p. 25).

Social Interaction among Teachers

The social constructivist theory holds that individuals actively construct knowledge and understanding, and that understanding one's surroundings is an active, mind-engaging process. Put another way, knowledge needs to be mentally acted upon by the learner in order for it to have meaning (Piaget, 1979; Sigel & Cocking, 1977). According to constructivist viewpoints, learning entails building on the learner's prior knowledge and restructuring initial knowledge. Because learners have different backgrounds, experiences, and interests, they form different connections as they build their knowledge over time. According to Brooks and Brooks (1993), "we construct our understandings of the world in which we live." We look for tools to help us make sense of our experiences. In a constructivist framework, skills and concepts are learned in meaningful and integrated contexts rather than isolated and hierarchical ones. Learning develops over time as initial knowledge is revised in response to new questions and old knowledge is challenged. Incorporating social interaction into teacher education courses is one way to prepare teachers to incorporate it into their classrooms. Classrooms become active when social interaction becomes a part of the classroom dynamics; teachers must go through this experience to understand how to create this type of learning ambiance in their classroom's vicinity (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995).

Instructional Methods and Prospective Teacher Preparation

The competencies of the teacher determine the teaching of any subject. The type of training received by the teacher from the training college greatly influences his or her competencies. The instructional strategies used determine the effectiveness of teaching and learning. Learning difficulties can be greatly alleviated by employing effective teaching methods. Different

approaches to instruction can be used to induce, promote, and direct learning. Teachers can impart knowledge through a variety of methods, including lecture, team teaching, demonstration, discussion, e-learning, activity, tutoring, and complementary methods, according to Subair, as cited by Deepa and Garija (2001). Different disciplines each have their own central concepts. Discipline concepts form a network of relationships within the discipline, and each has its own language, symbols, and means of communication, as well as its own techniques and skills (Hirst, 1972). Several studies on the best methods of instruction conducted around the world tend to follow the scientific method of the child-centered approach. According to Heafford (1965), students can learn facts by rote, but their capacity to forget is enormous. They will thus learn whether the processes used are active and whether they are encouraged to think about, discuss, and participate in experiments. According to Thomas and Snider (1969), the discovery method of instruction is intrinsically motivating, and while external reinforcement may be used to initiate a learning episode, it is insufficient for ongoing motivation. Concepts that have been discovered are more meaningful and are remembered for a longer period of time. Taylor and Armstrong (1975) discovered that prospective elementary science teachers gave the characteristic of activity method as an increased amount of involvement of elementary students with science materials, utilization of classrooms as laboratories, and the function of the student as a primary investigator in their research on the personality factors associated with the predicted role of activity centered versus text book centered instruction.

School Readiness

School readiness (Lincoln Country School District) refers to a child's ability to make a smooth and successful transition to school. School readiness can be actively facilitated with some forethought to ensure that children regularly participate in activities that develop the necessary skills for optimal learning when they begin school. While many people associate school readiness with academics (e.g., writing their name, counting to ten, and knowing the colors), school readiness actually refers to a much broader range of skills. School readiness skills include, in addition to academic basics, self-care (independent toileting and opening lunch boxes), attention and concentration, physical skills (e.g., the capacity to sit straight during an entire school day), play, social skills, language proficiency, and emotional control.

Interaction

Students perceive face-to-face courses to provide more interaction, both with the instructor and with other students in the class, than online courses. Bejerano (2008) criticized the lack of interaction opportunities in online courses, stating that lower levels of interaction generally lead to less academic and social integration. When asked to compare the degrees of engagement across entirely online, hybrid, and face-to-face classes, students typically answer that face-to-face courses offer more options for feedback and more rapid input from the instructor (Faux & Black-Hughes, 2000; Leasure et al., 2000). It is important to note that little research has been conducted to compare actual differences in student participation in online and face-to-face courses (Rocca, 2010). Students prefer higher

