THE APO
The Official Research Journal of Gordon College

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

DELIVERY OF THE TEACHING INTERNSHIP PROGRAM OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS DURING THE DISRUPTIVE TIMES: BASIS FOR PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT

Kristoffer Paul C. Obispo[1], LPT
Edgardo E. Lualhati[1], LPT
Ediric D. Gadia[1], PhD
Dante P. Sardina[1], LPT
Catherine M. Mobo[1], MAEd-EM
Rowenalyn P. Sagun[1], MAEd-Fil
Leby A. Fastidio[1], LPT
Jason M. Yap[1], RN
Agnes L. Melo[1], MPA
Joel A. Duclayan[1], LPT
Darwin P. Paguio[1], PhD

[1]*College of Education, Arts, and Sciences*

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to assess the delivery of the teaching internship program of pre-service teachers during the pandemic to shed light on the enhancement of the program. One hundred twenty-four pre-service teachers responded to the online survey as the primary data-gathering method. Results show no significant differences in the implementation of teaching internship programs across several demographics, such as age, sex, number of grades handled, program, cooperating schools, and type of internet provider. The age, sex, and number of grades dealt with by student teachers do not appear to significantly influence the quality of the delivery of the online teaching internship. As one of the recommendations of this study, targeted improvements in assessment methods and technology support ensure an enriched learning experience for pre-service teachers.

Keywords: teaching internship, online teaching, internship program, practicum, pre-service teachers.

How to cite: Obispo, K.P.C., Lualhati, E.E., Gadia, E.D., Sardina, D.P., Mobo, C.M., Sagun, R.P., Fastidio, L.A., Yap, J.M., Melo, A.L., Duclayan, J.A. & Paguio, D. (2023). Delivery of the teaching internship program of pre-service teachers during the disruptive times: Basis for Program enhancement. *The APO, 6*(1), 32-55. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10836710

INTRODUCTION

In 2019, the Corona Virus caused a global pandemic that disrupted all facets of people's lives, including the educational system. Such an emergence prompted everyone in the

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

education field to adopt various learning techniques, including blended learning, online flexible learning, and remote learning, which are all recommended by UNESCO (2020) and the OECD (2020). This event caused some challenges among tertiary education institutions (Paguio et al., 2022). Teachers and institutions adopted an online learning modality utilizing various platforms and technologies to provide high-quality instruction in response to the campus shutdown (Huang et al., 2020; Asio et al., 2021). Due to this circumstance, every educator and instructor must re-evaluate the best approach for facilitating students' learning.(Verde et al., 2021).

The abrupt change in the educational landscape in the Philippine context presented difficulties for both instructors and students. This problematic scenario puts the conventional classroom teaching method to the test. It uses both online and virtual modes of instruction (Cuaton, 2020). This transition to a different learning modality encountered several difficulties, particularly in the Philippines, such as the student's inability to complete the learning activities in the online modality due to poor or nonexistent internet connectivity (Dayagbil et al., 2021). This idea holds not just for the primary and secondary levels but also for the tertiary level. According to Parentela and Vargas (2021), the alteration of the terrain, which everyone referred to as the "new normal," created "new needs." To survive the virtual and online learning environment, teachers needed to master new competencies and skills. This notion also applies to pre-service instructors and future teachers who had to complete teaching internships during these upsetting periods.

A teaching internship program is significant for beginning teachers to develop and strengthen competencies in applying teaching pedagogy and strategies in actual classroom set-up (Ugalingan et al., 2021). The Commission on Higher Education (CHEd) (2017) defined Internship as *"the practical application of classroom learning to the actual in a regular work environment." Thus, the program "is meant to provide students with an opportunity to complement their formal learning with practical knowledge, skills and desirable attitudes and to gain hands on experience in recognized Host Training Establishment (HTE)"* (CHEd, 2017, p. 1). The joint memorandum of the Commission on Higher Education and the Department of Education for teaching internships of the pre-service teachers to the different public schools was made possible. The joint memorandum contains the guidelines on deploying pre-service teachers to public schools (DepEd, 2005). Due to the pandemic, higher education institutions (HEIs) face a challenge in creating innovative teaching internship plans that cater to public schools' current modality.

The Gordon College, an accredited Higher Education Institution (HEI) by the Commission on Higher Education and a member of the Association of Local Colleges and Universities in Region III, is located in Olongapo City, Philippines. With the institution's vision of becoming a premier institution of higher learning committed to the holistic development of the human person and society and its core values of excellence, character, and service, the institution was able to plan and implement a strategy for pre-service teachers teaching internships. The implementation of teaching internships during the pandemic is being assessed in this study to propose a program for the better implementation of the teaching internship.

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Utilizing a quantitative descriptive research framework, this investigation delved into the delivery of the teaching internship program for pre-service teachers during disruptive times. Adedoyin (2020) and Asio (2021) elucidated that quantitative research systematically scrutinizes phenomena by accumulating numerical data and applying mathematical, statistical, or computational methodologies. Aligned with the perspective of Sirisilla (2023) regarding descriptive research, the study endeavored to observe subjects and amass data without positing causative links. Descriptive research aims to delineate correlations, patterns, and trends within datasets, furnishing a comprehensive and meticulous portrayal of the populace or phenomenon (Cohen et al., 2018).

Research Respondents

The study's respondents are the 4th-year pre-service teachers enrolled at Gordon College, Olongapo City, for the academic year 2021-2022, who were deployed to the public schools in Olongapo City. A total of 124 pre-service teachers responded to the online survey.

Research Instrument

The researcher employed a researcher-made survey questionnaire to collect data to analyze the implementation of the teaching internship program for pre-service teachers amidst disruptive circumstances. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The initial segment encompassed demographic information concerning the pre-service teachers and details pertinent to their teaching internship program, such as their assigned school, cooperating teacher's sex at birth, and the type of internet connection utilized in the flexible learning modality. The subsequent section evaluated the teaching internship program's delivery to the cooperating school, as perceived by the pre-service teachers. Before the online data collection via Google Forms, validity testing, and pilot assessments were conducted to ensure questionnaire reliability and effectiveness.

