Research Article https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.9.2.309

International Journal of Educational Methodology
Volume 9, Issue 2, 309 - 320.
ISSN: 2469-9632
https://www.ijem.com/

Student's Readiness on the Implementation of Face-to-Face Classes: The Aftermath of Face-to-Face Class Restriction

Andie Tangonan Capinding*
Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, PHILIPPINES

Received: November 26, 2022 ▪ Revised: December 13, 2022 ▪ Accepted: February 22, 2023

Abstract: This research analyzes the effects of restricting face-to-face classes during the lockdown and students' preparation for face-to-face instruction. During the academic year 2021-2022 break, it was conducted at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST)-Gabaldon Campus's College of Education. This study employed a descriptive correlational and descriptive comparative research design. The 151 education students who participated in this study were chosen using a stratified sampling method. According to the study, students received satisfactory to very satisfactory grades during the lockdown. The study also showed that after the lockdown and after the Commission on Higher Education recommended face-to-face classes, the majority of respondents agree that they are academically, socio-emotionally, and physically prepared to go through a face-to-face mode of learning. The majority of them prefer face-to-face classes to any other form of distance learning. The general weighted average of a student is a predictor of academic readiness in face-to-face classes. In addition, students' general weighted averages have direct link to their socio-emotional readiness. Students' profiles, on the other hand, have no impact on their physical readiness. There is no significant difference in student preparation in face-to-face classes when students are grouped by gender, year and section, and civil status. There is no association between the student profile and their preferred mode of learning. The theoretical and practical ramifications of the research were also addressed.

Keywords: *Academic readiness, physical readiness, socio-emotional readiness.*

To cite this article: Capinding, A. T. (2023). Student's readiness on the implementation of face-to-face classes: The aftermath of face-to-face class restriction. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, *9*(2), 309-320. https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.9.2.309

Introduction

It's been more than two academic years since the COVID-19 pandemic arrived and face-to-face classes have been suspended and different learning modalities were imposed. Because of the suspension of face-to-face classes, students need to adapt to different learning modalities like modular, online, blended learning, and other learning modalities, which most Filipino students are not familiar with. Fabito et al. (2021) show that upon the suspension of face-to-face instruction, teachers and students are not fully prepared to undergo online learning. In addition, during the blended learning setup, there are different problems encountered not only by students but also by the parents and teachers such as lack of technology and mental health matters (Ignacio, 2021). In addition, Turnbull et al. (2021) identified five obstacles to converting face-to-face classes to online learning: access to technology, faculty and student online competency, academic dishonesty, privacy and confidentiality, and integration of synchronous and asynchronous learning tools. Nevertheless, the new, alternative way of learning is progressively adapted by both students and teachers.

Furthermore, students' activity, routine, the way they interact with others and as well as their physical activity change during distance learning. Students in face-to-face classes learn through physical interaction with their classmates and with their teachers, while in distance learning students and their teacher meet virtually or not at all. Hence their social aspect was affected both positively and negatively: positively, since they can spend more time with their families; negatively, since students were more concerned about being a burden on others because of infection by COVID-19 than being alone or disconnected from everyone due to the COVID-19 pandemic (Alghamdi, 2021). According to Wali et al. (2022), the cognitive and social-emotional aspect of the students during the pandemic were quite good. It could imply that the students adapted to the new way of learning and a new way of life during the pandemic. In contrast, Rettew et

* **Correspondence:**
Andie Tangonan Capinding, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology – Gabaldon Campus, Philippines.
✉ andiecapinding103087@gmail.com

al. (2021) show that during the pandemic student's mood and wellness indices decline. Also, according to Genta et al. (2021) during the pandemic, the physical and psychological domains of the World Health Organization Quality of Life Questionnaire worsened but the environmental domain improved as compared with the study before the pandemic.

During the pandemic, physical activity was affected due to the lockdown; a large percentage of the students gained weight and did not exercise regularly (Özden & Parlar Kiliç, 2021). Moreover, an increase of three hours per day in a sedentary lifestyle and a decrease of 20% in vigorous activity were significantly observed during the pandemic (Bertrand et al., 2021). During the blended learning set-up, the student uses modules, television, the internet, radio, and other self-learning materials, which contribute to the changes in their learning styles. As a result, the five-hour screen time of the students increased significantly during the lockdown (Guo et al., 2021).

Nonetheless, after the suspension of face-to-face classes, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) memorandum order no. 1, series of 2022, stated that all areas under alert level 1 for COVID-19 shall have limited face-to-face classes provided that all faculty members and students are fully vaccinated; otherwise, they shall continue a flexible learning setup. This order gives a different view for students and parents, some are in favour some are not. According to the Philippine News Agency (2021), some parents are hesitant about sending their children to school even though the cases of COVID-19 were declining.

There are numerous types of research on the impact of COVID-19 and lockdowns, most of which focus on the pandemic period, but there are few or no studies that provide data on the post-pandemic period. Hence, based on the literature reviewed, the researcher wishes to assess the student's readiness for face-to-face classes after two years of distance learning. The researcher wants to determine the aftermath of the lockdown and restriction of face-to-face classes during the pandemic. Specifically, the researcher sought to answer the following questions: (a) How may the profile of the respondents be described in terms of sex, age, year level, civil status, family monthly income, and general weighted average (GWA)?; (b) How may the face-to-face class preparedness of the students be described in terms of academic, socio-emotional, and physical?; (c) What is the mode of learning preferences of the students?; (d) Is there a significant relationship between students' profile (age, monthly income and GWA) and their preparedness in face-to-face classes?; (e) Is there a significant difference in student preparation in face-to-face classes, when they are grouped according to their profiles (sex, year & section, and civil status)?; and (f) Is there a significant relationship between student's profile and their mode of learning preferences? The respondent's profile was included because the researcher looked at how different student attributes were affected by class restrictions. To determine whether the pandemic and class constraints had a favourable or unfavourable effect on students' perceptions of education, the researcher also considered the students' readiness for face-to-face learning. The researcher also examined whether the students were ready to participate in face-to-face instruction.