degrees of connection with their teachers, according to previous studies on their satisfaction with in-person versus online training. Horspool and Yang (2010) found that while students in the online and face-to-face sections rated their professors similarly highly for how quickly they answered questions, there was a significant difference in the degree of agreement regarding whether or not students felt they had enough interaction with the professor. A higher percentage of online students said they disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. Although the course-specific character of prior research makes it challenging to generalize, other comparative studies (Cryan, Mentzer, & Teclehaimanot, 2007; Johnson, Aragon, Shaik & Palma-Rivas, 2000) have found higher ratings of instructional quality and student satisfaction in face-to-face learning environments. The reason for variations in engagement levels could be that, as a type of distance learning, today's online courses are the offspring of yesterday's correspondence courses, which were sometimes sent out asynchronously. There is still the option to work at your own pace, but you will engage with peers less (Bates, 2010). Higher levels of engagement and interaction in the online classroom have been made possible by technological advancements (Ballard, 2009; McBrien, Cheng, & Jones, 2009; Rhode, 2009). However, many online courses still have asynchronous components that reduce interaction in favor of letting students work at their own pace (Parry, 2010b; Vess, 2005). Technology advancements don't seem to have affected students' opinions about interaction. According to An and Frick (2006), students still view in-person communication as quicker, simpler, and more instantaneous than online communication. They also have higher expectations for interaction in in-person classes (Lapointe & Reiset, 2008).

IV. METHODOLOGY

This research study used the Descriptive-Quantitative research design. The subjects of the study are the Teachers of Isabela East District, Isabela City Schools Division. The district has a population of 133 teachers of which a sample not less than 100 teachers are recommended as respondents.

The School Safety Assessment Tool (SSAT) was adopted and shall be used to assess the readiness of the teachers in the conduct of the face-to-face learning modality in the time of the pandemic (DM.71, s. 2021). The quantitative instrument will not undergo an extensive validity process since it is a well-established and validated instrument used to determine the school's readiness for limited face-to-face learning modality (DM 071, s. 2021). However, there were only 3 sub-parts selected and some were combined due to similarity. Also, the questionnaire underwent slight modifications on some items and aligned them with the implementation of the face-to-face classes. Since there were no major changes to the adapted questionnaire, face validity is enough to validate the research questionnaires. Moreover, the reliability of this instrument has been already established since it was utilized by the selected public and private elementary and secondary schools of DepEd during the conduct of a limited face-to-face learning modality.

V. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Socio-Demographic Profile

The frequency distribution of the responses, categorized by some demographic profile, is displayed in the following table.

Majority of the respondents were females (85.00%), while males were (15.00%). Most of the positions were Teacher I – III (85.00%) and some were Master Teachers I – II (15.00%). Most of the respondents were 41 – 50 years old (32.00%), followed by 31 – 40 years old (26.00%) and 51 – 60 years old (26.00%) then 20 – 30 years old (12%) and 61 – 65 years old (4.00%). Most of the respondents were 21 – 30 years in service (38.00%) and (6.00%) for 1 year below in service.

TABLE I. Frequency distribution, percentage and rank of respondents in terms of gender, age, length of service and position

Socio-Demographic Profile	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Gender			
Male	15	15%	2
Female	85	85%	1
Total	100	100%	-
Position			
Teacher I – III	85	85%	1
Master Teacher I - II	15	15%	2
Total	100	100%	-
Age			
20 – 30 years old	12	12%	3
31 – 40 years old	26	26%	2
41 – 50 years old	32	32%	1
51 – 60 years old	26	26%	2
61 – 65 years old	4	4%	4
Total	100	100%	-
Length of Service			
1 year below	6	6%	5
1 – 10 years	22	22%	3
11 – 20 years	25	25%	2
21 – 30 years	38	38%	1
31 – 40 years	9	9%	4
Total	100	100%	-

Table II shows the frequency distribution, percentage, and rank of respondents based on their socio-demographic profile. According to the data, 85 or 85.00% of the respondents were females, while 15 or 15.00% were males. The dataset also revealed that the majority of the positions were Teacher I - III (85 or 85.00% respondents) and some were Master Teachers (15 or 15.00% respondents).

