

**Research Article****PREPAREDNESS OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, STAKEHOLDERS, AND LEARNERS ON THE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF FACE-TO-FACE LEARNING MODALITY FOR SY 2022-2023*****Melody P. Retardo, Maed**

Marinduque State College, Marinduque, Philippines

Received 10th April 2023; Accepted 18th May 2023; Published online 30th June 2023

Abstract

This quantitative descriptive-correlational research aimed to assess the level of preparedness of public elementary school teachers, stakeholders, and learners in the full implementation of full face-to-face learning modality in Santa Cruz East District for SY 2022-2023. The study utilized and used a researcher-made instrument in gathering salient data. Purposive sampling was used. This study determined the preparedness of teachers, stakeholders, and learners for full implementation of face-to-face learning modality in attaining educational goals and objectives. The findings reveal several significant relationships between the level of preparedness and the demographic profile of the respondents that can influence the level of preparedness of teachers and learners in various aspects of instruction, delivery, and learning evaluation. However, stakeholders' level of preparedness in terms of learning assistance does not appear to be significantly associated with their demographic profile. These results emphasize the importance of considering demographic factors when addressing preparedness in the context of education and highlight the need for targeted support and interventions based on specific demographic characteristics. The study recommends that the district provides and supports comprehensive training programs for teachers, stakeholders, and learners considering the demographic factors such as age, gender, educational attainment and trainings attended. Overall, the findings of this study aim to promote inclusive, effective, and context-specific approaches to face-to-face learning, ensuring the preparedness and success of teachers, stakeholders, and learners in Santa Cruz East District.

Keywords: Face-to-face learning modality, Graduate School Marinduque State College, learners, Preparedness, Santa Cruz East District, Stakeholders, Teacher.

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a far-reaching impact on education worldwide, necessitating significant changes in teaching and learning approaches. This scenario applies to the international, national, and local contexts, where governments and educational institutions have grappled with the challenges posed by the pandemic. Internationally, countries have recognized the need to adapt their educational systems in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, with a focus on ensuring continuity of learning while safeguarding the well-being of students and educators. Blended learning, incorporating a combination of online and in-person instruction, has emerged as a widely adopted approach in this regard. However, while various learning modalities have been implemented during the pandemic, face-to-face learning is often regarded as the most engaging and conducive to effective teaching and learning. Therefore, while blended learning has provided necessary flexibility and resilience during the pandemic, the benefits and effectiveness of face-to-face learning remain widely recognized. At the national level, the Philippines, like many other countries, has faced the need to modify its educational structure to accommodate the circumstances brought about by the pandemic. The Department of Education (DepEd) in the Philippines, in collaboration with the Department of Health (DOH), has taken steps to facilitate the safe resumption of face-to-face classes. This includes the authorization of pilot face-to-face classes in selected public schools located in low-risk zones, guided by specific operational guidelines outlined in a joint memorandum circular. Within local communities in the Philippines, schools and stakeholders have actively participated in a trial program for face-to-face learning,

demonstrating their commitment to exploring this mode of instruction. The monitoring and assessment results of this pilot deployment have yielded positive outcomes, contributing to the Department of Education's (DepEd) decision to plan for the full implementation of face-to-face classes in the upcoming School Year 2022-2023. In the Santa Cruz East District of Marinduque, there exists a research gap regarding the preparedness of teachers, stakeholders, and learners for the full implementation of face-to-face classes. While the Department of Education (DepEd) has planned for the resumption of in-person instruction, it is crucial to assess the readiness and capacity of the district's educational system to ensure a smooth transition and successful implementation. The research aims to address this gap by examining the level of preparedness among teachers, stakeholders, and learners in the Santa Cruz East District. It seeks to investigate the specific challenges and needs that may hinder or support the effective implementation of face-to-face learning. By identifying these factors, appropriate interventions and support mechanisms can be developed to address the existing problem. Justifying the problem that exists in the Santa Cruz East District, several factors contribute to the need for this research. Firstly, the unique characteristics and context of the district, such as its geographical location and community dynamics, may present specific challenges that differ from other areas within Marinduque. Understanding these specific challenges is essential to tailor interventions that align with the district's needs. Additionally, the Santa Cruz East District may face infrastructure limitations, resource constraints, or communication barriers that can affect the preparedness of teachers, stakeholders, and learners for face-to-face learning. By conducting research to identify these challenges, appropriate strategies and support systems can be established to address them effectively. Moreover, the involvement and

engagement of local stakeholders, including parents, community leaders, and local government units, are crucial for the successful implementation of face-to-face classes. Assessing their level of preparedness and understanding their perspectives can help foster collaboration and develop initiatives that align with the community's needs and aspirations. By filling the research gap in the Santa Cruz East District, the findings of this study can inform evidence-based decision-making, policy formulation, and resource allocation. It can guide the development of targeted interventions and capacity-building programs to enhance the preparedness of teachers, stakeholders, and learners, leading to improved educational outcomes and the overall well-being of the district's education system.