Methodology

Research Design

For this study, quantitative research was used. The process of gathering, examining, and interpreting numerical data is known as quantitative research. It can be used to identify trends and averages, formulate hypotheses, examine causality, and extrapolate findings to larger populations (Bhandari, 2022). Specifically, this study used a descriptive correlational, and comparative design. A descriptive correlational design seeks the link between variables without attempting to manipulate any of them (Copeland, 2022). On the other hand, a descriptive comparative study approach is used to describe variations between groups in a population that are not subjected to any manipulation (Cantrell, 2011)

Sampling Method

A stratified sampling technique was used to choose the 151 respondents. Stratified random sampling separated the population into strata. Members of the strata must have similar features or attributes, such as gender, monthly income, and so on (Hayes, 2022). The strata were the courses and sections of the college of education. The sample size is made up of 32 (21.2%) males and 119 (78.8%) females.

Questionnaires Validity

The questionnaire is divided into two sections: one for the students' profiles and the other for an evaluation of their level of face-to-face class readiness, including their level of academic, socio-emotional, and physical readiness. The questionnaire for monthly income is from the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA).

The researcher interviewed two associate professors and one professor regarding potential research items in the questionnaire. The researcher analyzed the interview and created a 12-item questionnaire for academic readiness, a 13-item questionnaire for socio-emotional readiness, and a 10-item questionnaire for physical readiness. Following the content validity and reliability tests, there are 10 items for academic preparedness, 12 items for socio-emotional readiness, and 7 items for physical readiness retained.

The validity of the surveys was determined using Aiken's V technique. The researcher enlists the assistance of nine faculty members from the college of education to rate each item in the three main constructs of the questionnaire. The rater assigns a score to each item depending on its construct. The lowest and highest scores for each item are 1 and 4, respectively. The formula of Aiken's V is $V = s / [n (c - 1)]$, where $s = r - lo$, r is the score given by the faculty rater, lo is the lowest possible score of each item, c is the maximum possible score of each item, and n is the number of raters. The critical values for the nine raters are 0.81, which is less than the computed values for each item in the questionnaire, indicating that the instrument is valid.

Table 1. Aiken's V coefficient of Each Item.

Academic Readiness		
Items	**Aiken's V Coefficient**	**Interpretation**
I am ready to learn from my teacher in person.	0.85	Valid
I am ready to compete academically with my classmates in the classroom.	0.88	Valid
I am ready to do classwork inside the classroom.	0.92	Valid
I am ready to listen to class discussions, which modular learning cannot provide.	0.88	Valid
I am ready to solve challenges on the board.	0.96	Valid
I am ready to report to class every day (5 times a week).	0.85	Valid
I am ready to prepare a content report and present it to the class.	0.88	Valid
I am ready to take exams and quizzes under the direct supervision of my lecturers.	0.85	Valid
I am ready to present my ideas in front of the class.	0.85	Valid
I am ready to write and read when my teacher instructs me to do so.	0.85	Valid
Socio-Emotional Readiness		
I am not scared to go to school even though the pandemic is not yet totally over.	0.88	Valid
I am ready to collaborate with my classmates in face-to-face groupings.	0.88	Valid
I can easily explain to my friends how I feel in a face-to-face scenario.	0.85	Valid
I want to know how my classmates and friends feel.	0.96	Valid
I am ready to cope with a face-to-face setting after two years of modular learning.	0.92	Valid
I am ready to express my feelings toward my classmates and teachers which I cannot do in modular learning.	0.88	Valid
I can ask for help from my classmates and teachers when I need something.	0.85	Valid
I can comfort my classmates and teachers in times of their hard times.	0.85	Valid
I can listen to others without interrupting them.	0.85	Valid
I am ready to play with my classmates in face-to-face settings.	0.85	Valid
I am ready to buy or purchase my food at the school canteen alone and with others.	0.85	Valid
I am ready for a debate/discussion with my classmates in front of the class when our teacher tells us to do so.	0.92	Valid
Physical readiness		
I am fully vaccinated and ready to go to school.	0.96	Valid
I am physically fit enough to participate in physical activities in physical education class.	0.92	Valid
I am prepared to walk, run, or drive to school.	0.85	Valid
I don't have any medical conditions that would prevent me from attending school.	0.92	Valid
I didn't smoke, consume alcohol, or use drugs.	0.85	Valid
When my teacher tells me to clean the classroom, I am ready.	0.85	Valid
I take vitamins every day.	0.85	Valid

Questionnaires Reliability

The questionnaires were pretested on 30 students who were not participants in the study, and it was determined that the questionnaires for academic preparedness *(Cronbach's alpha = .85),* socio-emotional readiness *(Cronbach's alpha = .88),* and physical readiness *(Cronbach's alpha = .86)* were all reliable. The reliability coefficients were obtained using SPSS Cronbach's alpha.

