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ABSTRACT

This study aimed to assess the Performance of Pre-Service Teachers on their Field Study Courses (FSCs) and Practice Teaching Courses (PTCs). This utilized the descriptive research design in which questionnaires were used to gather data. The study shows that there is no significant relationship between the respondents’
level of competencies and academic performance on field study courses, same results was manifested between the respondents’ level of competencies on field study courses and their academic performance in practice teaching which leads to a conclusion that their competencies does not have anything to do with their actual teaching performance as determined through their academic achievement. Moreover, the results show a significant relationship between the academic performances of the Pre-Service Teachers in their Field Study Courses (FSCs) with their Practice Teaching Courses (PTCs) which goes to show that obtained grades are directly proportional with each other.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Confucius (450 BC), a famous Chinese philosopher, once said “I hear and forget, I see and I remember, Involve me, and I will learn” often quoted as being a belief underpinning many learning and teaching pedagogies. It’s been a quest for educational philosophers to identify ways on how to educate students effectively which ended up with the thought of immersing them in their own learning process that latter been introduced as Experiential Learning. Wurdinger and Carlson (2009), stated that “Students learn best by doing and through experience. It has been proven that experiential learning is one way to develop a child’s innate ability by triggering their curiosity and letting them handle things themselves. Although good lecturing should be part of an educator’s teaching repertoire, faculty should also actively involve their students in the learning process through discussion, group work, hands-on participation, and applying information outside the classroom. This process defines experiential learning where students are involved in learning content in which they have a personal interest, need, or want.”

According to UNESCO (2002), “Experiential learning engages students in critical thinking, problem-solving and decision making in contexts that are personally relevant to them. This approach to learning also involves making opportunities for debriefing and consolidation of ideas and skills through feedback, reflection, and the application of the ideas and skills to new situations.” Experiential learning teaches students the competencies they need for real-world success. The public is clamouring for an education that teaches students the
competencies they need for real-world success. Although we can simulate the real world in the classroom and laboratory, authentic experiential learning creates an invaluable opportunity to prepare students for a profession or career, learn the craft of a fine artist, or discover how the discipline creates evidence to contribute to its body of knowledge. Thus, Sullivan and Rosin (2008) argued that “the mission for higher education should be to bridge the gap between theory and practice’ and Collins (1991) suggests that to do this, “the educational environment needs to create rich connections between the formal and experiential curriculums intentionally.”

This gave birth to the Field Study Courses and its integration on the Teacher Education Curriculum in the Philippine Educational System for Higher Education Institutions, paving the way for a more concrete learning experience for students who are taking up education as their chosen career.

**FRAMEWORK**

The field study experience for pre-service teachers is clearly stipulated in the CHED Memorandum no. 30 (CMO 30) which was promulgated on September 3, 2004. The purpose of which is of rationalizing the undergraduate teacher education in the country to keep pace with the demands of the global competitiveness. In consonance with this, Article V, Section 13 of the said memorandum provides for the inclusion of field study courses in the Teacher Education Curriculum which intends to provide with students with practical learning experiences in which they observe, verify, and reflect on, in actual school settings.

Field Study Courses involve collecting data outside of an experimental setting, this type of data gathering is most often done in a natural setting and can be done in a variety of ways for various discipline. Field Study Courses collect original or unconventional data via face-to-face interviews, surveys and direct class observation which are very common to most public Higher Education Institutions offering Teacher Education Program.

According to CHED Memorandum Order no. 11 series of 2009, the twelve (12) units of experiential learning shall be comprised of six (6) units of Field Study courses to be taken concurrently with Professional Education courses and six (6) units of practice teaching to be taken after the professional education courses. Field Study Courses are crafted to prepare and equip the pre-service teacher for their In-Campus and Off-Campus Practice-Teaching Performance.
Thus, this research aimed to identify the performance of pre-service teachers on Field Study Courses with the help of its cooperating schools as determined by their Academic Performance. Specifically, this study will determine the level of competencies Pre-Service Teachers imbibed as characterized by the different core objectives of their Field Study Courses. Furthermore, this research will determine if there are significant relationships between the Academic Performance of Pre-Service Teachers on their Field Study Courses with that of their Academic Performance on their In-Campus and Off-Campus Teaching plus determining if there’s a significant relationship between the Level of Competencies of Pre-Service Teachers to that of their Academic Performance on their Field Study Courses.

Assessing pre-service teachers on the effectiveness of Field Study Courses is a way to determine ways and means of improving the Teacher-Education Program. The results of this research can be a baseline data for designing a program that will help pre-service teachers to be prepared for the challenges of the newly implemented K12 Curriculum. It is also the aim of this research to provide a meaningful assessment of the Field Study Courses on pre-service teachers as they were exposed in pre-service teaching. This will craft an ideal proposal for administrators and officials of Higher Education Institutions for immediate response regarding the aforementioned matter.