Statement of the problem

The purpose of this study is to determine the level of preparedness of public elementary school teachers, stakeholders, and learners in the Santa Cruz East District for the full implementation of Face-to-Face Learning Modality in the School Year 2022-2023.

This research aimed to answer specifically the following questions:

1. What is the teachers' and stakeholders' demographic profile in terms of their:
 - Age;
 - Gender;
 - Educational attainment; and
 - Trainings attended?
2. What is the learners' demographic profile in terms of their:
 - Age; and
 - Gender?
3. What is the level of preparedness of public-school teachers in the full implementation of face-to-face learning in terms of:
 - Instruction and delivery; and
 - Resources for learning?
4. What is the level of preparedness of stakeholders in the full implementation of face-to-face learning in terms of learning assistance?
5. What is the level of preparedness of learners in the full implementation of face-to-face learning in terms of learning evaluation?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of preparedness of Teachers, Stakeholders, and Learners According to each Profile?
7. What training program can be developed to enhance the preparedness of public elementary school teachers, stakeholders, and learners for the full implementation of the face-to-face learning modality?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive correlational research design. A quantitative descriptive correlational research design was used to describe and analyze the characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes of the specific population or phenomenon under investigation. Its aim was to

provide a detailed and accurate portrayal of the research variables and their relationships. The research was conducted specifically in the 19 public elementary schools of the Santa Cruz East District, which is one of the nine school districts within the Division of Marinduque. The researcher intentionally selected this district as the locale of the study to ensure that the findings directly benefit the teachers, stakeholders, and learners within that specific area. The study targeted elementary kindergarten to grade six teachers, stakeholders, and learners in all public elementary schools of Santa Cruz East District. The population included teachers responsible for kindergarten to grade six, stakeholders comprising Barangay Captain, Barangay Kagawad, Barangay Tanod, Barangay Health Workers, Barangay Nutrition Scholars, and parents, as well as kindergarten to grade six learners.

The researcher employed purposive sampling, which involved selecting participants based on specific criteria relevant to the study's objectives. This sampling method allowed for the intentional selection of individuals who possessed valuable insights and experiences related to the research topic. By using purposive sampling, the researcher aimed to gather a sample that would provide rich and in-depth information for the study. A total of 90 teachers, 250 learners and 553 stakeholders served as the respondents of the study. The research instrument used in the study is a survey questionnaire designed to gather information from different groups of participants: teachers, stakeholders, and learners. The questionnaire consists of several parts that aim to collect demographic information and assess the level of preparedness of each group for the full implementation of the face-to-face learning modality. The research instrument used in this study underwent a validation process to ensure the accuracy of the responses.

The collected data was analyzed using descriptive-correlational statistics to examine the demographics of the respondents and their level of preparedness in the full implementation of the face-to-face learning modality. The Statistical Package for Social Science v.23 (SPSS 23) was utilized as the software tool for data analysis. Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation, were used to summarize the age distribution of teachers and stakeholders. Frequency distributions were used to display the distribution of gender, educational attainment, and the number of trainings attended by the respondents. Descriptive statistics, frequency and percentage distributions were also employed to summarize the age distribution of learners and display the gender distribution. The researcher employed Likert scale analysis to evaluate the level of preparedness across different aspects. For teachers, their readiness in terms of instruction and delivery was assessed, and statistical measures such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency distributions were derived from their responses. Similarly, the level of preparedness of teachers regarding resources for learning was also analyzed using Likert scale analysis, with corresponding statistical measures calculated. Likewise, stakeholders' preparedness in providing learning assistance was evaluated through Likert scale analysis, and measures such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency distributions were obtained. Lastly, learners' level of preparedness in terms of learning evaluation was assessed using the same method, and statistical measures including mean, standard deviation, and frequency distributions were computed. Correlation analysis, specifically the non-parametric test which is Spearman's rank correlation