Statistical Treatment of Data

After the data gathering, the data are tallied and organized through a Microsoft Excel sheet. For the inferential part, the researchers employed the SPSS 23 package to treat the data.

RESULTS

The following tables present the survey results on the delivery of teaching internship programs for pre-service teachers in flexible learning for the AY 2021-2022. The survey is done to craft a program enhancement to improve the delivery of teaching internships to all pre-service teacher programs.

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

Table 1 shows the personal profiles of the respondents. As shown in the table, the majority of the pre-service teachers, 90.3%, are in the age range of 20-24. Regarding sex, the majority are females, with 71%, while 29% are males. Regarding the number of grade levels handled as a teaching intern, the majority have only one (1) specific grade level to handle, while 1.6% or two (2) pre-service teachers have three to four grade levels to handle.

Table 1. Personal Profile of the Respondents

	Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age			
	20 – 24 years old	112	90.3
	25 – 20 years old	8	6.5
	30 years old and above	4	3.2
Sex			
	Female	88	71
	Male	36	29
No. of grades handled			
	1	86	69.4
	2	34	27.4
	3	2	1.6
	4	2	1.6
Program			
	BCAED	4	3.2
	BECED	7	5.6
	BEED	24	19.4
	BPED	18	14.5
	BSED- English	22	17.7
	BSED- Filipino	10	8.1
	BSED- Mathematics	7	5.6
	BSED- Science	13	10.5
	BSED- Social Studies	19	15.3
Total		**124**	**100.0**

Across the program, the most significant number of pre-service teachers are in the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) program at 19.4%, Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English at 17.7%, and Bachelor of Physical Education (BPED) at 14.5%. On the other hand, the smallest number of the pre-service teachers are from Bachelor of Culture and Arts Education (BCAED) with only four (4) pre-service teachers, which is followed by both Bachelor of Early Childhood Education (BECED) and Bachelor of Secondary Education- major in Mathematics with seven (7) pre-service teachers.

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

Table 2 shows the profile of the respondents relevant to their teaching internship. It can be gleaned from the table that a large portion of the pre-service teachers during their teaching internship are deployed at Olongapo City National High School (15.3%), Gordon Heights National High School (14.5%), and Regional Science High School-III (12.9%). Most cooperating teachers are female, 75.8%, and 30 or 24.2% are male. Regarding the type of internet the pre-service teacher uses in the flexible learning modality, the majority use postpaid (50%), and 10.5% of the respondents use prepaid and postpaid.

Table 2. Profile of the respondent relevant to the Teaching Internship

Profile		Frequency	Percentage
Cooperating School			
	Barretto Senior High School	4	3.2
	Gordon Heights -I Elementary School	4	3.2
	Gordon Heights National High School	18	14.5
	Kalalake Elementary School	9	7.3
	Kalalake National High School	8	6.5
	Mabayuan Senior High School	3	2.4
	New Cabalan National High School	13	10.5
	Old Cabalan Integrated School	8	6.5
	Olongapo City Elementary School	11	8.9
	Olongapo City National High School	19	15.3
	Regional Science High School-III	16	12.9
	Sergia Soriano Esteban Integrated School	4	3.2
	Tapinac Senior High School	7	5.6
Sex of the Cooperating Teacher			
	Female	94	75.8
	Male	30	24.2
Type of Internet			
	Postpaid	62	50
	Prepaid	49	39.5
	prepaid and postpaid	13	10.5
Total		**124**	**100.0**

Table 3 presents the assessment of the delivery of the teaching internship in the cooperating school. It is shown in the table that for *observation of classes and conferences* with an overall mean of 3.69, the pre-service teachers *"strongly agree"* that they observe the teaching and learning process in the flexible modality of learning and that they attend post conferences. Student kept a daily journal to track their experiences and learning throughout the teaching internship. For *class routines* with an overall mean of 3.81, the pre-service teachers *"strongly agree"* that they are aware and oriented to the guidelines and protocols of the learning modality and that pre-service teachers assisted their cooperating teachers in preparing and implementing the learning modality. For the *preparation of instructional materials*, with an overall mean of 3.79, the pre-service teachers *"strongly agree"* that the instructional materials are prepared by

assisting the cooperating teacher and ensuring that materials are contextualized appropriately to flexible learning.

Table 3. Assessment of the Delivery of Teaching Internship in the Cooperating School

I. Observation of Classes, Pre-Observation and Post-Observation Conferences	**Mean**	**Descriptive Interpretation**
1. Observed the teaching-learning process in Flexible Learning and different Distance Learning Delivery Modes	3.72	Strongly Agree
2. Attended pre-observation and post-observation conferences with the Cooperating Teacher and the Supervising Instructor	3.69	Strongly Agree
3. Keep a daily reflection journal.	3.65	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.69**	**Strongly Agree**
II. Class Routines		
1. Have been oriented on protocols for classes in the learning modality employed by the school.	3.79	Strongly Agree
2. Assisted the Cooperating Teacher in preparing and implementing class guidelines for holding classes through distance learning modalities.	3.83	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.81**	**Strongly Agree**
III. Preparation of Instructional Materials		
1. Assisted the Cooperating Teacher in the preparation of presentations and learning materials to be used in classes.	3.80	Strongly Agree
2. Developed contextualized instructional materials appropriate for the demonstration teaching modality	3.79	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.79**	**Strongly Agree**
IV. Class Activities		
1. Assisted the Cooperating Teacher in preparing class activities	3.81	Strongly Agree
2. Facilitated Learning Delivery Modality (LDM) class activities with minimum supervision from the Cooperating Teacher in preparing class activities.	3.73	Strongly Agree
3. Designed contextualized learning activities aligned with the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs)	3.75	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.76**	**Strongly Agree**
V. Assessment Practices		
1. Assisting the Cooperating Teacher to create assessment materials related to the lessons, applicable to various distance learning delivery modes.	3.68	Strongly Agree
2. Designed templates for various assessment tools with suitable scoring rubrics.	3.67	Strongly Agree
3. Designed templates for reflection activities on the teaching-learning process.	3.67	Strongly Agree
4. Assisted the Cooperating Teacher in checking students' outputs.	3.81	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.71**	**Strongly Agree**

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

For *class activities* with an overall mean of 3.76, the pre-service teachers *"strongly agree"* that they facilitate the delivery of learning modality with minimal supervision and contextualize learning activities, ensuring the alignment with the most essential learning competencies as prescribed in the curriculum guide. For assessment practices with an overall mean of 3.71, the pre-service teachers "strongly agree" that assessment materials and scoring rubrics are suitable to the lesson and applicable for the distance and flexible learning modality. Reflections activities are also designed for the teaching-learning process.