Data Collection

The researcher seeks authorization from the college of education's area head and the campus director of Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology's Gabaldon campus. The questionnaire was distributed during the vacation period of the academic year 2021-2022. The data was gathered using Google Forms.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using IBM-SPSS. The student's profile was described using frequency distribution and percentage. Means were employed to describe students' readiness in face-to-face classes. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicates that the data were not normally distributed, so the researcher utilized non-parametric tests such as Kendall's-Tau for correlation, Kruskal-Wallis, and the Mann-Whitney U test for the test of differences.

Table 2. Normality Test.

	Kolmogorov Smirnov[a]		
	Statistic	**df**	**Sig.**
Academic Readiness	.095	151	.002
Socio-Emotional Readiness	.103	151	.000
Physical Readiness	.142	151	.000

The researcher utilized a four-point scale. The following weighted mean and verbal interpretation were used to describe students' readiness in face-to-face classes: 1.00 - 1.74 for strong disagreement, 1.75 - 2.49 for disagreement, 2.50 - 3.24 for agreement, and 3.25 - 4.00 for strong agreement.

Findings / Results

Profile of the Respondents

According to the data, the sample has 119 (78.8%) female students and 32 (21.2%) male students. Table 3 also displays the ages of the respondents. There are 72 (48%) in the 18-20 age bracket, 65 (43%) in the 21-23 age bracket, 8 (5%) in the 27-29 age bracket, 4 (3%) in the 24-26 age bracket, and 1 (0.66%) in both the 30-32 and 33-35 age brackets.

Table 3 illustrates the distribution of responders by year and section. The majority of respondents are fourth-year Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) students, 50 (33.1%), followed by third-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) students, 30 (19.9%), second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) students, 23 (15.2%), first and fourth-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) students, both with 11 (7.3%) respondents, third-year Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) students, 10 (6.6%), first-year Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) students, 9 (6%), and second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) students, 9 (6%).

According to the data, 145 (96% of respondents) are single students, while only 6 (4%) are married. Table 3 also shows the respondents' monthly family income distribution. The majority of respondents, 128 (84.8%), are from poor families, followed by low income, 19 (12.6%), lower middle income, 3 (2%), and middle income, 1 (0.7%).

Table 3. Shows the Profile of the Student Respondents.

Sex	**Frequency**	**%**
Male	32	21.2
Female	119	78.8
Total	151	100.0
Age		
18-20	72	48
21-23	65	43
24-26	4	3
27-29	8	5
30-32	1	0.66
33-35	1	0.66
Total	151	100.00

Table 3. Continued

Year and Section		
Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) 1	9	6.0
Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) 1	11	7.3
Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) 2	7	4.6
Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) 2	23	15.2
Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) 3	10	6.6
Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) 3	30	19.9
Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) 4	50	33.1
Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) 4	11	7.3
Total	151	100.0
Civil Status		
Single	145	96.0
Married	6	4.0
Total	151	100.0
Monthly Income		
Less than P12,082 (Poor)	128	84.8
Between P12,082 and P24,164 (Low-income class but not poor)	19	12.6
Between P24,164 and P48,328 (Lower middle-income class)	3	2.0
Between P48,328 and P84,574 (Middle middle-income class)	1	.7
Total	151	100.0

General Weighted Average

Table 4 displays the mean (89.94), standard deviation (3.27), minimum (81.25), and maximum (96.88) general weighted average of the students last semester. It shows that the education students got satisfactory to outstanding performance during last semester.

Table 4. Shows the General Weighted Average of the Students.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
GWA	151	81.25	96.88	89.94	3.27
Valid N (listwise)	151				

Face-to-Face Preparedness of the Students

Table 5 shows that students strongly agree that they are prepared to learn from their teacher in person (3.29), that they are prepared to listen in class discussions, which modular learning cannot provide (3.29), and that they are prepared to write and read when their teacher instructs them to do so (3.29). Students also agree that they are prepared to compete academically with their classmates in the classroom (3.06), that they are prepared to do classwork inside the classroom (3.20), that they are prepared to solve challenges on the board (3.07), that they are prepared to report to class every day (2.87), that they are ready to prepare a content report and present it to the class (3.07), that they are ready to take exams and quizzes under the direct supervision of their lecturers (3.23), that they are (3.17). Overall, the students believe they are academically prepared (3.16). According to the data, the students are academically prepared in a face-to-face context. They are prepared to complete tasks assigned in the classroom. Furthermore, the consequences of face-to-face class restriction are not as detrimental as initially anticipated in terms of academic readiness.

Table 5 also shows the socio-emotional readiness of students in face-to-face classes. Students strongly agree that they are prepared to collaborate with their classmates in face-to-face groupings (3.25), that they can ask their classmates and teachers for help when they need it (3.36), that they can listen to others without interrupting them (3.38), and that they are prepared to play with their classmates in face-to-face settings (3.26). On the other hand, they agree that they are not scared to go to school even though the pandemic is not yet totally over (2.93), that they can easily explain to their friends how they fell in a face-to-face scenario (3.05), that they want to know how their classmates and friends feel (3.22), that they are ready to cope with a face-to-face setting after two years of modular learning (3.01), that they are ready to express their feelings toward their classmates and teachers which they cannot do in modular learning (3.21), that they can ask for help from their classmates and teachers when they need something (3.36), that they can comfort their classmates and teachers in times of their hard times (3.15), that they are ready to buy or purchase their food at the school canteen alone and with others (3.16), and that they are ready for a debate/discussion with their classmates in front of the class when their teacher tells us to do so (3.00). Overall, students are socially and emotionally prepared (3.17). According to the data, the students are ready to interact and showcase their knowledge and skills in the classroom. They are ready to communicate with the other students, even though the virus threat has not yet been eradicated. This also implies that the restriction of the face-to-face class makes them eager to go outside and interact with others.