coefficient, was employed to examine the relationships between the level of preparedness of teachers, stakeholders, and learners in the full implementation of face-to-face learning. This analysis aimed to determine if there were significant correlations between their preparedness levels. The results of the normality test provided insights into the interdependencies between different stakeholders and their preparedness levels. For example, we examined if there was a significant correlation between the preparedness of teachers and stakeholders, stakeholders and learners, or teachers and learners. These findings could inform policymakers and educational institutions about the alignment and coordination needed among different groups for the successful implementation of face-to-face learning.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research aimed to determine the level of preparedness of public elementary school teachers, stakeholders, and learners in the Santa Cruz East District for the full implementation of Face-to-Face Learning Modality in the School Year 2022-2023. This study sought to answer specifically the following: 1) Teachers' and stakeholders' demographic profile in terms of their: 1.1 age; 1.2 gender; 1.3 educational attainment; and 1.4 trainings attended; 2) Learners' demographic profile in terms of their: 2.1 age; and 2.3 gender; 3) Level of preparedness of public-school teachers in the full implementation of face-to-face learning in terms of: 3.1. instruction and delivery; and 3.2. resources for learning; 4) Level of preparedness of stakeholders in the full implementation of face-to-face learning in terms of learning assistance; 5) Level of preparedness of learners in the full implementation of face-to-face learning in terms of learning evaluation; 6) Significant relationship between the level of preparedness of Teachers, Stakeholders, and Learners According to each Profile; and Training program can be developed to enhance the preparedness of public elementary school teachers, stakeholders, and learners for the full implementation of the face-to-face learning modality. Based on the data gathered, the following findings were drawn.

Demographic Profile of the Teachers and Stakeholders

Teachers' Demographic Profile according to Age: Based on the data presented, the teachers' demographic profile in terms of age shows a diverse distribution across different age groups. The majority of teachers comprises 43.80% of the population fall within the age range of 25-54 years which is the prime working age. This finding suggests a relatively balanced representation of teachers within these age groups. Furthermore, there is a significant presence of mature working age of teachers who are 55-64 years old, accounting for 38.20% of the total sample. These experienced educators bring valuable knowledge and expertise to the teaching profession, contributing to the overall quality of education. On the other hand, the early working age group of teachers, aged 20-24 years, represents 16.88% of the total sample. This indicates the inclusion of relatively new and early-career teachers who may bring fresh perspectives and innovative approaches to the classroom.

Teacher's Demographic Profile according to Gender: The demographic profile of teachers in terms of gender indicates a significant gender disparity within the teaching profession. The majority of the teachers in the sample are female, accounting

for 78.7% of the total respondents. In contrast, male teachers comprise only 21.3% of the sample.

Teacher's Demographic Profile According to Educational Attainment: The demographic profile of teachers in terms of educational attainment reveals that the majority of the respondents in the sample are college graduates, accounting for 47.2% of the total. Another substantial portion of the teachers, comprising 44.9%, are college graduates with masters units. A smaller percentage of teachers, 7.9%, hold a master's degree.

Teacher's Demographic Profile according to Level of Training Attended : The demographic profile of teachers in terms of the level of training attended indicates that a significant portion of the respondents have received training at the division level and regional level, both accounting for 36.0% of the total. Training at the national level is the next most common, with 23.6% of teachers having attended such training. A smaller percentage of teachers have attended training at the school level (3.4%) and district level (1.1%).

Stakeholders' Demographic Profile according to Age: The demographic profile of stakeholders according to age reveals that the majority of respondents fall within the age groups of 55-64 years old (30.92%) and 25-54 years old (28.75%). The next largest age group consists of stakeholders aged 51-60 years old, accounting for 21.2% of the total. Stakeholders aged 20-24 years old make up 24.77% of the respondents, while those above 65 years old represent 15.55%.

Stakeholders' Demographic Profile according to Gender: The stakeholders' demographic profile according to gender reveals that the majority of respondents are female, accounting for 59.3% of the total. In contrast, male stakeholders make up 40.7% of the respondents.

Stakeholder's Demographic Profile according to Educational Attainment: The majority of stakeholders (58.2%) are college graduates, followed by those with college graduate education plus masters units (26.4%). A smaller percentage of stakeholders hold a master's degree (7.4%), while a few have either completed master's degrees with doctoral units (0.2%) or fall into the "others" category (7.8%).

Stakeholders' Demographic Profile according to Number of Days of Training Attended: It reveals that a significant proportion of stakeholders (41.6%) have not received any training, while the majority (47.7%) have attended training sessions lasting 1-2 days. A smaller percentage of stakeholders have participated in longer training programs, with 4.3% attending 3-4 days of training and 6.3% having completed 5 or more days of training.

Demographic Profile of the Learners

Learners' Demographic Profile in Terms of Age: It shows that the majority of the learners (37.98%) fall within the age range of 6-8 years old, followed by 9-11 years which comprises the 27.91% of the learner respondents, 17.44 % of 5 years old while the remaining 16.67% are in the age range of 12-18 years old.