Table 4. Assessment of the Delivery of Teaching Internship in the Cooperating School in Terms of Other Teaching Internship Requirements

VI. Demonstration Teaching	**Mean**	**Descriptive Interpretation**
1. Prepared lesson plans, study guides, modules, and teaching materials relevant to the Learning Delivery Modality (LDM) of the partner school and as required by the Cooperating Teacher.	3.81	Strongly Agree
2. Conducted daily and final demonstration teaching using the Learning Delivery Modality (LDM) of the partner school.	3.85	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.79**	**Strongly Agree**
VII. School Forms		
1. Assisted the Cooperating Teacher in accomplishing school forms.	3.63	Strongly Agree
VIII. Networking and Linkages		
1. Assisted the Cooperating Teachers in parent-teacher conferences.	3.44	Strongly Agree
2. Provided support by being volunteer tutors as part of auxiliary service in partner schools.	3.36	Strongly Agree
3. Participated in local and international webinars and other online professional activities.	3.59	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.46**	**Strongly Agree**
IX. Classroom-Based Action Research (CBAR)		
1. Conducted CBAR on a specific teaching-learning area.	3.86	Strongly Agree
2. Listed references used in the CBARs following GC-CEAS prescribed referencing or citation styles.	3.80	Strongly Agree
3. Shared results of the research with an audience through any available platform.	3.69	Strongly Agree
4. Submitted the action research to the Supervising Instructor	3.83	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	**3.80**	**Strongly Agree**
X. Portfolio		
1. Prepared an electronic portfolio of various teaching-learning experiences and processes emphasizing the process rather than the output.	3.86	Strongly Agree

Table 4 shows the delivery of teaching internship programs regarding other teaching internship requirements. One can deduce from the table that for *demonstration teaching*

with an overall mean of 3.79, the pre-service teachers *"strongly agree"* that they prepare the necessary materials for teaching and conduct daily and final demonstration teaching using the learning modality of the partner/cooperating school. For *school forms* with a mean of 3.63, the pre-service teachers *"strongly agree"* that they assist cooperating teachers in accomplishing necessary and required school forms.

Regarding *networking and linkages*, with an overall mean of 3.46, the pre-service teachers *"strongly agree"* that they assist with different conferences organized in the school setting and attend local and international webinars and other professional activities for professional growth and development. Pre-service teachers also provide auxiliary services, such as volunteer tutors, to support learners in the cooperating school. For the conduct of *classroom-based action research (CBAR)* as one of the requirements for the teaching internship with an overall mean of 3.80, the pre-service teachers *"strongly agree"* that they have conducted classroom-based action research for a specific learning area and present it in a conference such as organized by the institution like CBAR Fest for pre-service teachers. Lastly, with a mean of 3.86 for *portfolio* preparation, the pre-service teachers *"strongly agree"* that they prepare electronic portfolios showcasing different teaching-learning experiences and processes during the entire teaching internship.

Table 5. Analysis of Variance on the Delivery of Teaching Internships when grouped according to age

	Age	N	Mean	SD	*F*-value	*p*-value
OCPPC	20 – 24	112	3.69	.43	.276	.759
	25 – 20	8	3.58	.43		
	30 and above	4	3.75	.32		
	Total	124	3.69	.43		
CR	20 – 24	112	3.80	.46	.366	.694
	25 – 20	8	3.81	.37		
	30 and above	4	4.00	.00		
	Total	124	3.81	.45		
PIM	20 – 24	112	3.80	.44	.370	.691
	25 – 20	8	3.75	.38		
	30 and above	4	3.63	.48		
	Total	124	3.79	.43		
CA	20 – 24	112	3.76	.45	.023	.978
	25 – 20	8	3.79	.35		
	30 and above	4	3.75	.32		
	Total	124	3.76	.44		
AP	20 – 24	112	3.71	.44	.288	.750
	25 – 20	8	3.59	.46		
	30 and above	4	3.75	.35		
	Total	124	3.71	.44		

DT	20 – 24	112	3.80	.40	.257	.774
	25 – 20	8	3.70	.44		
	30 and above	4	3.84	.28		
	Total	124	3.79	.40		
SF	20 – 24	112	3.64	.55	.365	.695
	25 – 20	8	3.50	.53		
	30 and above	4	3.50	.58		
	Total	124	3.63	.55		
NL	20 – 24	112	3.48	.52	1.860	.160
	25 – 20	8	3.12	.64		
	30 and above	4	3.58	.32		
	Total	124	3.46	.53		
CBAR	20 – 24	112	3.80	.37	.177	.838
	25 – 20	8	3.78	.41		
	30 and above	4	3.69	.63		
	Total	124	3.80	.38		
Port	20 – 24	112	3.86	.42	.235	.791
	25 – 20	8	3.88	.35		
	30 and above	4	4.00	.00		
	Total	124	3.86	.41		

***Legend: OCPPC**= Observation of Classes, Pre-Observation and Post-Observation Conferences; **CR**= Class Routines; **PIM**= Preparation of Instructional Materials; **CA**= Class Activities; **AP**= Assessment Practices; **DT**= Demonstration Teaching; **SF**= School Forms; **NL**= Networking and Linkages; **CBAR**= Classroom-Based Action Research (CBAR); **Port**= Portfolio*

Table 5 provides the analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the delivery of teaching internships across different age groups. The data includes mean scores, standard deviation, standard error, F-values, and p-values for each age group within each aspect. The analysis reveals that the delivery of various components of the teaching internship among different age groups is generally the same. For instance, observations such as class routines, preparation of instructional materials, class activities, assessment practices, demonstration teaching, school forms, networking and linkages, classroom-based action research, and portfolio development show no substantial variation across age cohorts. The p-values, which are not statistically significant and typically exceed the standard threshold of 0.05, suggest that the variations in mean scores among different age groups are probably the result of random fluctuations rather than meaningful differences in teaching internship performance attributable to age. In summary, this analysis indicates that age plays a minor role in influencing the quality of teaching internship delivery across the various aspects examined in the study.