Figure 1. The Schema of the Study Showing the Interplay between the Variables
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to determine the academic performance of pre-service teachers in their field study courses and practice teaching and their relationship. Specifically, it sought to determine the following: (1) the Academic Performance of the Pre-Service Teachers in their Field Study Courses (Field Study 1 – The Learner’s Development and Environment, Field Study 2 – Experiencing the Teaching-Learning Process, Field Study 3 – Technology in the Learning Environment, Field Study 4 – Exploring the Curriculum, Field Study 5 – Learning Assessment Strategies, Field Study 6 – On Becoming 21st Century Teacher); (2) the Academic Performance of the Pre-Service Teachers in their In-Campus and Off-Campus Teaching; (3) the Level of Competencies of the Pre-Service Teachers in their Field Study Courses; (4) the significant relationship between the respondents’ Level of Competencies in their Field Study courses with their Academic Performance in their Field Study Courses; (5) the significant relationship between the respondents’ Level of Competencies in their Field Study courses with their Academic Performance in their In-Campus and Off-Campus Teaching; (6) the significant relationship between the respondents’ Academic Performance in their Field Study courses with their Academic Performance in their In-campuses and Off-campus teaching.

METHODOLOGY

In order to make this research study accurate and reliable, different approaches were used to justify the data gathering and treatments. Descriptive Quantitative Research Design was used to describe the specific behavior as it occurs in the environment, “Descriptive Research was used to describe the data collected in research studies and accurately characterize the variables under observation with a specific sample” Causal-Comparative (Ex Post Facto) was likewise applied to determine the difference between two groups and then to look for possible causes for, or consequences of, this difference. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2009), Causal Comparative Design is used to determine the cause or consequences of differences that already exist between and among groups of individual. The researcher made use of Content-Data Analysis Method in order to preserve the advantages of quantitative content analysis as developed within communication science and to transfer and further develop them to qualitative-interpretative steps of analysis and Documentary Analysis Method was utilized as
a tool for obtaining relevant documentary evidence to support and validate facts stated in this research, especially during the chapter of the literature review. To determine if the program or intervention had the desired effect the Evaluation Design of Descriptive Research Method was used. “An evaluation design is done to determine the program strengths, weakness, or gaps with the purpose of improving it through modification.” Chantrill (2015), Best and Kahn (2006) stated that “To make the gathering of data accurate, a Survey Technique was used to collect pertinent data from respondents.”

The research population of the study was the students of College of Education, Rizal Technological University who enrolled in FSCs and conducted their PTCs for School Year 2015-2016 at Rizal Technological University – Laboratory High School (In-Campus Teaching) and respective cooperating schools (Off-Campus Teaching). In this study, the researchers used the total population of enrolled 251 Pre-Service Teachers as samples.

In the pursuit of the study, the researchers employed the following instruments in gathering needed data – the survey questionnaire, and rating scale. The Survey Questionnaire was the main research instrument that the researchers used to gather the necessary data for the study. The respondents, which were the RTU-CED Pre-Service Teachers, answered a structured questionnaire that the researchers, themselves, prepared which according to Kirklees Council n.d., “Structured Questionnaire is a type of a questionnaire where the possible response or answers of the respondents are already provided.”

The survey questionnaires prepared by the researchers was comprised of two parts: The First part was composed of their demographic profile such as their Field of Specialization, The Second part shows prevalent perceptions of the respondents with regard to their Level of Competencies towards the Six FSCs; each FSCs has Three (3) statements which were derived from the core objectives of the field study courses as stated in each FS Manuals authored by Dr. Brenda Corpuz and other Academicians. Four (4) options were available for each statement: Very High, High, Low, and Very Low. These options are in the form of a four-point Likert-scale as shown on one of the succeeding pages.

In order to ensure the validity, reliability and effectiveness of the researcher-made questionnaire, the researchers drafted a set of survey. They adhered to certain principles and procedures in validating the instrument using the following steps:

Content Validation - to test the survey questionnaire’s validity, the researchers asked various professionals to criticize the drafted questionnaires constructively. Included are: a Field Study (FS) Professor, a Professional Education (PROFED)
Professor, a Professor/Critic who spearheads the deployment of Pre-Service Teachers for In-Campus and Off-Campus Teaching, and a Statistician.

These professionals assessed the validity of the instrument. The validity of the instrument is defined as the extent of measurement on how likely the instrument will work when its function to measure is being described or qualified. The instructions, modifications, and advice given by the people mentioned were used by the researchers in formulating the official survey questionnaires which were used for the study’s pilot test and the data gathering proper.