Learners' Demographic Profile in Terms of Gender: The study shows that out of the total 258 learners, 38.0% are male and 62.0% are female.

Level of Preparedness of Public School Teachers in the Full Implementation of Face-To-Face Learning in Terms of Instruction and Delivery and Resources for Learning

Level of Preparedness of the Teachers in Terms of Instruction and Delivery According to Age: Research showed that teachers across all age groups generally exhibit a high level of preparedness in terms of instruction and delivery. The mean scores for each age group range from 3.47 to 3.79, indicating that teachers are well-prepared in these aspects.

Level of Preparedness of the Teachers in Terms of Instruction and Delivery According to Gender: Analyzing the data, it is evident that both male and female teachers exhibit a high level of preparedness in terms of instruction and delivery. The mean scores for each gender range from 3.42 to 3.71, indicating that teachers, regardless of gender, are well-prepared in these aspects.

Level of Preparedness of the Teachers in Terms of Instruction and Delivery According to Educational Attainment : The study showed that teachers across all educational attainment levels demonstrate a high level of preparedness in terms of instruction and delivery. The mean scores for each educational attainment range from 3.45 to 4.00, indicating that teachers with different educational backgrounds are well-prepared in these aspects.

Level of Preparedness of the Teachers in Terms of Instruction and Delivery According to Highest Level of Training Attended: It is revealed that teachers at all levels of training exhibit a varying degree of preparedness in terms of instruction and delivery. The mean scores range from 1.67 to 4.00, indicating differences in the level of preparedness across different training levels.

Level of Preparedness of the Teachers in Terms of Resources for Learning According to Age: Teachers across different age groups exhibit varying levels of preparedness in terms of resources for learning. The mean scores range from 3.29 to 3.80, indicating differences in preparedness across age categories.

Level of Preparedness of the Teachers in terms of Resources for Learning According to Gender: It is observed that both male and female teachers demonstrate a relatively high level of preparedness in terms of resources for learning. The mean scores range from 3.37 to 3.68, indicating a consistent level of preparedness across genders.

Level of Preparedness of the Teachers in Terms of Resources for Learning According to Educational Attainment: The study showed that teachers across different levels of educational attainment demonstrate a generally high level of preparedness in terms of resources for learning. The mean scores range from 3.31 to 3.86, indicating a consistent level of preparedness across educational categories.

Level of Preparedness of the Teachers in Terms of Resources for Learning According to Highest Level of Training Attended: Based on the data gathered, it shows that teachers across various training levels demonstrate a generally high level of preparedness in terms of resources for learning. The mean scores range from 3.00 to 4.00, indicating a consistent level of preparedness across the different training categories.

Level of Preparedness of Stakeholders in the Full Implementation of Face-To-Face Learning

Level of Preparedness of Stakeholders in the Full Implementation of Face-To-Face Learning in Terms of Learning Assistance According to Age: The finding revealed that stakeholders across different age groups demonstrate a consistent level of preparedness in terms of learning assistance. The mean scores range from 3.10 to 3.67, indicating a generally high level of preparedness among stakeholders in providing learning assistance during face-to-face learning.

Level of Preparedness of Stakeholders in the Full Implementation of Face-To-Face Learning in Terms of Learning Assistance According to Gender: Upon analyzing the data, it can be observed that both male and female stakeholders exhibit a similar level of preparedness in terms of learning assistance. The mean scores for both genders range from 3.15 to 3.35, indicating a consistently high level of preparedness among stakeholders regardless of gender.

Level of Preparedness of Stakeholders in the Full Implementation of Face-To-Face Learning in Terms of Learning Assistance According to Educational Attainment: Results show that stakeholders with different levels of educational attainment demonstrate a generally high level of preparedness in terms of learning assistance. The mean scores across different educational attainment categories range from 2.98 to 3.40, indicating a preparedness level that falls between "prepared" and "well-prepared" based on the provided descriptions.

Level of Preparedness of Stakeholders in the Full implementation of Face-To-Face Learning in Terms of Learning Assistance According to Number of Days of Training Attended: The study shows that stakeholders who attended different numbers of training days exhibit a generally high level of preparedness in terms of learning assistance. The mean scores across different training attendance categories range from 2.91 to 3.46, indicating a preparedness level that falls between "prepared" and "well-prepared" based on the provided descriptions.