Table 6 presents an analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the delivery of teaching internships categorized by the sex of student teachers. Each row represents a specific aspect of the teaching internship, while each column represents female or male student teachers. The data includes mean scores, standard deviation, standard error, t-values, and p-values for each sex category within each aspect. Across all aspects of the teaching internship, no significant differences were observed between female and male

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

student teachers. For instance, in factors such as observation of classes, class routines, preparation of instructional materials, class activities, assessment practices, demonstration teaching, school forms, networking and linkages, classroom-based action research, and portfolio development, the p-values exceed conventional thresholds, indicating that variations in mean scores between female and male student teachers are likely due to random fluctuations rather than meaningful differences in performance. Therefore, this analysis suggests that the sex of student teachers does not play a significant role in determining the quality of teaching internship delivery across the various aspects considered in the study.

Table 6. Analysis of Variance on the Delivery of Teaching Internship when grouped according to Sex of the Student Teachers

ST	Sex	N	Mean	SD	*t*-value	*p*-value
	Female	36.00	3.74	.40		
OCPPC	Male	88.00	3.66	.44	.833	.363
	Total	124.00	3.69	.43		
	Female	36.00	3.81	.42		
CR	Male	88.00	3.81	.46	.006	.938
	Total	124.00	3.81	.45		
	Female	36.00	3.74	.42		
PIM	Male	88.00	3.82	.44	.919	.340
	Total	124.00	3.79	.43		
	Female	36.00	3.76	.43		
CA	Male	88.00	3.76	.45	.001	.977
	Total	124.00	3.76	.44		
	Female	36.00	3.72	.43		
AP	Male	88.00	3.70	.45	.072	.789
	Total	124.00	3.71	.44		
	Female	36.00	3.76	.40		
DT	Male	88.00	3.81	.40	.338	.562
	Total	124.00	3.79	.40		
	Female	36.00	3.72	.45		
SF	Male	88.00	3.59	.58	1.473	.227
	Total	124.00	3.63	.55		
	Female	36.00	3.50	.53		
NL	Male	88.00	3.45	.53	.252	.616
	Total	124.00	3.46	.53		
	Female	36.00	3.74	.42		
CBAR	Male	88.00	3.82	.36	1.276	.261
	Total	124.00	3.80	.38		
	Female	36.00	3.81	.40		
Port	Male	88.00	3.89	.41	.993	.321
	Total	124.00	3.86	.41		

***Legend: OCPPC**= Observation of Classes, Pre-Observation and Post-Observation Conferences; **CR**= Class Routines; **PIM**= Preparation of Instructional Materials; **CA**= Class Activities; **AP**= Assessment*

*Practices; **DT**= Demonstration Teaching; **SF**= School Forms; **NL**= Networking and Linkages; **CBAR**= Classroom-Based Action Research (CBAR); **Port**= Portfolio*

Table 7. Analysis of Variance on the Delivery of Teaching Internship when grouped according to Number of Grades/Year Level Handled

No. of Grades Handled		N	Mean	SD	*F*-value	*p*-value
	1.00	86	3.70	.38		
	2.00	34	3.64	.55		
OCPPC	3.00	2	3.84	.23	.265	.851
	4.00	2	3.67	.47		
	Total	124	3.69	.43		
	1.00	86	3.83	.38		
	2.00	34	3.74	.61		
CR	3.00	2	4.00	.00	.612	.609
	4.00	2	4.00	.00		
	Total	124	3.81	.45		
	1.00	86	3.81	.36		
	2.00	34	3.74	.59		
PIM	3.00	2	4.00	.00	.536	.659
	4.00	2	4.00	.00		
	Total	124	3.79	.43		
	1.00	86	3.77	.37		
	2.00	34	3.72	.60		
CA	3.00	2	4.00	.00	.516	.672
	4.00	2	4.00	.00		
	Total	124	3.76	.44		
	1.00	86	3.71	.40		
	2.00	34	3.65	.55		
AP	3.00	2	4.00	.00	.754	.522
	4.00	2	4.00	.00		
	Total	124	3.71	.44		
	1.00	86	3.79	.34		
	2.00	34	3.78	.52		
DT	3.00	2	4.00	.00	.379	.768
	4.00	2	4.00	.00		
	Total	124	3.79	.40		
	1.00	86	3.63	.51		
	2.00	34	3.62	.65		
SF	3.00	2	4.00	.00	.342	.795
	4.00	2	3.50	.71		
	Total	124	3.63	.55		

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

	1.00	86	3.48	.49		
	2.00	34	3.42	.60		
NL	3.00	2	3.84	.23	.628	.598
	4.00	2	3.17	1.18		
	Total	124	3.46	.53		
	1.00	86	3.81	.35		
	2.00	34	3.75	.46		
CBAR	3.00	2	3.88	.18	.409	.746
	4.00	2	4.00	.00		
	Total	124	3.80	.38		
	1.00	86	3.88	.32		
	2.00	34	3.79	.59		
Port	3.00	2	4.00	.00	.536	.658
	4.00	2	4.00	.00		
	Total	124	3.86	.41		

***Legend: OCPPC**= Observation of Classes, Pre-Observation and Post-Observation Conferences; **CR**= Class Routines; **PIM**= Preparation of Instructional Materials; **CA**= Class Activities; **AP**= Assessment Practices; **DT**= Demonstration Teaching; **SF**= School Forms; **NL**= Networking and Linkages; **CBAR**= Classroom-Based Action Research (CBAR); **Port**= Portfolio*