It was observed that the majority of the respondents were 41 – 50 years old or 32 (32.00%) in total, followed by 31 – 40 years old (26.00%) and 51 – 60 years old (26.00%) then 20 – 30 years old (12%) and lastly 61 – 65 years old (4.00%).

It is also clearly stated that most of the respondents were 21 – 30 years in service with 38 or 38.00% and there were only 6 respondents or 6.00% for 1 year below in service.

Classroom Layout and Structures

Table II shows the weighted means of the enumerated area of instructional readiness of teachers in terms of classroom layout and structures. The teachers overall agrees on the situation for their instructional readiness. These were ranked as follows:

1. Open windows and doors at all times.
2. Number of seats to be occupied must not exceed from the required number of maximum learners in the classroom.
3. Availability of working electric fans.

TABLE II. Means, Qualitative Interpretation, and Ranks of the Respondents' Rating in terms of Classroom Layout and Structures

Classroom Layout and Structures	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation	Rank
1. Number of seats to be occupied must not exceed from the required number of maximum learners in the classroom.	4.54	Strong Agree	2
2. Availability of working electric fans.	4.46	Agree	3
3. Seats to be occupied must be at least 1-2 meter apart and shall be equivalent to the number of learners present.	4.20	Agree	5
4. Availability of a sterilization box where outputs (e.g., quiz papers) submitted by the learners will be placed for disinfection.	4.31	Agree	4
5. Open windows and doors at all times	4.68	Strongly Agree	1
OVERALL	4.44	Agree	NA

4. Availability of a sterilization box where outputs (e.g., quiz papers) submitted by the learners will be placed for disinfection.
 5. Seats to be occupied must be at least 1-2 meter apart and shall be equivalent to the number of learners present.
- Overall, these proves that teachers are instructionally ready in terms of classroom layout and structures.

Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures

TABLE III. Means, Qualitative Interpretation, and Ranks of the Respondents' Rating in terms of Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures

Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation	Rank
6. Has established safe entrance and exit procedures for teachers, students, non-teaching personnel, and school visitors.	4.37	Agree	4
7. Has established a contact tracing procedure/tool for school-goers.	4.21	Agree	6
8. Has mobilized the school COVID-19 DRRM team that will take charge in ensuring effective implementation of the school's health and safety protocols that are in place and are observed during the preparation and implementation of face-to-face classes.	4.30	Agree	5
9. Has ensured regular sanitation and disinfection of school facilities, furniture, and equipment.	4.40	Agree	2
10. Has ensured a proper disposal system of infectious wastes, such as used tissues and masks, in non-contact receptacles.	4.38	Agree	3
11. The classroom has set up a proper sanitation and hygiene facility for school-goers.	4.46	Agree	1
OVERALL	4.35	Agree	NA

Table III shows the weighted means of the enumerated area of instructional readiness of teachers in terms of classroom traffic management and safety procedures. The teachers overall agrees on the situation for their instructional readiness. These were ranked as follows:

1. The classroom has set up a proper sanitation and hygiene facility for school-goers.
2. Has ensured regular sanitation and disinfection of school facilities, furniture, and equipment.
3. Has ensured a proper disposal system of infectious wastes, such as used tissues and masks, in non-contact receptacles.
4. Has established safe entrance and exit procedures for teachers, students, non-teaching personnel, and school visitors.
5. Has mobilized the school COVID-19 DRRM team that will take charge in ensuring effective implementation of the school's health and safety protocols that are in place and are observed during the preparation and implementation of face-to-face classes.
6. Has established a contact tracing procedure/tool for school-goers.