Level of Preparedness of Learners in the Full Implementation of Face-To-Face Learning

Level of Preparedness of Learners in the Full Implementation of Face-To-Face Learning in Terms of Learning Evaluation According to Age: The data gathered revealed that learners across different age groups exhibit a generally high level of preparedness in terms of learning evaluation. The mean scores for each age group range from 3.34 to 3.73, indicating a preparedness level that falls between "prepared" and "well-prepared" based on the provided descriptions.

Level of Preparedness of Learners in the Full Implementation of Face-To-Face Learning in Terms of Learning Evaluation According to Gender: The study conducted also showed that both male and female learners demonstrate a high level of preparedness in terms of learning evaluation. The mean scores for each gender group range from 3.38 to 3.75, indicating preparedness levels that fall between "prepared" and "well-prepared" based on the provided descriptions.

Significant Difference between the Level of Preparedness of Teachers, Stakeholders, and Learners According to each Profile

Results of Test for Significant Relationship between the Demographic Profile and the Level of Preparedness of Teacher in terms of Instruction and Delivery: The results of the study suggest that while certain demographic variables, such as educational attainment and the number of trainings attended, may have a weak to moderate association with the level of preparedness of teachers in terms of instruction and delivery, age and gender appear to have negligible correlations. These findings provide insights into the factors that may influence teacher preparedness and could be useful for designing targeted interventions or professional development programs aimed at enhancing teacher readiness in the classroom.

Results of Test for Significant Relationship between the Demographic Profile and the Level of Preparedness of Teachers in terms of Resources for Learning: The results of this study indicate that there is generally a negligible to low correlation between age and gender with the level of preparedness of teachers in terms of resources for learning. However, there appears to be a low to moderate correlation between educational attainment and the training grouping variable with teacher preparedness. These findings suggest that factors such as educational attainment and training grouping may play a more significant role in determining the level of preparedness among teachers. Nonetheless, it is important to consider the specific items within each variable that exhibit statistically significant correlations.

Results of Test for Significant Relationship between the Demographic Profile and the Level of Preparedness of Learners in terms of Learning Evaluation: This study suggest that there is generally a negligible correlation between age and the level of preparedness of learners in terms of learning evaluation. However, gender appears to have a more notable relationship with the level of preparedness, indicating a low or slight correlation for most aspects of learning evaluation.

Training Program to Enhance the Preparedness of Public Elementary School Teachers, Stakeholders, and Learners for the Full Implementation of the Face-To-Face Learning Modality

Based on the results of the study, a comprehensive training program to enhance the preparedness of public elementary school teachers, stakeholders, and learners in Santa Cruz East District, Marinduque, for face-to-face learning is being proposed. The program aims to equip teachers with the necessary knowledge and skills for quality instruction, stakeholders with the resources to support teachers and learners, and learners with the adaptability to the face-to-face learning modality. The implementation strategy involves conducting the training program in phases, covering topics such as the introduction to face-to-face learning, classroom management, delivery of quality instruction, resources for learning, and support systems. The program will utilize a combination of lectures, workshops, simulations, and interactive activities, with a maximum of 50 participants per batch. The training program will be evaluated through pre- and post-training assessments, observation of participants' performance in simulations, and feedback from participants

through evaluation forms and focus group discussions. The expected outputs of the program include well-prepared teachers, improved classroom management and delivery of instruction, enhanced support systems, and increased confidence and adaptability of learners in the face-to-face learning modality. In addition to the training program, the study suggests preparing materials for stakeholders, including flyers, informational videos, and a session guide outlining their responsibilities. For learners, materials such as flyers, a student handbook, and interactive learning materials are recommended to support their preparedness for face-to-face learning. A sample flyer format for stakeholders is provided, emphasizing their role in supporting face-to-face learning and providing practical tips. A session guide outline is also included, detailing the objectives, content, activities, and timeframes for each session of the training program.