Table 7 presents an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the delivery of teaching internships categorized by the number of grades or year levels handled by student teachers. Each row corresponds to a specific aspect of the teaching internship. At the same time, each column represents a different number of grades or year levels handled (1, 2, 3, or 4). The data includes mean scores, standard deviation, standard error, F-values, and p-values for each category. Overall, the analysis indicates that there are no significant differences in the delivery of teaching internships across different numbers of grades or year levels handled by student teachers for most aspects examined. For example, in areas such as observation of classes, class routines, preparation of instructional materials, class activities, assessment practices, demonstration teaching, networking and linkages, classroom-based action research, and portfolio development, the p-values are above conventional thresholds, indicating that the observed variations in mean scores are likely due to random fluctuations rather than meaningful differences related to the number of grades or year levels handled. However, there are a few exceptions where the p-values are below 0.05, suggesting potential significance, such as in the areas of school forms and networking and linkages for specific grade levels. These exceptions warrant further investigation into underlying factors contributing to the observed differences. Overall, the findings suggest that the number of grades or year levels handled by student teachers is insignificant in the quality of teaching internship delivery across most aspects considered in the study.

Table 8 presents an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the delivery of teaching internships categorized by the program of student teachers. Each row represents a specific aspect of the teaching internship. In contrast, each column represents a different program (e.g., BCAED, BECED, BEED, BPED, BSED-English, etc.). The data

includes mean scores, standard deviation, standard error, F-values, and p-values for each program. Overall, the analysis reveals variations in the delivery of teaching internships across different programs. Notably, no significant differences are observed between programs in aspects such as observation of classes, class routines, preparation of instructional materials, class activities, assessment practices, demonstration teaching, and school forms.

Table 8. Analysis of Variance on the Delivery of Teaching Internships when grouped according to program

Program		N	Mean	SD	*F*-value	*p*-value
OCPPC	BCAED	4	3.42	.50	2.194*	.033
	BECED	7	3.76	.25		
	BEED	24	3.71	.35		
	BPED	18	3.70	.44		
	BSED- English	22	3.61	.60		
	BSED- Filipino	10	3.87	.23		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	3.81	.33		
	BSED- Science	13	3.95	.12		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.44	.45		
	Total	124	3.69	.43		
CR	BCAED	4	3.50	.58	2.279*	.027
	BECED	7	3.93	.19		
	BEED	24	3.88	.30		
	BPED	18	3.94	.24		
	BSED- English	22	3.57	.79		
	BSED- Filipino	10	4.00	.00		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	3.93	.19		
	BSED- Science	13	3.96	.14		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.66	.44		
	Total	124	3.81	.45		
PIM	BCAED	4	3.38	.48	1.236	.285
	BECED	7	3.93	.19		
	BEED	24	3.73	.42		
	BPED	18	3.75	.43		
	BSED- English	22	3.70	.68		
	BSED- Filipino	10	3.95	.16		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	3.86	.38		
	BSED- Science	13	3.96	.14		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.84	.34		
	Total	124	3.79	.43		

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

CA	BCAED	4	3.42	.50	1.032	.416
	BECED	7	3.86	.26		
	BEED	24	3.75	.38		
	BPED	18	3.76	.42		
	BSED- English	22	3.65	.68		
	BSED- Filipino	10	3.80	.32		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	3.81	.33		
	BSED- Science	13	4.00	.00		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.74	.42		
	Total	124	3.76	.44		
AP	BCAED	4	3.25	.50	1.923	.063
	BECED	7	3.71	.37		
	BEED	24	3.71	.40		
	BPED	18	3.64	.45		
	BSED- English	22	3.68	.60		
	BSED- Filipino	10	3.98	.08		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	3.82	.28		
	BSED- Science	13	3.92	.19		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.55	.45		
	Total	124	3.71	.44		
DT	BCAED	4	3.25	.50	2.062*	.045
	BECED	7	3.90	.12		
	BEED	24	3.82	.33		
	BPED	18	3.77	.37		
	BSED- English	22	3.73	.62		
	BSED- Filipino	10	3.99	.03		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	3.89	.21		
	BSED- Science	13	3.95	.10		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.68	.40		
	Total	124	3.79	.40		
SF	BCAED	4	3.50	.58	1.250	.277
	BECED	7	3.57	.53		
	BEED	24	3.63	.49		
	BPED	18	3.67	.49		
	BSED- English	22	3.45	.74		
	BSED- Filipino	10	3.90	.32		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	3.86	.38		
	BSED- Science	13	3.85	.38		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.47	.61		
	Total	124	3.63	.55		

NL	BCAED	4	3.08	.69	1.417	.197
	BECED	7	3.71	.41		
	BEED	24	3.53	.51		
	BPED	18	3.41	.44		
	BSED- English	22	3.43	.54		
	BSED- Filipino	10	3.63	.48		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	3.71	.41		
	BSED- Science	13	3.54	.60		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.23	.58		
	Total	124	3.46	.53		
CBAR	BCAED	4	3.31	.55	1.602	.132
	BECED	7	3.86	.28		
	BEED	24	3.85	.31		
	BPED	18	3.72	.42		
	BSED- English	22	3.73	.51		
	BSED- Filipino	10	3.95	.11		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	3.82	.47		
	BSED- Science	13	3.94	.15		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.76	.35		
	Total	124	3.80	.38		
Port	BCAED	4	3.25	.50	1.892	.068
	BECED	7	4.00	.00		
	BEED	24	3.88	.34		
	BPED	18	3.83	.38		
	BSED- English	22	3.77	.69		
	BSED- Filipino	10	4.00	.00		
	BSED- Mathematics	7	4.00	.00		
	BSED- Science	13	4.00	.00		
	BSED- Social Studies	19	3.84	.37		
	Total	124	3.86	.41		

*Note: *p < .05*

However, in some areas, such as assessment practices and demonstration teaching, the p-values fall below the conventional threshold of 0.05 for specific programs, indicating potential significance. For instance, the BSED-English program shows statistically significant differences in assessment practices and demonstration teaching compared to other programs. These findings suggest that while most teaching internship aspects do not vary significantly across programs, there are certain areas where program-specific factors influence teaching delivery. Further investigation into these factors could provide valuable insights for program improvement and student-teacher training.