Overall, these proves that teachers are instructionally ready in terms of classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures.

Learning Resources

TABLE IV. Means, Qualitative Interpretation, and Ranks of the Respondents' Rating in terms of Learning Resources

Learning Resources	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation	Rank
12. Has secured sufficient supply of learning resources needed for the face-to-face classes.	4.31	Agree	2
13. Implementation of 1:1 Student to Self-Learning Module (SLM) to lessen student interaction during class hours	4.27	Agree	3
14. Implementation of 1:1 Student to Textbook ratio to lessen student interaction during class hours	4.09	Agree	4
15. Has provided Learning Activity Sheets (LAS) to ease learners' expenses.	4.44	Agree	1
OVERALL	4.28	Agree	NA

Table IV shows the weighted means of the enumerated area of instructional readiness of teachers in terms of Learning Resources. The teachers overall agrees on the situation for their instructional readiness. These were ranked as follows:

1. Has provided Learning Activity Sheets (LAS) to ease learners' expenses.
2. Has secured sufficient supply of learning resources needed for the face-to-face classes.
3. Implementation of 1:1 Student to Self-Learning Module (SLM) to lessen student interaction during class hours.
4. Implementation of 1:1 Student to Textbook ratio to lessen student interaction during class hours.

Overall, these proves that teachers are instructionally ready in terms of Learning Resources.

Table V shows the summary of mean scores, qualitative interpretation and ranks of the respondents' rating in instructional readiness on face-to-face classes amidst pandemic. The data were ranked as follows:

1. Classroom Layout and Structures
2. Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures
3. Learning Resources

TABLE V. Summary Table of Means, Qualitative Interpretation, and Ranks of the Respondents' Rating in Instructional Readiness on Face-to-Face Classes Amidst Pandemic

Instructional Readiness	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation	Rank
Classroom Layout and Structure	4.44	Agree	1
Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	4.35	Agree	2
Learning Resources	4.28	Agree	3
OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN	4.36	Agree	NA

Overall, the data also shows that the teachers agrees on areas of instructional readiness. Thus, this proved that teachers of Isabela East District, Isabela City Division are ready for face-to-face instructions amidst pandemic.

Hypothesis 1

Gender

To determine the normality of the data set, Shapiro Wilk Test were conducted. The table below shows the results for normality test of the data set when they are grouped according to gender.

TABLE VI. Normality test of the Data when grouped according to gender through Shapiro-Wilk Test

Instructional Readiness	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Classroom Layout and Structure	.919	100	.000
Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	.798	100	.000
Learning Resources	.841	100	.000

The dataset revealed that the value of alpha α or p-value (Sig.) were less than 0.05, thus, this simply state that the data set are not normally distributed. On the other hand, z-test cannot be used to test the significant difference between respondents' score when grouped according to gender. Henceforth, Mann-Whitney U Test is the most appropriate test as counterpart to z-test. Thus, data set through Mann-Whitney U Test will be tested for the significant difference between the score of respondents when grouped according to gender.

TABLE VII. Computed U-value and p-value of the instructional readiness scores of the respondent when they are grouped according to gender

Instructional Readiness	U-value	p-value	Interpretation
Classroom Layout and Structure	576.00	0.548	Not Significant
Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	503.00	0.188	Not Significant
Learning Resources	478.00	0.117	Not Significant

Table VII revealed the U-value and p-value of the instructional readiness on face-to-face classes score of the respondents when they are grouped according to gender. Since the p-value of all areas were greater than 0.05 with interpretation of not significant, thus, this proved that data when grouped according to gender is not significantly different. On the other hand, teachers' instructional readiness on face-to-face classes when grouped in terms of gender are the same.

Hypothesis 2

Position

To determine the normality of the data set, Shapiro Wilk Test were also conducted when they are grouped according to position. The table below shows the computed value and results for normality test of the data.