Table 5 depicts the students' physical preparedness in face-to-face classes. Students agree that they are physically fit enough to participate in physical education class activities (3.22) and that they take vitamins every day (2.52). Furthermore, students strongly agree that they are fully vaccinated and ready to go to school (3.34), that they are prepared to walk, run, or drive to school (3.26), that they do not have any medical conditions that would prevent them from attending school (3.39), that they did not smoke, consume alcohol, or use drugs (3.67) and that they are ready to clean the classroom when their teacher tells them to (3.67). (3.49). Overall, they strongly agree that they are physically prepared for face-to-face classes (3.27). The data shows that during the restriction of face-to-face classes, when students are inside their homes while studying, they physically prepare themselves to go through a face-to-face class environment by taking vitamins, exercising, eating healthy foods, and not consuming alcohol or smoking. It is their way of preparing themselves for a face-to-face setting because they are aware that the virus threat is not yet over.

Table 5. Student's Readiness in Face-to-face Classes.

Academic Readiness	**Weighted Mean**	**Verbal Interpretation**
I am ready to learn from my teacher in person.	3.29	Strongly Agree
I am ready to compete academically with my classmates in the classroom.	3.05	Agree
I am ready to do classwork inside the classroom.	3.20	Agree
I am ready to listen to class discussions, which modular learning cannot provide.	3.29	Strongly Agree
I am ready to solve challenges on the board.	3.07	Agree
I am ready to report to class every day (5 times a week).	2.87	Agree
I am ready to prepare a content report and present it to the class.	3.07	Agree
I am ready to take exams and quizzes under the direct supervision of my lecturers.	3.23	Agree
I am ready to present my ideas in front of the class.	3.16	Agree
I am ready to write and read when my teacher instructs me to do so.	3.29	Strongly Agree
Total Weighted Mean	3.15	Agree
Socio-Emotional readiness		
I am not scared to go to school even though the pandemic is not yet totally over.	2.93	Agree
I am ready to collaborate with my classmates in face-to-face groupings.	3.24	Strongly Agree
I can easily explain to my friends how I feel in a face-to-face scenario.	3.04	Agree
I want to know how my classmates and friends feel.	3.21	Agree
I am ready to cope with a face-to-face setting after two years of modular learning.	3.01	Agree
I am ready to express my feelings toward my classmates and teachers which I cannot do in modular learning.	3.20	Agree
I can ask for help from my classmates and teachers when I need something.	3.35	Strongly Agree
I can comfort my classmates and teachers in times of their hard times.	3.15	Agree
I can listen to others without interrupting them.	3.38	Strongly Agree
I am ready to play with my classmates in face-to-face settings.	3.26	Strongly Agree
I am ready to buy or purchase my food at the school canteen alone and with others.	3.10	Agree
I am ready for a debate/discussion with my classmates in front of the class when our teacher tells us to do so.	3.00	Agree
Total Weighted Mean	3.16	Agree
Physical readiness		
I am fully vaccinated and ready to go to school.	3.34	Strongly Agree
I am physically fit enough to participate in physical activities in physical education class.	3.22	Agree
I am prepared to walk, run, or drive to school.	3.25	Strongly Agree
I don't have any medical conditions that would prevent me from attending school.	3.39	Strongly Agree
I didn't smoke, consume alcohol, or use drugs.	3.66	Strongly Agree
When my teacher tells me to clean the classroom, I am ready.	3.49	Strongly Agree
I take vitamins every day.	2.52	Agree
Total Weighted Mean	3.27	Strongly Agree

Student's Mode of Learning Preferences

Table 6 displays the student's preferred mode of learning. According to the data, the majority of students preferred face-to-face learning (104, 68.9%), followed by blended learning (28, 18.5%), modular learning or self-paced printed modules (17, 11.3), and virtual online learning (2, 1.3%).

Table 6. Mode of Learning Preferences.

Mode of Learning Preferences	Frequency	%
Blended learning	28	18.5
Face-to-face learning	104	68.9
Modular learning (Self-paced Learning)	17	11.3
Virtual online learning	2	1.3
Total	151	100.0

Correlation Between Students' Profile (Age, Monthly Income and GWA) and Their Readiness in Face-to-Face Classes

Table 7 depicts the relationship between student profile and readiness in face-to-face classes. The data show a significant relationship between students' socio-emotional readiness and general weighted average *(r = .151, p<.01). S*imilarly, data show a significant relationship between student's academic readiness and their overall weighted average *(r = .126, p<.05).* Academic readiness, on the other hand, has no significant association with age *(r = -.013, p>.05)* and monthly income *(r = -.004, p>.05).* There is also no significant relationship between socio-emotional readiness and the following profiles: age *(r = -.23, p>.05);* and monthly income *(r = -.006, p>.05).* Furthermore, data show that there is no significant relationship between physical readiness and student's profile such as age *(r =.069, p>.05),* monthly income *(r = -.038, p>.05),* and general weighted average *(r = .055, p>.05)*.