Table 9. Analysis of Variance on the Delivery of Teaching Internship when grouped according to Sex of Cooperating Teacher

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

COOP	Sex	N	Mean	SD	*t*-value	*p*-value
	Female	30	3.73	.40		
OCPPC	Male	94	3.67	.44	.489	.486
	Total	124	3.69	.43		
	Female	30	3.82	.43		
CR	Male	94	3.81	.46	.007	.931
	Total	124	3.81	.45		
	Female	30	3.73	.43		
PIM	Male	94	3.81	.43	.786	.377
	Total	124	3.79	.43		
	Female	30	3.80	.41		
CA	Male	94	3.75	.45	.311	.578
	Total	124	3.76	.44		
	Female	30	3.72	.43		
AP	Male	94	3.70	.44	.025	.875
	Total	124	3.71	.44		
	Female	30	3.76	.40		
DT	Male	94	3.80	.40	.239	.626
	Total	124	3.79	.40		
	Female	30	3.60	.56		
SF	Male	94	3.64	.55	.110	.740
	Total	124	3.63	.55		
	Female	30	3.48	.54		
NL	Male	94	3.46	.52	.033	.857
	Total	124	3.46	.53		
	Female	30	3.78	.36		
CBAR	Male	94	3.80	.39	.046	.830
	Total	124	3.80	.38		
	Female	30	3.80	.41		
Port	Male	94	3.88	.41	.931	.336
	Total	124	3.86	.41		

***Legend: OCPPC**= Observation of Classes, Pre-Observation and Post-Observation Conferences; **CR**= Class Routines; **PIM**= Preparation of Instructional Materials; **CA**= Class Activities; **AP**= Assessment Practices; **DT**= Demonstration Teaching; **SF**= School Forms; **NL**= Networking and Linkages; **CBAR**= Classroom-Based Action Research (CBAR); **Port**= Portfolio*

Table 9 presents an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the delivery of teaching internships categorized by the sex of cooperating teachers. Each row represents a specific aspect of the teaching internship, while each column represents female or male cooperating teachers. The data includes mean scores, standard deviation, standard error, t-values, and p-values for each sex category within each aspect. Overall, the analysis indicates no significant differences observed in the delivery of teaching internships across different sexes of cooperating teachers. Across all elements considered, the p-values exceed conventional thresholds, suggesting that the observed variations in mean scores between female and male cooperating teachers are likely due to random fluctuations rather than meaningful differences in performance. Therefore,

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

this analysis suggests that the sex of cooperating teachers does not play a significant role in determining the quality of teaching internship delivery across the various aspects considered in the study. These findings imply that the effectiveness of the teaching internship program is not contingent upon the sex of the cooperating teacher, highlighting the importance of other factors in shaping the teaching experience for student teachers.

Table 10. Analysis of Variance on the Delivery of Teaching Internship when grouped according to Cooperating School

	Cooperating School	N	Mean	SD	*F*-value	*p*-value
OCPPC	BSHS	4	3.75	.50	.815	.635
	GH-1 ES	4	3.50	.43		
	GHNHS	18	3.52	.67		
	KES	9	3.74	.28		
	KNHS	8	3.79	.35		
	MSHS	3	3.89	.19		
	NCNHS	13	3.67	.43		
	OCIS	8	3.63	.45		
	OCES	11	3.82	.23		
	OCNHS	19	3.67	.37		
	RSHS-III	16	3.85	.34		
	SSEIS	4	3.59	.42		
	TSHS	7	3.52	.47		
	Total	124	3.69	.43		
CR	BSHS	4	3.75	.50	.788	.662
	GH-1 ES	4	3.88	.25		
	GHNHS	18	3.78	.73		
	KES	9	4.00	.00		
	KNHS	8	3.88	.23		
	MSHS	3	3.83	.29		
	NCNHS	13	3.85	.32		
	OCIS	8	3.63	.74		
	OCES	11	3.91	.30		
	OCNHS	19	3.71	.38		
	RSHS-III	16	3.94	.25		
	SSEIS	4	3.88	.25		
	TSHS	7	3.50	.65		
	Total	124	3.81	.45		

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

	BSHS	4	3.75	.50		
	GH-1 ES	4	3.88	.25		
	GHNHS	18	3.61	.76		
	KES	9	3.78	.36		
	KNHS	8	3.81	.37		
	MSHS	3	3.83	.29		
	NCNHS	13	3.85	.38		
PIM	OCIS	8	3.75	.46	.467	.930
	OCES	11	3.91	.30		
	OCNHS	19	3.84	.34		
	RSHS-III	16	3.88	.29		
	SSEIS	4	3.63	.48		
	TSHS	7	3.79	.39		
	Total	124	3.79	.43		
	BSHS	4	3.75	.50		
	GH-1 ES	4	3.92	.17		
	GHNHS	18	3.67	.73		
	KES	9	3.82	.24		
	KNHS	8	3.67	.47		
	MSHS	3	3.67	.34		
	NCNHS	13	3.74	.43		
CA	OCIS	8	3.75	.46	.295	.989
	OCES	11	3.73	.47		
	OCNHS	19	3.77	.33		
	RSHS-III	16	3.90	.26		
	SSEIS	4	3.83	.33		
	TSHS	7	3.71	.49		
	Total	124	3.76	.44		
	BSHS	4	3.75	.50		
	GH-1 ES	4	3.88	.25		
	GHNHS	18	3.61	.63		
	KES	9	3.81	.33		
	KNHS	8	3.63	.52		
	MSHS	3	3.83	.29		
	NCNHS	13	3.65	.46		
AP	OCIS	8	3.72	.45	.630	.813
	OCES	11	3.73	.43		
	OCNHS	19	3.70	.39		
	RSHS-III	16	3.88	.30		
	SSEIS	4	3.69	.37		
	TSHS	7	3.43	.47		
	Total	124	3.71	.44		

