

# **Teaching TLE in Limited Face-to-Face Settings: A Descriptive Phenomenology from a Rural Philippine Secondary School**

Romart Lastima Ignacio

University of the Visayas, Graduate School of Education

## **Author Note**

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Romart L. Ignacio. Email:

[romart.ignacio@deped.gov.ph](mailto:romart.ignacio@deped.gov.ph) ORCID: 005-0652-9161

## **Abstract**

Background: After extended school closures, the Philippines piloted limited face-to-face classes, which affected skill-based subjects like Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE). Objective: To explore the lived experiences of TLE teachers during limited face-to-face classes in a rural public secondary school. Methods: A qualitative study using Husserlian descriptive phenomenology was conducted at Pilar National High School (Cebu Province Division), SY 2021–2022. Semi-structured one-on-one interviews were audio-recorded with consent and analyzed using Colaizzi’s seven-step method; trustworthiness was ensured through credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability strategies; ethics approval was granted by the University’s Research Ethics Committee. Results: Three themes emerged: (1) Limited F2F as a challenge (loss of collaboration and laboratory practice; compressed time; mask-related communication issues); (2) Teachers develop a new paradigm (flexibility, technology-supported instruction, home-based performance tasks with analytic rubrics); and (3) Re-establishing interpersonal relationships (closer teacher–student interaction, immediate feedback, social reconnection). Conclusion: Despite constraints, teachers adapted with creative strategies and valued the relational benefits of in-person contact; findings support practical lesson exemplars

and targeted capacity-building for TLE under constrained conditions.

**Keywords:** TLE; phenomenology; limited face-to-face; rural secondary school; Philippines

## **Introduction**

In November 2021, selected public schools in the Philippines reopened via limited face-to-face classes under strict health protocols. TLE—reliant on hands-on practice, collaboration, and laboratory work—was uniquely affected by restrictions on group tasks and shared equipment. This study explores how TLE teachers experienced teaching within these constraints at a rural island public secondary school, aiming to illuminate their lived experiences and distill themes that can inform practical teaching exemplars and school policy during constrained operations.

## **Method**

### **Design**

A Husserlian descriptive phenomenology was employed to bracket preconceptions and foreground meanings of teachers' lived experiences.

### **Setting and Participants**

The study was conducted at Pilar National High School (Pilar, Camotes, Cebu) during SY 2021–2022. From ten TLE teachers, six participated until data saturation was reached. Inclusion criteria: vaccinated TLE teachers delivering in-person classes (Grades 7–12) during the pilot and willing to participate.

### **Data Collection**

Semi-structured one-on-one interviews (40–50 minutes) were audio-recorded with consent, conducted in English and mother tongue as preferred, and supplemented by researcher observation.

## **Data Analysis**

Analysis followed Colaizzi's seven steps: familiarization; extraction of significant statements; formulation of meanings; clustering into themes; exhaustive description; fundamental structure; and member checking for verification.

## **Trustworthiness**

Credibility (member checking), transferability (thick description), dependability (audit trail), and confirmability (bracketing and reflexivity) were addressed throughout.

## **Ethics**

Approved by the University of the Visayas Research Ethics Committee; participation was voluntary, with informed consent, confidentiality, and minimal risk assured. No monetary incentives were provided.

## **Results**

Six TLE teachers contributed 72 significant statements, distilled into 13 formulated meanings, six clustered sub-themes, and three overarching themes.

## **Overarching Themes**

Theme 1 — Limited face-to-face as a challenge: loss of collaborative and laboratory activities, compressed time, and mask-related communication barriers.

Theme 2 — Teachers develop a new paradigm: adapted strategies, technology integration (videos, infographics, online links), individual home-based performance tasks, and analytic rubrics for fair assessment.

Theme 3 — Re-establishing interpersonal relationships: restored real-time feedback and rapport with smaller class sizes, enabling focused support.

### **Clustered Sub-themes**

1) Teaching under limited face-to-face is a challenge; 2) Innovative learning strategies; 3) Home-based task scheme with rubrics; 4) Socio-personal relationships; 5) Technical assistance and esprit de corps; 6) Addressing learning gaps from modular years.

### **Discussion**

Skill-intensive subjects like TLE face distinctive barriers under restricted classroom conditions, yet teachers creatively re-engineered pedagogy with technology, individualized tasks, and structured assessment to sustain competency development. The relational value of limited face-to-face—immediate feedback, motivation, and social reconnection—was emphasized, suggesting that even reduced in-person time can yield affective and instructional gains. These insights informed a lesson exemplar featuring technology-enabled demonstrations, visual scaffolds, and home-task rubrics to approximate laboratory learning ethically and safely.

### **Implications for Practice**

Schools can invest in educational technology capacity-building; standardize rubric-guided performance tasks suitable for home settings; maintain smaller face-to-face groups when possible; and offer targeted refreshers to address learning gaps from modular years.

### **Limitations and Future Work**

Single-site, small sample; teacher perspectives only; reliance on self-report and observation; transferability is contextual. Future work could include multisite samples and learner outcomes tied to rubric-assessed home tasks.

### **Conclusion**

TLE teachers navigated limited face-to-face with flexibility, technology integration, and robust assessment, while valuing the human connection regained in class. Practical, safety-conscious,

and equity-minded exemplars can sustain skill development when full laboratories are not feasible.

### Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Approved by the University of the Visayas Research Ethics Committee; informed consent obtained.

Funding: Self-funded.

Competing interests: None declared.

Data availability: De-identified excerpts available upon reasonable request.

Author contributions (CRediT): R.L.I.—conceptualization, methodology, investigation, analysis, writing.