Table 7. Correlation between Students' Profile (Age, Monthly Income and GWA) and Their Readiness in Face-to-Face Classes.

		Age	Monthly Income	GWA
Academic Readiness	Correlation Coefficient	-.013	-.004	.126*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.831	.952	.028
	N	151	151	151
Socio-Emotional Readiness	Correlation Coefficient	-.023	-.006	.151**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.700	.932	.008
	N	151	151	151
Physical Readiness	Correlation Coefficient	.069	-.038	.055
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.268	.578	.346
	N	151	151	151

Comparison of Student Profiles (Sex, Year & Section, and Civil Status) with the Dependent Variables Readiness in Face-to-Face Classes

Table 8 reveals that there is no significant difference in students' academic readiness when they are categorized by year and section *(H = 4.35, p>.05),* sex *(U = 1674, p>.05),* or civil status *(U = 405.5, p>.05).* When students are categorized by year and section *(H = 10.07, p>.05)*, sex *(U = 1656.5, p>.05),* and civil status *(U = 345.5, p>.05),* there is no significant variation in their socio-emotional readiness. Similarly, the findings demonstrate that there is no significant difference in students' physical readiness when they are grouped according to year and section *(H = 4.82, p>.05),* sex *(U = 1567.5, p>.05),* and civil status *(U = 325, p>.05).*

Table 8. Comparison of Student Profiles (Sex, Year & Section, and Civil Status) with the Dependent Variables Readiness in Face-to-Face Classes

	Test	Academic Readiness	Socio-Emotional Readiness	Physical Readiness
Year and Section	Kruskal-Wallis	4.35	10.07	4.82
	Asymp. Sig.	.739	.185	.682
Sex	Mann-Whitney U Test	1674.00	1656.50	1567.50
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.293	.258	.124
Civil Status	Mann-Whitney U Test	405.50	345.50	325.00
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.778	.392	.292

Correlation between Student's Mode of Learning Preferences and Student's Profile.

Table 9 shows that there is no significant association between the student's mode of learning preferences and the following profile: sex *(χ^2 = 1.739a, p>0.05),* age *(χ^2 = 20.870a, p>0.05),* year, and section *(χ^2 = 32.224a, p>0.05),* civil status *(χ^2 = 1.593a, p>0.05),* monthly income *(χ^2 = 3.080a, p>0.05),* and general weighted average *(χ^2 = 180.427a, p>0.05).*

Table 9. Correlation between Student's Mode of Learning Preferences and Students' Profile.

Pearson Chi-Square		Sex	Age	Year and Section	Civil Status	Monthly Income	GWA
Mode of Learning Preferences	Value	1.739[a]	20.870[a]	32.224[a]	1.593[a]	3.080[a]	180.427[a]
	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	.628	.992	.056	.661	.961	.117
	N valid cases	151	151	151	151	151	151

Discussion

The data shows that even after going through lockdowns and class restrictions, where there is no face-to-face interaction, students still manage to prepare themselves in face-to-face classes. Even though they had difficulties learning through distance learning, they were able to prepare for face-to-face instruction. It demonstrates that the effects of distance learning on students' eagerness to learn are not as severe as first thought. On the other hand, according to Lassoued et al. (2020), during distance learning, professors and students face self-imposed constraints and pedagogical, technical, financial, and organizational obstacles. Similarly, according to Maqableh and Alia (2021), one-third of the students polled are dissatisfied with their online learning experience. However, in this study, most students were not negatively impacted by these educational experiences during the lockdowns.

Data shows that students are socially and emotionally prepared for face-to-face classes. Even though the threat of a virus is still present, students are not afraid to interact with their classmates and teachers. It demonstrates that, despite long and arduous years of distance learning, students can interact and express their emotions with others. It also implies that the students prepare themselves emotionally and socially. It could also show that the impact of distance learning on education students is not as severe as previously thought. According to Marzana et al. (2022), following the lockdown, students typically express happiness or joy due to the lifting of restrictions, as well as a type of "post-lockdown anxiety" caused by a sense of personal inadequacy when it comes to adjusting to the return to normal, carrying out daily activities, and attending community events. On the other hand, Bashir et al. (2021) demonstrate that the lockdown has a negative impact on students' health, concentration, sleeping, and mental well-being. Similarly, Jackaria (2022) claims that there are students who are not mentally or socially unprepared to learn in face-to-face classes.

Data suggests that students are physically prepared to attend school. They are ready to participate in physical activities that their teacher will introduce towards them. It is because students are taking vitamins and have received COVID-19 vaccines. According to the Department of Health (2022), as of September 1, 2022, there were 72 719 989 total vaccinated individuals, accounting for roughly 65% of the total population.

According to the data, students prefer to learn in a face-to-face setting. Similarly, Hidalgo et al. (2021) found that undergraduate students preferred face-to-face learning over distance learning. The current and previous studies imply that most students are eager to attend school and participate in class discussions, as evidenced by the data in table 5, which shows that students are excited to go to school and have physical contact with their teachers and classmates. The data also show that most students are tired or frustrated with distance learning via modules and online methods. According to Wang et al. (2020), non-graduate undergraduate students experienced more anxiety during online learning than previously. Furthermore, according to Unger and Meiran (2020), most students believe online learning is not the same as face-to-face learning.