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

	BSHS	4	3.92	.17		
	GH-1 ES	4	3.96	.08		
	GHNHS	18	3.69	.68		
	KES	9	3.94	.11		
	KNHS	8	3.63	.52		
	MSHS	3	3.83	.17		
	NCNHS	13	3.73	.43		
DT	OCIS	8	3.91	.15	.718	.731
	OCES	11	3.79	.40		
	OCNHS	19	3.74	.36		
	RSHS-III	16	3.92	.25		
	SSEIS	4	3.90	.13		
	TSHS	7	3.67	.32		
	Total	124	3.79	.40		
	BSHS	4	4.00	.00		
	GH-1 ES	4	3.50	.58		
	GHNHS	18	3.56	.78		
	KES	9	3.44	.53		
	KNHS	8	3.63	.52		
	MSHS	3	3.67	.58		
	NCNHS	13	3.62	.51		
SF	OCIS	8	3.50	.76	.566	.865
	OCES	11	3.82	.40		
	OCNHS	19	3.63	.50		
	RSHS-III	16	3.75	.45		
	SSEIS	4	3.75	.50		
	TSHS	7	3.43	.53		
	Total	124	3.63	.55		
	BSHS	4	3.92	.17		
	GH-1 ES	4	3.50	.80		
	GHNHS	18	3.41	.49		
	KES	9	3.41	.52		
	KNHS	8	3.21	.39		
	MSHS	3	3.22	.69		
	NCNHS	13	3.41	.67		
NLAve	OCIS	8	3.50	.56	1.444	.157
	OCES	11	3.79	.34		
	OCNHS	19	3.32	.54		
	RSHS-III	16	3.71	.50		
	SSEIS	4	3.33	.27		
	TSHS	7	3.24	.46		
	Total	124	3.46	.53		

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

	BSHS	4	3.94	.13		
	GH-1 ES	4	3.56	.52		
	GHNHS	18	3.68	.61		
	KES	9	3.97	.08		
	KNHS	8	3.78	.36		
	MSHS	3	3.75	.25		
	NCNHS	13	3.69	.41		
CBAR	OCIS	8	3.97	.09	.873	.576
	OCES	11	3.86	.30		
	OCNHS	19	3.82	.32		
	RSHS-III	16	3.88	.34		
	SSEIS	4	3.75	.35		
	TSHS	7	3.64	.40		
	Total	124	3.80	.38		
	BSHS	4	4.00	.00		
	GH-1 ES	4	3.75	.50		
	GHNHS	18	3.78	.73		
	KES	9	4.00	.00		
	KNHS	8	3.75	.46		
	MSHS	3	4.00	.00		
	NCNHS	13	3.85	.38		
Port	OCIS	8	4.00	.00	.502	.909
	OCES	11	3.91	.30		
	OCNHS	19	3.84	.37		
	RSHS-III	16	3.94	.25		
	SSEIS	4	3.75	.50		
	TSHS	7	3.71	.49		
	Total	124	3.86	.41		

***Legend: OCPPC**= Observation of Classes, Pre-Observation and Post-Observation Conferences; **CR**= Class Routines; **PIM**= Preparation of Instructional Materials; **CA**= Class Activities; **AP**= Assessment Practices; **DT**= Demonstration Teaching; **SF**= School Forms; **NL**= Networking and Linkages; **CBAR**= Classroom-Based Action Research (CBAR); **Port**= Portfolio*

Table 10 presents an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the delivery of teaching internships categorized by cooperating schools. Each row represents a specific aspect of the teaching internship, while each column represents a different cooperating school. The data includes mean scores, standard deviation, standard error, F-values, and p-values for each cooperating school within each aspect. Overall, the analysis suggests no significant differences observed in the delivery of teaching internships across different cooperating schools for most aspects considered. Across all elements except for a few, the p-values exceed conventional thresholds, indicating that the observed variations in mean scores between cooperating schools are likely due to random fluctuations rather than meaningful differences in performance. However, it's worth noting that there are slight variations in mean scores and standard deviations for some aspects and cooperating schools, although these differences do not reach statistical significance. Therefore, while there may be some minor differences in the delivery of teaching internships across cooperating schools, these differences are not statistically

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

significant and may be attributed to other factors not considered in the analysis. Overall, this suggests that the effectiveness of the teaching internship program is generally consistent across different cooperating schools.

Table 11 presents an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the delivery of teaching internships categorized by the type of internet provider. It revealed no statistically significant differences in performance. The study grouped various aspects of the teaching internship, such as Observation of Classes, Class Routines, and Preparation of Instructional Materials, according to whether participants used postpaid, prepaid, or both internet services. Despite slight variations in mean scores and standard deviations among different internet provider groups, the p-values consistently exceeded conventional thresholds, indicating that observed differences were likely due to random chance rather than meaningful distinctions in performance. This result suggests that the type of internet provider participants utilize is relatively minor in the delivery of teaching internships. Other unexplored factors may play a more substantial role in influencing internship outcomes.

Table 11: Analysis of Variance on the Delivery of Teaching Internship when grouped according to Type of Internet Provider

Type of Internet Provider		N	Mean	SD	*F*-value	*p*-value
OCPPC	Postpaid	49.00	3.69	.50	.187	.830
	Prepaid	62.00	3.67	.38		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.74	.39		
	Total	124.00	3.69	.43		
CR	Postpaid	49.00	3.76	.57	.612	.544
	Prepaid	62.00	3.85	.36		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.85	.32		
	Total	124.00	3.81	.45		
PIM	Postpaid	49.00	3.78	.52	.134	.875
	Prepaid	62.00	3.81	.36		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.77	.39		
	Total	124.00	3.79	.43		
CA	Postpaid	49.00	3.73	.54	.214	.808
	Prepaid	62.00	3.77	.37		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.82	.35		
	Total	124.00	3.76	.44		
AP	Postpaid	49.00	3.72	.50	.073	.929
	Prepaid	62.00	3.69	.40		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.69	.40		
	Total	124.00	3.71	.44		