Conclusion

Based on the summary of findings, the research does not support the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the level of preparedness of public elementary school teachers, stakeholders, and learners in the Santa Cruz East District and their readiness for the full implementation of the face-to-face learning modality in the School Year 2022-2023. The findings reveal several significant relationships between the level of preparedness and demographic profiles of teachers and learners. Regarding teachers' level of preparedness in terms of instruction and delivery, there is a significant correlation between age and preparedness in certain aspects. Educational attainment and the number of trainings attended also show significant correlations with preparedness in specific areas. These findings suggest that demographic factors, such as age, educational attainment, and training attendance, can influence teachers' preparedness in various aspects of instruction and delivery. In terms of resources for learning, teachers' level of preparedness also shows significant correlations with age, educational attainment, and the highest level of training attended. Younger teachers, those with higher levels of education, and those who have attended higher levels of training display higher levels of preparedness. These results indicate that certain demographic characteristics contribute to teachers' readiness in terms of resources for learning. However, stakeholders' level of preparedness in terms of learning assistance does not exhibit significant correlations with demographic factors. This implies that stakeholders' preparedness in supporting face-to-face learning experiences is not strongly influenced by their demographic profiles. When considering learners' level of preparedness in terms of learning evaluation, age and gender demonstrate significant correlations with preparedness in certain aspects. These findings indicate that the demographic characteristics of learners can influence their readiness to actively engage in learning evaluation processes. Overall, the findings suggest that demographic factors, such as age, educational attainment, and training attendance, can influence the level of preparedness of teachers and learners in various aspects of instruction, delivery, and learning evaluation. However, stakeholders' level of preparedness in terms of learning assistance does not appear to be significantly associated with their demographic profiles. These results emphasize the importance of considering demographic factors when addressing preparedness in the context of education and highlight the need for targeted support and interventions based on specific demographic characteristics.

REFERENCES

- AECT (Association for Education and Communication), (1997). The definition of educational technology. Washington: *Association for Educational Communication and Technology*
- Alexander, C. D. and Fuller, E. (2005). *Effects of Teacher Qualifications on Student Achievement in Middle School Mathematics in Texas*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (April).
- Alghamdi, A., Karpinski, A. C., Lepp, A., & Barkley, J. (2020). Online and face-to-face classroom multitasking and academic performance: Moderated mediation with self-efficacy for self-regulated learning and gender. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 102, 214–222.
- Baker, S. G., Frandsen, B. R., & McInnis, K. J. (2019). The impact of education on learning: Using propensity score methods to understand causal effects. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 70, 7-17.
- Bascia, N., & Imre, R. (2017). Gender and the teaching profession. In A. D. Reid, E. M. Harris, & P. B. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Teacher Education in a Transnational World* (pp. 205-222). Routledge.
- Beattie, C. (1970). Entrance age to kindergarten and first grade: Its effect on cognitive and affective development of students. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5-31.
- Bremer, J., & Freeman, J. G. (2018). Promoting gender equity in education. *Prospects*, 48(3), 313-328.
- Bovill, H. (2017). Intergenerational stakeholder dialogue in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 32(5), 636-653.
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2017). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public administration review*, 77(3), 390-400.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership*, 60(6), 40-45.
- Cabardo, J. R. O., (2016). Levels of Participation of the School Stakeholders to the Different School-Initiated Activities and the Implementation of School-Based Management.
- Crnici, K. & Lamberty, G. (1994). Reconsidering school readiness: Conceptual and applied perspectives. *Early Education and Development*, 5(2), 91-105
- Cruikshank, D. (2003). *The Act of Teaching*. Third Edition. 1221 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY. McGraw Hill Companies.
- Chemonics, (1975). Gender-Sensitive Policies Require Engagement from Local Stakeholders and School Personnel
- Cheung, A. C. K. (2018). Stakeholders' participation in educational policy-making: A literature review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 38(4), 505-518.
- Coburn, C. E. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher*, 32(6), 3-12.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. *Learning Policy Institute*.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 291-309.
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2007). Variations in the conditions for teachers' professional learning and development: Sustaining commitment and effectiveness over a career. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(4), 423-443.
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational researcher*, 38(3), 181-199.
- De Torres, P., (2021). Stakeholder's Involvement to School-Initiated Activities of District I Secondary Schools: Basis for Enhanced Community Partnership Program of Activities.
- Dian, W., Sugueng, B.W. & Ariyawan, A. N (2021). Teachers' Difficulties in Developing Learning Resources.
- Downes, A. (2016). Learning Evaluation Models You Can Use.
- Duffy, J., Warren, K., & Walsh, M. (2001). Classroom Interactions: Gender of teacher, Gender of Student, and Classroom Subject. *Gender Roles*, 45,579-593.
- Feil, E. G., Severson, H. H., & Walker, H. M. (1998). Screening for Emotional and Behavioral Delays: Early Screening Project. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 21(3), 252-266.
- Flores, G. (2018). Gender Diversity and Inclusive Education among Women School Stakeholders in Selected Schools of Cavite: A Grounded Theory Study
- Fullan, M. (2017). Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school. *Teachers College Press*.
- Gagne, M. & Deci, E.L. (2005) Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*,26, 331-362.
- Garet, M., Porter, A., Desimone, L. Birman, B., & Yoon, K. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Analysis of a national sample of teachers. *American Education Research Journal*, 38(4), 915-945.
- Gaevi D, Joksimovi S, Manataki A, Dawson S, Kovanovi V and De Kereki I F (2016) Int. Conf. on Learning Analytics and Knowledge (Edinburgh) Translating network position into performance: importance of centrality in different network configurations 314-323
- Gašević, D., Dawson, S., Rogers, T., & Gasevic, D. (2016). Learning analytics should not promote one size fits all: The effects of instructional conditions in predicting academic success.
- Gibson, S., & Oberg, D. (2004). Revisiting information literacy in a multimedia environment: An issue of skills, strategies, or attitudes? *School Library Media Research*, 7.
- Goldhaber, D. (2002). The mystery of good teaching: Surveying the evidence on student achievement and teachers' characteristics. *Education Next*, 2(1), 50-55.
- Gorard, S., & Smith, E. (2005). An international comparison of gender and education. *Gender and Education*, 17(3), 247-259.
- Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Master, B. (2014). Effective instructional time use for school leaders: Longitudinal evidence from observations of principals. *Educational Researcher*, 43(8), 433-444.
- Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(7), 495-500.
- Hagger, H., & McIntyre, D. (2000). What Can Research Tell us about Teacher Education?

- Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417-458.
- Hattie, J., (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses related to achievement. New York, NY: Routledge
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hirsh, S., & Kummerow, E. (2018). The learning curve: How professional development improves educators' instructional effectiveness. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 11(1), 7-40.
- Hollins, E.R. (2011). Teacher Preparation for Quality Teaching. Importance of Preparation and Planning for Teachers.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Merrill, E. (2017). Seven trends: The transformation of the teaching force. *CPRE Research Reports*.
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a "sense of success": New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617.
- Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (2020). Student achievement through staff development. Routledge.
- Kagan, S. (1994) Cooperative learning. San Juan Capistrano, CA: *Kagan Cooperative Learning*
- Kang, M., Anderson, R. S., Park, J., & Kim, H. (2020). Gender composition in schools and students' educational outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 29, 100321.
- Khalil, M. K. & Ilkhider, I. A. (2016). Applying learning theories and instructional design models for effective instruction.
- Keddie, A., Churchill, R., & Hodge, S. (2019). 'Men aren't real teachers': Exploring the potential for male teachers in the early years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 102-111.
- Klein, S. (2018). Gender imbalance in education. UNESCO. Retrieved from <https://gemreportunesco.wordpress.com/2018/03/07/gender-imbalance-in-education/>
- Klette, K., Myklebust, J. O., & Bjørnstad, E. (2008). Relations between teacher characteristics, teaching style, and pupils' work in mathematics. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 52(6), 605-626.
- Kosgei, A., Mise, J.K., Odera, O., & Ayugi, M. E. (2013). Influence of Teacher Characteristics on Students' Academic Achievement among Secondary Schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(3), 76-82.
- Lagura & Alegre (2020). Educational Preparation and Quality of Trainings Attended towards Teachers' Capability in Research-Based Instructional Materials Development
- Lamb, A. (2018). The role of age in education. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education.
- Santrock, J. W. (2021). *Educational psychology*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- La Paro, K.M. & Pianta, R.C. (2000). Predicting children's competence in early school years: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(4), 443-484. doi: 10.3102/00346543070004443
- Lee, Y., & Yuen, A. H. (2010). Factors affecting teachers' adoption of technology: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 42(1), 67-96.
- Lichoro, D. M. (2015). Faculty readiness for transition to teaching online courses in the Iowa Community College Online Consortium (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Iowa.
- Liem, A. D. (2020). How educational background influences stakeholder collaboration in education policy making. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(3), 274-288.
- Liem, A. D., & Scott, D. (2019). Stakeholder capacity building in education: A systematic review of the evidence. *Educational Policy*, 33(5), 697-733.
- Lillard, A. S., Lerner, M. D., Hopkins, E. J., Dore, R. A., Smith, E. D., & Palmquist, C. M. (2020). The impact of pretend play on children's development: A review of the evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(2), 139-174.
- Manila Bulletin, (2021) Safe pilot implementation of limited face-to-face classes assured by DepEd, DOH
- McConachie, L. (2018). School readiness and kindergarten transitions: Children with visual impairment and blindness. In A. J. Mashburn, J. LoCasale-Crouch, & K. C. Pears (Eds.), *Kindergarten Transitions and Readiness: Promoting Cognitive, Social-emotional, and Self-regulatory Development* (pp. 205-224). Springer.
- Mahdi, H. & Al-Dera, A. (2013). The Impact of Teachers' Age, Gender and Experience on the Use of Information and Communication Technology in EFL Teaching
- Mapp & Handerson (2002). Parents' involvement in inclusive education: An empirical test for the psycho-educational development of learners with special educational needs (SENs).
- Meisels, S. (1995). Out of the Readiness Maze
- Murtaza, R. (2016). Gender and teaching: An exploration of Pakistani teachers' perceptions and experiences. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 75-83.
- Natividad, J. (2021). Preparedness of Elementary School Teachers in The Implementation of Blended Distance Learning: Basis for Technical Assistance.
- OECD. (2017). Education Policy Outlook 2017: Putting Student Learning at the Centre. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2019). TALIS 2018 Results (Volume II): Teachers and School Leaders as Valued Professionals. OECD Publishing.
- Oshima T. & Domaleski C., (2006). Academic Performance Gap Between Summer-Birthday and Fall-Birthday Children in Grades K-8
- Otero, V., Finkelstein, N., McCray, R., & Pollock, S. (2006). Who is responsible for preparing science teachers? *Science*, 313(5786), 445-446.
- Owoko, I.S. (2009). The Role of Advocacy in Enhancing Equalization of Opportunities for Disabled People (unpublished paper) presented in Leonard Cheshire Disability workshop in Kisumu.
- Panighari, M. (2013). Perception of Secondary School Stakeholders Towards Women Representation in Educational Leadership in Harari Region of Ethiopia.
- Petrie, K., & McGee, C. (2012). Teacher Professional Development: Who is the learner?. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(2).
- Puri M. (2004) Handbook of Inclusive Education for Educators, Administrators and Planners: Within Walls, Without Boundaries
- Pizmony-Levy, O., Pallas, A., & Baek, C. (2018). Americans' Views of Stakeholders in Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Polly, D., Mims, C., Shepherd, C. E., & Inan, F. A. (2014). Evidence of impact: Transforming teacher education with