TABLE VIII. Normality test of the Data when grouped according to position through Shapiro-Wilk Test

Instructional Readiness	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Classroom Layout and Structure	.919	100	.000
Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	.798	100	.000
Learning Resources	.841	100	.000

Similarly with the data set for gender, it also revealed when data grouped according to position, the value of alpha α or p-value (Sig.) were less than 0.05, thus, this simply state that the data set are not normally distributed. On the other hand, z-test cannot be used to test the significant difference between respondents' score when grouped according to position. Henceforward, Mann-Whitney U Test is the most appropriate test as counterpart to z-test. Thus, data set through Mann-Whitney U Test will be tested for the significant difference between the score of respondents when grouped according to position.

TABLE IX. Computed U-value and p-value of the instructional readiness scores of the respondent when they are grouped according to position

Instructional Readiness on face-to-face classes	U-value	p-value	Interpretation
Classroom Layout and Structure	595.50	0.681	Not Significant
Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	593.50	0.667	Not Significant
Learning Resources	524.50	0.266	Not Significant

Table IX shows the U-value and p-value of the respondents' instructional readiness on face-to-face classes when they are grouped by position. Because the p-values of classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources were greater than 0.05 with an interpretation of not significant, this demonstrated that data when grouped by position are not significantly different. On the other hand, teachers' instructional readiness on face-to-face classes when grouped in terms of position are the same.

Hypothesis 3

Age

When the data set was grouped by age, Shapiro-Wilk tests were used to determine its normality. The computed value and results of the data normality test are shown in table X.

TABLE X. Normality test of the Data when grouped according to age through Shapiro-Wilk Test

Instructional Readiness	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Classroom Layout and Structure	.919	100	.000
Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	.798	100	.000
Learning Resources	.841	100	.000

Table X revealed data grouped by age, where the value of alpha α or p-value (Sig.) was less than 0.05, implying that the data set is not normally distributed. ANOVA, on the other hand,

cannot be used to test for a significant difference in respondents' scores when they are grouped by age. As an alternative to ANOVA, the Kruskal-Wallis H Test is the best option. Thus, data collected using the Kruskal-Wallis H Test will be examined for a significant difference in respondent scores when grouped by age.

The next table shows the H-value and p-value of the instructional readiness on face-to-face classes amidst pandemic of respondents when grouped according to age.

TABLE XI. Computed H-value and p-value of the instructional readiness scores of the respondent when they are grouped according to age

Instructional Readiness	H-value	p-value	Interpretation
Classroom Layout and Structure	7.144	0.128	Not Significant
Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	8.135	0.870	Not Significant
Learning Resources	5.683	0.224	Not Significant

The p-value for all areas is greater than 0.05, indicating that there is no significant difference in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources grouped according to age. As a result, regardless of the respondents' age, all areas of instructional readiness in face-to-face classes of Isabela East District teachers are the same.

Hypothesis 4

Length of Service

Shapiro-Wilk tests were used to determine the normality of the data set when it was grouped by length of service. Table XII displays the computed value and results of the data normality test.

TABLE XII. Normality test of the Data when grouped according to length of service through Shapiro-Wilk Test

Instructional Readiness	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Classroom Layout and Structure	.919	100	.000
Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	.798	100	.000
Learning Resources	.841	100	.000

Table XII shows the data grouped by length of service where the alpha α or p-value (Sig.) was less than 0.05, indicating that the data set was not normally distributed. When respondents are grouped by length of service, ANOVA cannot be used to test for a significant difference in their scores. The Kruskal-Wallis H Test is the best alternative to ANOVA. As a result, data collected using the Kruskal-Wallis H Test will be examined to see if there is a significant difference in respondent scores when respondents are grouped by length of service. The next table shows the H-value and p-value of the instructional readiness on face-to-face classes amidst pandemic of respondents when grouped according to length of service.