The data show that students' academic readiness is directly related to their academic performance. It implies that students who outperform their peers in academic performance are more prepared and excited to learn in a face-to-face setting. It further suggests that if academic performance is the dependent variable, academic readiness is one of the predictors of students' performance. Dangol and Shrestha (2019) concluded that students must be academically prepared to achieve high educational achievement. Data also shows that students' socio-emotional readiness is related to their academic performance. It implies that students who outperform their peers in academic performance are more emotionally and socially prepared in face-to-face classes. In addition, it demonstrates that students who are socially and emotionally prepared perform better in class. Students with higher grades showed higher levels of social-emotional abilities (Portela-Pino et al., 2021). During the lockdown, socially and emotionally prepared students are more eager to learn, even in the face of adversity. Several cognitive and socioemotional factors have influenced academic achievement (Costa & Fleith, 2019).

On the other hand, there is no significant relationship between age and academic readiness, implying that between and among ages, students' academic readiness might be comparable. Additionally, being older does not show being more academically prepared. According to Baptista et al. (2016), age is not a predictor of academic readiness. Likewise, monthly income does not contribute to students' academic readiness. It shows that economic status is not a predictor of a student's eagerness to continue learning. Similarly, Örs (2018) discovered no difference in self-directed learning readiness based on monthly income.

There is no association between socioemotional preparedness and student age. It shows that students' socio-emotional preparation for face-to-face learning is consistent across age groups. It doesn't logically imply that older students are

more equipped on a socio-emotional level. Furthermore, younger students have already been emotionally coping with the sudden change in the educational system. Socio-emotional preparedness is not related to the family's monthly income. It demonstrates that the impact of the pandemic on the social and emotional components of the students is the same regardless of economic status. On the other hand, according to Mohamed and Toran (2018), students' socio-emotional development levels differ depending on their family's socio-economic position.

Students' physical readiness has nothing to do with their age. It implies that students' age is not a predictor of their physical readiness in a face-to-face setting. Data also reveal that students of all ages physically prepare themselves to study in a face-to-face class. Monthly income does not predict students' physical preparedness for face-to-face learning. It means that, regardless of the family's economic situation, parents supplied their children with the proper care and nutrition during the epidemic. According to Benson et al. (2022), parents fed their children with more veggies by including them in kitchen activities during the lockdown. The students' overall weighted average also has no association with their physical readiness. It demonstrates that student academic performance was not a predictor of students' physical preparation in face-to-face learning.

There was no significant difference between males' and females' academic readiness. It demonstrates that both male and female students believe they are academically prepared in face-to-face classes. Similarly, Baptista et al. (2016) found no correlation between students' academic readiness and gender. There is no significant difference between and among year-level academic readiness. It implies that both courses agreed that they are academically prepared and that each section is equally motivated to learn in a face-to-face class. Likewise, between and among civil status, there was no significant difference in their academic readiness, which implies that single and married students are comparable in terms of academic readiness. It also demonstrates that even students who are already married prepare themselves to be academically ready in a face-to-face setting. In contrast, Orion et al. (2014) show that civil status is one of the factors that contribute to students dropping out of school.

In terms of socio-emotional preparedness, there is no significant difference between male and female students. It demonstrates that the socio-emotional readiness of male and female students is similar. On the other hand, according to Jabeen and Mahmood (2022), boys have slightly higher socio-emotional responsiveness than girls. When students are categorized based on their civil status, there is no significant difference in their socio-emotional readiness. It means that single and married students are comparable in their socio-emotional readiness. Married students do not appear to be more emotionally disturbed than unmarried students. Data also shows that married students prepare themselves emotionally and socially, even though studying is not only their commitment but also that of their children and family. In contrast, Sarokhani et al. (2013) found that single students experience more stressful situations, including pressures related to employment, the economy, graduation, and marriage. The findings that year and section have no direct association with socio-emotional preparedness are consistent with the data that age has no relationship with socio-emotional readiness.

Furthermore, both male and female students physically prepare for face-to-face learning. There is no significant difference between and among year-level physical readiness. It demonstrates that both lower and higher grade level students physically prepared themselves to learn face-to-face. Civil status does not predict students' physical readiness in a face-to-face scenario.

Table 9 demonstrates that male and female students have the same mode of learning preference, and the majority of them, according to table 6, prefer to learn in a face-to-face setting. Age does not predict a student's preferred way of learning. It demonstrates that students' modes of learning preferences may be consistent across all ages. Year and section do not influence students' choices in their preferred learning modalities. The civil status of parents is also not a determinant in students' learning mode preferences. Parents' monthly income does not reflect students' learning preferences. The students' overall weighted average does not predict their preferred way of learning. It does not imply that if students are academically inclined, they will choose face-to-face learning mode or that if they are less equipped, they will prefer modular learning or vice versa. The statistics reveal that the respondent's profile has no relationship to the student's learning preferences. It demonstrates that the lockdown's impact on students' learning preferences cannot be associated with their profiles.

The discussions indicate that the consequences of the lockdown during the widespread Coronavirus disease were not as abysmal as previously assumed in terms of academic, socio-emotional, and physical aspects. Although some students are still hesitant to go outside and have physical contact with people, most responders have prepared themselves to engage with others. Almost 70% of students preferred face-to-face learning, indicating that the dread and anxiety they felt during lockdowns and distant learning was little by little lessened by the manner they prepared themselves. Furthermore, according to Rotas and Cahapay (2021), Filipino students use various coping strategies to reduce stress and anxiety during distance learning, including looking for proper space and time; borrowing learning resources; seeking support from peers; approaching teachers; practicing time management; doing learning tasks ahead of time; extending the time for learning activities; diverting attention; regulating the self; taking extra jobs; crying; and praying.