- preparing tomorrow's teachers to teach with technology (PT3) grants. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 39, 35-45.
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The Death and Life of the Great American School System*. New York: Basic Books
- Richardson, J. T., & Woodley, A. (2003). Another look at the role of age, gender and subject as predictors of academic attainment in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(4), 475-493
- Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. NBER Working Paper No. 6691.
- Salcedo, C. (2010). Comparative Analysis of Learning Outcomes in Face-to-Face Foreign Language Classes vs. Language Lab and Online. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*
- Sass, T. R., Hannaway, J., Xu, Z., Figlio, D. N., & Feng, L. (2016). Value-added models for teacher effectiveness: An exploration of stability across models and contexts. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 41(2), 136-170.
- Satrianta, H., Darmawansyah, & Kahar, L. (2022). Student's Readiness to Carry Out Face-to-Face Learning at Kendari Vocational High School. *Pedagogia: Journal Pendidikan*, 11 (1), 71-13.
- Saxena, S. (2014). How to Involve Various Educational Stakeholders in Education Improvement?
- Sigue-Bisnar, M. (2022). Beyond the return to face-to-face classes.
- Taye, B.T. (2021) Readiness and Intention for Adapting New Normal COVID-19 Prevention Campaign for Sustainable Response Among Debre Berhan University Student's During Campus Re-Entry: A Cross-Sectional Study
- Talosig, M. (2022). The Manila Times, Campus Press
- UNESCO. (2019). Gender equality in education. Retrieved from <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/gender-equality-education-2019-en.pdf>
- United Nations Children's Fund Unicef, (2012), *The State of the World's Children 2012: Children in an Urban World, Working Papers, eSocialSciences*
- UNESCO. (2019). Gender-sensitive pedagogy for teachers. UNESCO Bangkok.
- UNESCO. (2019). Global Education Monitoring Report 2019: Migration, displacement, and education: Building bridges, not walls. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2017). ICT competency framework for teachers.
- Ventayen, et al. (2019). Teachers' readiness in online teaching environment: a case of department of education teachers
- Wane, S., Hagen-Zanker, J., & Spadafora, N. (2020). Gender-responsive teachers for gender-responsive schools: A guide for teacher educators and school leaders. UNESCO.
- Widodo S., Prahmana R., Purnami A., & Turmudi (2017). Teaching materials of algebraic equation. *IOPConf. Series: Journal of Physics. Conf. Series* 943,pp.1-8.
- Xu, D. & Jaggars, S. (2016). Comparative Analysis of Student Performance in an Online vs. Face-to-Face Environmental Science Course From 2009 to 2016
- Yoon, K. S. (2017). The role of professional development in improving teaching and learning. In *The Wiley Handbook of Teaching and Learning* (pp. 102-124). Wiley.
- Yu, Z. (2021). The effects of gender, educational level, and personality on online learning outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic.