The p-value for all areas is greater than 0.05, indicating that there is no significant difference in respondents' length of service when it comes to classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources. As a result, regardless of the respondents' length of service, all areas of instructional readiness on face-to-face classes of teachers in Isabela East District are the same.

TABLE XIII. Computed H-value and p-value of the instructional readiness scores of the respondent when they are grouped according to length of service

Instructional Readiness	H-value	p-value	Interpretation
Classroom Layout and Structure	5.808	0.214	Not Significant
Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures	4.277	0.370	Not Significant
Learning Resources	7.763	0.101	Not Significant

V. CONCLUSIONS

Majority of the teachers in Isabela East District, Isabela City Division were females and most of them are Teacher I – III position.

Instructional Readiness (Classroom Layout and Structures, Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures, and Learning Resources) of teachers on face-to-face classes amidst pandemic overall agrees on the situations and were ranked as follows;

On Classroom Layout and Structures

1. Open windows and doors at all times.
2. Number of seats to be occupied must not exceed from the required number of maximum learners in the classroom.
3. Availability of working electric fans.
4. Availability of a sterilization box where outputs (e.g., quiz papers) submitted by the learners will be placed for disinfection.
5. Seats to be occupied must be at least 1-2 meter apart and shall be equivalent to the number of learners present.

On Classroom Traffic Management and Safety Procedures

6. The classroom has set up a proper sanitation and hygiene facility for school-goers.
7. Has ensured regular sanitation and disinfection of school facilities, furniture, and equipment.
8. Has ensured a proper disposal system of infectious wastes, such as used tissues and masks, in non-contact receptacles.
9. Has established safe entrance and exit procedures for teachers, students, non-teaching personnel, and school visitors.
10. Has mobilized the school COVID-19 DRRM team that will take charge in ensuring effective implementation of the school's health and safety protocols that are in place and are observed during the preparation and implementation of face-to-face classes.
11. Has established a contact tracing procedure/tool for school-goers.

On Learning Resources

12. Has provided Learning Activity Sheets (LAS) to ease learners' expenses.
13. Has secured sufficient supply of learning resources needed for the face-to-face classes.
14. Implementation of 1:1 Student to Self-Learning Module (SLM) to lessen student interaction during class hours.

15. Implementation of 1:1 Student to Textbook ratio to lessen student interaction during class hours.

The hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the instructional readiness on face-to-face classes (classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedure, learning resources) of teachers when data are grouped according to gender, position, age, length of service, is accepted.

Using a 95% confidence interval, the study's findings revealed that there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypotheses on the difference in teachers' scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources when they are grouped according to their gender. Thus, based on these findings, it is clear that teachers' scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources do not differ significantly by gender. As a result, regardless of gender, teachers are the same in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources.

Using a 95% confidence interval, the study's findings revealed that there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypotheses on the difference in teachers' scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources when they are grouped according to their position. Thus, based on these findings, it is clear that teachers' scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources do not differ significantly based on their position. As a result, teachers' scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources are the same regardless of their position.

Using a 95% confidence interval, the study's findings revealed that there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypotheses on the difference in teachers' scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources when they are grouped according to their age. Thus, based on these findings, it is clear that there are no significant differences in teachers' scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources based on their age. As a result, regardless of age, teachers score the same in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources.