Conclusion

During the lockdown, students performed satisfactorily to very satisfactorily, and most learners learned similarly. Even after two years of arduous distance study, most students agree that they are academically prepared. It demonstrates that the student's enthusiasm to receive a decent education is not adversely affected by the lockdowns imposed during the pandemic. Students also demonstrate socio-emotional readiness to continue studying through face-to-face lessons. It shows that students emotionally and socially prepare themselves. It also shows that the impact of lockdown on students' socio-emotional aspects is not as severe as initially realized. Likewise, the majority of students are physically prepared to attend face-to-face classes. It indicates that students are ready to go outside and engage with others. It also suggests that the Philippine government's immunization helps students progressively overcome their worries, even though the COVID-19 virus is still present. In addition, most students chose face-to-face classes over alternative modes of learning. It demonstrates that most students are weary or dissatisfied with distance learning via modules and online techniques. This conclusion is consistent with their willingness to attend face-to-face classes. Academic performance is related to academic readiness in students. In addition, students' academic success predicts their socio-emotional readiness. The rest of the student's profile does not foresee academic, socio-emotional, or physical readiness in face-to-face classes. Similarly, the respondent profile does not predict students' modes of learning preferences.

The current research indicates that the consequences of face-to-face restriction are not as severe as previously thought in terms of the academic, socio-emotional, and physical aspects. Although the impact of the pandemic was evident during the lockdowns and class restrictions, as reported in several studies, the students' worry and anxiety progressively subsided. The way students prepared themselves helped to alleviate their fear and anxiety. It demonstrates that, regardless of the negative situation affecting students' learning, the combined efforts of all stakeholders can have a significant positive impact.

Recommendations

Teachers, educators, and administrators must continue to emphasize students' mental, emotional, social, spiritual, and physical well-being for students to cope with these difficult times. Parents and guardians must also keep a watchful eye on their children's physical and emotional health. Administrators may also offer interventions to eliminate the anxiety and fear caused by the pandemic. Researchers may also perform a study on the spiritual need of students during this crisis. Researchers may also focus on students' academic performance because the current study only focused on academic preparedness and not on students' actual performance. Researchers may also focus on students' attitudes and behaviours, as this study solely focused on their preparation.

Limitations

The study solely seeks to measure the readiness of students in face-to-face classes following the lockdown. The results of this study relied on the questionnaires provided by the researcher.

Ethics Statements

The research involving human participants underwent thorough review and approval by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology. Prior to participating in the study, all participants provided written informed consent, indicating their voluntary agreement to participate.

References

Alghamdi, A. A. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the social and educational aspects of Saudi university students' lives. *PLoS ONE, 16*(4), Article e0250026. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250026

Baptista, J., Osório, A., Martins, E. C., Verissimo, M., & Martins, C. (2016). Does social–behavioral adjustment mediate the relationship between executive function and academic readiness? *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 46*, 22-30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2016.05.004

Bashir, A., Bashir, S., Rana, K., Lambert, P., & Vernallis, A. (2021). Post-COVID-19 adaptations; the shifts towards online learning, hybrid course delivery and the implications for biosciences courses in the higher education setting. *Frontiers in Education, 6*, Article 711619. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.711619

Benson, T., Murphy, B., McCloat, A., Mooney, E., Dean, M., & Lavelle, F. (2022). From the pandemic to the pan: The impact of COVID-19 on parental inclusion of children in cooking activities: A cross-continental survey. *Public Health Nutrition, 25*(1), 36-42. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980021001932

Bertrand, L., Shaw, K. A., Ko, J., Deprez, D., Chilibeck, P. D., & Zello, G. A. (2021). The impact of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic on university students' dietary intake, physical activity, and sedentary behaviour. *Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism, 46*(3), 265-272. https://doi.org/10.1139/apnm-2020-0990

Bhandari, P. (2022, June 12). *What is quantitative research? | Definition, uses and methods*. Scribbr. https://bit.ly/3DvVpPT

Cantrell, M. A. (2011). Demystifying the research process: Understanding a descriptive comparative research design. *Pediatric Nursing, 37*(4), 188-189.

Copeland, B. (2022). *What is the meaning of descriptive correlational method?* De Kooktips. https://bit.ly/3IRu244

Costa, B. C. G., & Fleith, D. D. S. (2019). Prediction of academic achievement by cognitive and socio-emotional variables: A systematic review of literature. *Trends in Psychology, 27*(4), 977-991. https://doi.org/10.9788/TP2019.4-11

Dangol, R., & Shrestha, M. (2019). Learning readiness and educational achievement among school students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 7*(2), 467-476. https://doi.org/%2010.25215/0702.056

Department of Health. (2022). *National COVID-19 vaccination dashboard.* http://bit.ly/3JSA9r8

Fabito, B. S., Trillanes, A. O., & Sarmiento, J. R. (2021). Barriers and challenges of computing students in an online learning environment: Insights from one private university in the Philippines. *International Journal of Computing Sciences Research, 5*(1), 441-458. https://doi.org/10.25147/ijcsr.2017.001.1.51

Genta, F. D., Rodrigues Neto, G. B., Sunfeld, J. P. V., Porto, J. F., Xavier, A. D., Moreno, C. R. C., Lorenzi-Filho, G., & Genta, P. R. (2021). COVID-19 pandemic impact on sleep habits, chronotype, and health-related quality of life among high school students: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine, 17*(7), 1371-1377. https://doi.org/10.5664/jcsm.9196