**Table 1**

*Themes Distilled From Interviews*

| Formulated meanings (examples)                           | Clustered sub-themes                      | Overarching theme          |
|--|---|----------------------------|
| Loss of collaboration; mask-related strain; limited time | Teaching under limited F2F is a challenge | Limited F2F as a challenge |
| Flexibility; new strategies; tech integration            | Innovative learning strategies            | New teaching paradigm      |
| Analytic rubrics for home tasks                          | Home-based task scheme                    | New teaching paradigm      |

Interpersonal rapport; student voice      Socio-personal relationships      Interpersonal relationships

Co-teacher support and technical assistance      Technical assistance & esprit de corps      New teaching paradigm

Modular-era learning gaps      Addressing COVID-19 gaps      Limited F2F as a challenge

Note. F2F = face-to-face.

**Figure 1**

*Conceptual Flow of Themes and Sub-themes Derived From Teacher Interviews*

This figure conceptually illustrates how significant statements were transformed into formulated meanings, clustered into sub-themes, and organized into overarching themes using Colaizzi’s method.

**COREQ (Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research) Checklist**

| Domain / Item                           | Description                      | How addressed in this study   |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity | Interviewer/facilitator (Item 1) | Primary researcher conducted all interviews.                            |
|   | Credentials (Item 2)             | Graduate student researcher with supervised training.                   |
|   | Occupation (Item 3)              | Graduate student; teacher-researcher.                                   |
|   | Gender (Item 4)                  | Disclosed to participants as part of consent.                           |
|   | Experience and training (Item 5) | Semi-structured interviewing<br>And phenomenological analysis training. |

|                        |   |   |
|------------------------|---|---|
|                        | Relationship established<br>(Item 6)              | No prior close relationship; rapport built during consent and briefing. |
|                        | Participant knowledge of the interviewer (Item 7) | Participants informed of study aims and researcher role.                |
|                        | Interviewer characteristics<br>(Item 8)           | Reflexive notes kept to bracket assumptions.                            |
| Domain 2: Study design | Methodological orientation<br>(Item 9)            | Husserlian descriptive phenomenology.                                   |
|                        | Sampling (Item 10)                                | Purposive selection of TLE teachers involved in limited F2F.            |
|                        | Sample size (Item 11)                             | Six teachers; saturation achieved.                                      |
|                        | Non-participation (Item 12)                       | Four teachers declined or were unavailable; reasons noted.              |
|                        | Setting of data collection<br>(Item 13)           | School setting; private rooms following health protocols.               |
|                        | Presence of non-participants<br>(Item 14)         | Interviews conducted one-on-one; no others present.                     |

|                                 |                                  |  |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
|                                 | Description of sample (Item 15)  | Grades 7–12 TLE teachers; vaccinated; rural public school. |
|                                 | Interview guide (Item 16)        | Semi-structured guide piloted and refined.                 |
|                                 | Repeat interviews (Item 17)      | No repeat interviews; follow-ups via member checking.      |
|                                 | Audio/visual recording (Item 18) | Audio-recorded with consent.                               |
|                                 | Field notes (Item 19)            | Observation and reflexive field notes maintained.          |
|                                 | Duration (Item 20)               | Approximately 40–50 minutes per interview.                 |
|                                 | Data saturation (Item 21)        | Declared when no new themes emerged after six interviews.  |
| Domain 3: Analysis and findings | Transcripts returned (Item 22)   | Participants reviewed summaries during member checking.    |
|                                 | Data coding (Item 23)            | Significant statements extracted; meanings formulated.     |
|                                 | Number of data coders (Item 24)  | Single coder with peer debriefing.                         |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | Description of coding tree (Item 25)   | Statements → meanings → sub-themes → themes.                 |
|  | Derivation of themes (Item 26)         | Inductive clustering using Colaizzi’s method.                |
|  | Software (Item 27)                     | Manual coding; spreadsheets used for organization.           |
|  | Participant checking (Item 28)         | Member checking to verify the fundamental structure.         |
|  | Quotations presented (Item 29)         | Representative quotes included with pseudonyms.              |
|  | Data and findings consistent (Item 30) | Themes supported by multiple statements across participants. |
|  | Clarity of major themes (Item 31)      | Three overarching themes reported clearly.                   |
|  | Clarity of minor themes (Item 32)      | Six clustered sub-themes summarized.                         |

**References**

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches\** (2nd ed.). Sage.

Department of Education. (2021, November 14). On the opening of the pilot implementation of limited face-to-face classes. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2021/11/14/on-the-opening-of-the-pilot-implementation-of-limited-face-to-face-classes/>

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *\*Field Methods*, 18\*(1), 59–82.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903>

Morrow, R., Rodriguez, A., & King, N. (2015). Colaizzi’s descriptive phenomenological method. *\*The Psychologist*, 28\*(8), 643–644.  
[https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/26984/1/Morrow\\_et\\_al.pdf](https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/26984/1/Morrow_et_al.pdf)

Philippine Department of Education & Department of Health. (2021). *\*Operational guidelines on the implementation of limited face-to-face learning modality\** (Joint Memorandum Circular No. 01, s. 2021). <https://app.adpc.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/DedEd-DOH-210927-JMC-No.-01-series-of-2021-Operational-Guidelines-on-the-Implementation-of-Limited-Face-to-Face-Learning-Modality.pdf>

Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *\*International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19\*(6), 349–357.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>

Wirihana, L., Welch, A., Williamson, M., Christensen, M., Bakon, S., & Craft, J. (2018). Using Colaizzi’s method of data analysis to explore the experiences of nurse academics teaching on satellite campuses. *\*Nurse Researcher*, 25\*(4), 30–34.  
<https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.2018.e1516>

ABS-CBN News. (2021, November 1). LIST: Schools joining pilot implementation of limited face-to-face classes. <https://www.abs-cbn.com/news/11/01/21/list-schools-joining-pilot-face-to-face-classes>