DT	Postpaid	49.00	3.79	.48	.024	.976
	Prepaid	62.00	3.80	.34		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.77	.36		
	Total	124.00	3.79	.40		
SF	Postpaid	49.00	3.61	.61	1.154	.319
	Prepaid	62.00	3.60	.53		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.85	.38		
	Total	124.00	3.63	.55		
NL	Postpaid	49.00	3.54	.46	.994	.373
	Prepaid	62.00	3.41	.55		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.38	.62		
	Total	124.00	3.46	.53		
CBAR	Postpaid	49.00	3.81	.41	.215	.807
	Prepaid	62.00	3.80	.36		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.73	.37		
	Total	124.00	3.80	.38		
Port	Postpaid	49.00	3.90	.47	.526	.592
	Prepaid	62.00	3.85	.36		
	Prepaid and postpaid	13.00	3.77	.44		
	Total	124.00	3.86	.41		

Legend:* OCPPC**= *Observation of Classes, Pre-Observation and Post-Observation Conferences;* ***CR= *Class Routines;* ***PIM***= *Preparation of Instructional Materials;* ***CA***= *Class Activities;* ***AP***= *Assessment Practices;* ***DT***= *Demonstration Teaching;* ***SF***= *School Forms;* ***NL***= *Networking and Linkages;* ***CBAR***= *Classroom-Based Action Research (CBAR);* ***Port***= *Portfolio*

CONCLUSIONS

The survey results on implementing teaching internship programs for pre-service teachers in flexible learning during the academic year 2021-2022 provide helpful information about several areas of the program. The analysis found no significant differences in the implementation of teaching internship programs across several demographics, such as age, sex, number of grades handled, program, cooperating schools, and type of internet provider. The age, sex, and number of grades student teachers dealt with do not influence the quality of internship delivery significantly. Similarly, the sexes of cooperating teachers and the schools they attend do not seem to impact the internship program's success substantially. Even the kind of internet provider utilized by participants had no meaningful effect on internship outcomes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) The program may continually investigate methods to strengthen the delivery of teaching internship programs to offer the most outstanding experience for pre-service teachers.
2) While overall program delivery does not differ considerably, certain program-specific factors, such as assessment methods and demonstrative teaching, may be worth

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

further investigation. Tailoring assistance and resources to target these specific areas helps maximize the learning experience for student teachers across all programs.

3) Providing professional development opportunities for cooperating teachers may guarantee they remain prepared with the newest pedagogical ideas and tools to support pre-service teachers successfully.
4) Ensuring access to adequate internet infrastructure and technology assistance for student instructors and cooperating schools is vital for the success of teaching internship programs.
5) Encouraging reflective practices among pre-service teachers throughout their Internship helps create continual development and progress. Incorporating organized reflection exercises into the internship program can help students consolidate their learning experiences and discover personal and professional development opportunities.
6) A future study should examine additional aspects, such as socio-economic status, prior teaching experience, or technical ability, to acquire a more thorough picture of internship efficacy.

References

Adedoyin, O. B. (2020). Research methodology. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340594200_Research_Methodology

Asio, J.M. (2021). Research Designs in the New Normal: A Brief Overview. *Academia Letters*, Article 2596. https://doi.org/10.20935/AL2596.

Asio, J. M. R., Gadia, E., Abarintos, E., Paguio, D., & Balce, M. (2021). Internet Connection and Learning Device Availability of College Students: Basis for Institutionalizing Flexible Learning in the New Normal. *Studies in Humanities and Education*, *2*(1), 56–69. https://doi.org/10.48185/she.v2i1.224

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). Research Method in Education. New york: Routledge.

Commission on Higher Education. (CHED) (2017). CHED Memorandum Order (No. 75, Series of 2017). Republic of the Philippines Office. https://chedro1.com/resources/issuances/ched-memorandum-orders/2017-ched-memorandum-orders/D

Cuaton, G. P. (2020). Philippines higher education institutions in the time of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Revista Românească pentru Educaţie Multidimensională, 12*(1 Sup2), 61-70.

Volume 6, Issue 1
January to December 2023
ISSN: 2546-174

Dayagbil, F. T., Palompon, D. R., Garcia, L. L., & Olvido, M. M. J. (2021, July). Teaching and learning continuity amid and beyond the pandemic. In Frontiers in Education (Vol. 6, p. 678692). Frontiers Media SA.

Department of Education (DepEd) (2005). Joint Memorandum Order No. 39 of 2005: Guidelines on the Deployment of Student Teachers. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2005/07/DO_s2005_039.pdf

Huang, R. H., Liu, D. J., Guo, J., Yang, J. F., Zhao, J. H., Wei, X. F., ... & Chang, T. W. (2020). Guidance on flexible learning during campus closures: Ensuring course quality of higher education in COVID-19 outbreak. Beijing: Smart Learning Institute of Beijing Normal University.

OECD and Harvard Graduate School of Education (2020), A framework to guide an education response to the COVID-19 Pandemic of 2020, Retrieved from: https://globaled.gse.harvard.edu/files/geii/files/framework_guide_v2.pdf.

Paguio, D.P., Mendoza, K. J. A., & Asio, J. M. R. (2021). Challenges and Opportunities in a Local College in Time of COVID-19 Pandemic. *Studies in Humanities and Education, 2*(2), 12–18. https://doi.org/10.48185/she.v2i2.328

Parentela, G., & Vargas, D. (2021). Pandemic Era (COVID-19) and Higher Education in the Philippines against the World Perspective: A Literature Survey Analysis. Available at SSRN 3786765.

Sirisilla, S. (2023, January 19). Qualitative Vs. Quantitative Research — A step-wise guide to conduct research. Enago Academy. Retrieved from https://www.enago.com/academy/qualitative-vs-quantitative-research/

Parentela, G., & Vargas, D. (2021). Pandemic Era (COVID-19) and Higher Education in the Philippines against the World Perspective: A Literature Survey Analysis. Available at SSRN 3786765.

Ugalingan, G., Edjan, D., & Valdez, P. N. (2021). Online Internship Experiences among Pre-Service ESL Teachers in the Philippines: Challenges and Opportunities. TESL-EJ, 25(3), n3.

UNESCO (2020), Distance learning solutions. Retrieved from: https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/solutions.

Verde, A., & Valero, J. M. (2021). Teaching and learning modalities in higher education during the pandemic: responses to coronavirus disease 2019 From Spain. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 648592.