Guo, Y. F., Liao, M. Q., Cai, W. L., Yu, X. X., Li, S. N., Ke, X. Y., Tan, S. X., Lou, Z. Y., Cui, Y. F., Wang, Q., Gao, X. P., Liu, J., Liu, Y. H., Zhu, S., & Zeng, F. F. (2021). Physical activity, screen exposure and sleep among students during the pandemic of COVID-19. *Scientific Reports, 11*, Article 8529. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-88071-4

Hayes, A. (2022, August 4). *Stratified random sampling*. Investopedia. https://bit.ly/2tazNqr

Hidalgo, G. I., Sánchez-Carracedo, F., & Romero-Portillo, D. (2021). COVID-19 emergency remote teaching opinions and academic performance of undergraduate students: Analysis of 4 students' profiles. A case study. *Mathematics, 9*(17), Article 2147. https://doi.org/10.3390/math9172147

Ignacio, A. E. (2021). Online classes and learning in the Philippines during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, *4*(3), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.31149/ijie.v4i3.1301

Jabeen, A., & Mahmood, Z. (2022). Cognition based learning readiness skills in children of age 7-10 years: An unappreciated domain. *Rawal Medical Journal, 47*(3), 734-738. https://bit.ly/3U0NJu4

Jackaria, P. M. (2022). Elementary teachers' experiences and instructional challenges during the return to school after the COVID-19 closure in the Philippines. *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management, 2*(2), 216-225. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6955920

Lassoued, Z., Alhendawi, M., & Bashitialshaaer, R. (2020). An exploratory study of the obstacles for achieving quality in distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Education sciences, 10*(9), Article 232. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10090232

Maqableh, M., & Alia, M. (2021). Evaluation online learning of undergraduate students under lockdown amidst COVID-19 Pandemic: The online learning experience and students' satisfaction. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *128*, Article 106160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.106160

Marzana, D., Novara, C., De Piccoli, N., Cardinali, P., Migliorini, L., Di Napoli, I., Guidi, E., Fedi, A., Rollero, C., Agueli, B., Esposito, C., Marta, E., González-Leone, F., Guazzini, A., Meringolo, P., Arcidiacono, C., & Procentese, F. (2022). Community dimensions and emotions in the era of COVID-19. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 32*(3), 358-373. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2560

Mohamed, S., & Toran, H. (2018). Family socioeconomic status and social-emotional development among young children in Malaysia. *Journal of Applied Sciences, 18*(3), 122-128. https://doi.org/10.3923/jas.2018.122.128

Orion, H. C., Jr., Forosuelo, E. J. D., & Cavalida, J. M. (2014). Factors affecting students' decision to drop out of school. *SLONGAN, 2*, 1-16. https://bit.ly/3lo3sbs

Örs, M. (2018). The self-directed learning readiness level of the undergraduate students of midwife and nurse in terms of sustainability in nursing and midwifery education. *Sustainability, 10*(10), Article 3574. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103574

Özden, G., & Parlar Kiliç, S. (2021). The effect of social isolation during COVID-19 pandemic on nutrition and exercise behaviors of nursing students. *Ecology of Food and Nutrition, 60*(6), 663-681. https://doi.org/10.1080/03670244.2021.1875456

Philippine News Agency. (2021, October 22). *Some parents hesitant in sending kids back to school*. https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1157499

Portela-Pino, I., Alvariñas-Villaverde, M., & Pino-Juste, M. (2021). Socio-emotional skills as predictors of performance of students: Differences by gender. *Sustainability, 13*(9), Article 4807. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094807

Rettew, D. C., McGinnis, E. W., Copeland, W., Nardone, H. Y., Bai, Y., Rettew, J., Devadanam, V., & Hudziak, J. J. (2021). Correction: Personality trait predictors of adjustment during the COVID pandemic among college students. *PLoS ONE, 16*(10), Article e0259431. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0259431

Rotas, E., & Cahapay, M. (2021). From stress to success: Exploring how Filipino students cope with remote learning amid COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology, 3*(1), 27-35. https://doi.org/10.33902/JPSP.2021366608

Sarokhani, D., Delpisheh, A., Veisani, Y., Sarokhani, M. T., Manesh, R. E., & Sayehmiri, K. (2013). Prevalence of depression among university students: A systematic review and meta-analysis study. *Depression Research and Treatment, 2013*, Article 373857. https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/373857

Turnbull, D., Chugh, R., & Luck, J. (2021). Transitioning to e-learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: How have higher education institutions responded to the challenge? *Education and Information Technologies, 26*, 6401-6419. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10633-w

Unger, S., & Meiran, W. R. (2020). Student attitudes towards online education during the COVID-19 viral outbreak of 2020: Distance learning in a time of social distance. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science, 4*(4), 256-266. https://bit.ly/3GD2xw0

Wali, C. N., Elumalai, G., Suharjana, Irianto, D. P., Martono, & Komarudin. (2022). Status of the cognitive and socio-emotional aspects of students in the Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6*(6), 6006-6013. http://bit.ly/40iJePf

Wang, C., Zhao, H., & Zhang, H. (2020). Chinese college students have higher anxiety in new semester of online learning during COVID-19: A machine learning approach. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11,* Article 587413. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.587413