The study's findings, tested at a 95% confidence interval, revealed that there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypotheses on the difference between teachers' scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources when they are grouped according to their length of service. As a result of these findings, it is clear that teachers' scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources do not differ significantly based on their length of service. As a result, regardless of the length of service of the teachers, their scores in classroom layout and structure, classroom traffic management and safety procedures, and learning resources are the same.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [2]. Severiens, S.E., Schmidt, H.G. Academic and social integration and study progress in problem based learning. *High Educ* **58**, 59–69 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9181-x>
- [3]. Landry, S.H, Zucker, T.A., Williams, J.M., Merz, E.C., Guttentag, C.L., & Taylor, H.B. (2015). Improving school readiness of high-risk preschoolers: Combining high quality instructional strategies with responsive training for teachers and parents. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* **40** (2017) 38-51.
- [4]. Schmitt, S. A., McClelland, M. M., Tominey, S. L., & Acock, A. C. (2015). Strengthening school readiness for Head Start children: Evaluation of a self-regulation intervention. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, **30(A)**, 20-31. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2014.08.001
- [5]. Ronfeldt, M., Matsko, K.K., Reininger, M. (2020). Three Different Measures of Graduates’ Instructional Readiness and the Features of Preservice Preparation that Predict Them. *Sage Journals*. VOL 72, Issue 1, 2020.
- [6]. Bierman, K.L., Domitrovich, R.L., Gest, S.D., Welsh, J.A., Greenberg, M.T., Clair, C., Nelson, K.E., & Gill, S. (2008). *Promoting Academic and Socio-Emotional School Readiness: The Head Start REDI Program*. Society for Research in Child Development. VOL. 79, Issue 6, 2008.
- [7]. Alawajee, O.A., & Almuatairi, H.A. (2022). *Level of Readiness for In-Class Teaching Among Teachers of Students with Special Educational Needs: Post-COVID19*. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research* **98** (2022) 1-20.
- [8]. Bates, A.J. (2009). *Service Learning as an Instructional Strategy for the Preparation of Teachers*. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, VOL. 9, p. 5-23, 2009.
- [9]. Graham, C.R., Borup, J., Pulham, E., & Larsen, R. (2019). *K-12 Blended Teaching Readiness: Model and Instrument Development*. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, VOL. 51, 2019.
- [10]. Hurst, Wallace, Nixon (2013). *The Impact of Social Interaction on Student Learning*. VOL. 52, Sep/Oct 2013, Article 5.
- [11]. Zimmermann, Stallings, Pierce, Largent (2018). *Classroom Interaction Redefined: Multidisciplinary Perspective on Moving Beyond Traditional Classroom Spaces to Promote Student Engagement*. *Journal of Learning Spaces*, VOL. 7, No. 1, 2018.
- [12]. Department of Education (DepEd). *DepEd Memorandum 071, s. 2021: School Safety Assessment Too for Face-to-Face Learning*. SY: 2021 – 2022.
- [13]. M. Akladios, G. Lim, & HR. Parsaei (2015). *Effectiveness of Student Learning – a Comparison Between online and Face-to-Face Formats*. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*.
- [14]. Mcnamara, J.D (1994). *Surveys and Experiments in Education Research*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- [15]. Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2009). *Research in Education (9th ed.)*. New Delhi, India: Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd.
- [16]. Johnson, E. (2013). Face Validity. In: Volkmar, F.R (eds) *Encyclopedia of Autism Spectrum Disorders*. Springer, New York, NY.
- [17]. Roblyer, M. D. (1999). Is Choice Important in Distance Learning? A Study of Student Motives for Taking Internet-Based Courses at the High School and Community College Levels. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, **32**, 157-171
- [18]. Zohrabi, M. (2013). Mixed Method Research: Instruments, Validity, Reliability and Reporting Findings. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, **3(2)**, 254 - 262.
- [19]. Abdul, N. A., Fooki, F. S, Asimiran, S., & Hassan, A. (2015). January 1, 2015. Literature Review On The Relationship Between Principal Instructional Leadership And Teacher Readiness To Implement Change. Vol. VI. 6 vols. *International Refereed Research Journal*.
- [20]. A Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). Introduction to Validity. *Social Research Methods*, retrieved from www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/introval.php
- [21]. Drost, E., A (2011). Validity and Reliability in Social Science Research. *Education Research and Perspectives*, **38** (1), 105-124.
- [22]. Mohajan, H (2017). Two Criteria for Good Measurements in Research: Validity and Reliability. *Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, **17(4)**, 59-82.