Dry Run-In order to determine the survey questionnaire’s reliability, the researchers randomly conducted a Dry-Run Testing to Thirty (30) Pre-Service Teachers from six fields of specialization. Reliability of instrument means that the measurement approach relied on exhibits consistent results whenever applied repeatedly.

A twenty-item (20) Cronbach’s Alpha measurement was used by the researchers to check the reliability of the instrument which resulted in an Alpha of eighty-four hundredth (0.84); hence, there was a high or very high reliability. “Cronbach’s Alpha measurement is a function of the average inter-connections of items and the number of items in the scale.” “It means that the items or statements presented in the questionnaires were consistent and reliable. It denoted that the measurement of the respondents’ response will be the same, every time, it is being employed” (Rosal, 2016).
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Means Obtained by the Pre-Service Teachers as Regards Academic Performance on Field Study Courses

| Subject Code | Subject Description                                      | W.M. | V.I.   | Rank |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------|------|--------|------|
| FS 1         | Learners’ Development and Environment Experiencing Teaching-Learning Process | 1.72 | Very Good | 1.5  |
| FS 2         | Technology in the Learning Environment                   | 1.73 | Very Good | 3    |
| FS 3         | Exploring the Curriculum Learning Assessment Strategies   | 1.72 | Very Good | 1.5  |
| FS 4         | On Becoming 21st Century Teachers                        | 1.87 | Good    | 6    |
| FS 5         |                                                          | 1.78 | Good    | 4    |
| FS 6         |                                                          | 1.81 | Good    | 5    |

OVERALL MEAN 1.77 Good

Table 1, shows the academic performance obtained by the Rizal Technological University College of Education Pre-Service Teachers after undergoing the six field study courses.

As shown in the table, FSCs 1 through 3 the pre-service teachers’ has exemplified very good academic performance which goes to show that they have obtained cumulative grades that above the standards as prescribed by the course. Moreover, the table shows that respondents’ manifested a good academic performance in their FSCs 4 through 6, this can be related to the fact that these courses are implemented with high demanding standards since they are given concurrently with pre-service teaching courses during the internship period.

Above findings confirm the study of Pagaduan (2009) where she measured pre-service teacher’s academic performance on Field Study courses specifically in their Field Study 3 and 4. She found out that the Academic Performance of the pre-service teachers of the University of Cordilleras was at an average level. According to her “The results implied that there is still need to help students improve their grades in field study so that they can reach above average or excellent level.”

However, since the mean is very close to very good level, results connote that the students have learned from their observation. Through observation activities, the students learned how theories and concepts are applied in an actual classroom setting.”
Table 2. Means Obtained by the Pre-Service Teachers as Regards Academic Performance on In-Campus and Off-Campus Teaching

| Subject Code | Subject Description       | W.M. | V.I.     | Rank |
|--------------|---------------------------|------|----------|------|
| PROFED 13    | In-Campus Teaching        | 1.68 | Very Good| 2    |
| PROFED 15    | Off-Campus Teaching       | 1.42 | Very Good| 1    |
| **OVERALL MEAN** |                        | **1.55** | Very Good |      |

Table 2 depicts the academic performance of the Pre-Service Teachers of Rizal Technological University College of Education on their In-Campus and Off-Campus Practice Teaching Courses (PTCs).

As presented in the table, all pre-service teachers manifested very good performance during in-campus and off-campus teaching as justified with weighted means of $x = 1.65$ for In-Campus Teaching (Professional Education 13) and $x = 1.42$ for Off-Campus Teaching (Professional Education 15). This goes to show that learned concepts and theories from their observations and experiences became so evident and effective during their demonstration on both practicum. It just happened that the Off-Campus Teaching ranked 1 since the pre-service teachers have already established themselves in all the factors that should be imbibed by them, and since In-Campus set to be their benchmark and stepping stone, it is not surprising that it ranked 2nd since it was the pioneer in the development of a pre-service teacher.

Above findings can be jibed with the study of Bautista, wherein she quantified the academic performance of BEED pre-service teachers on their professional education courses, general education courses and practice teaching courses. She found out that the pre-service teachers have a very good performance in all subjects which includes Practice Teaching courses.
Table 3. Means Obtained by the Pre-Service Teachers as Regards Level of Competencies on Field Study Courses

| Objective Number | W.M. | V.I.     |
|------------------|------|---------|
| FS 1.1           | 3.56 | Very High |
| FS 1.2           | 3.49 | High    |
| FS 1.3           | 3.53 | Very High |
| **FS 1 MEAN**    | 3.52 | Very High |
| FS 2.4           | 3.37 | High    |
| FS 2.5           | 3.48 | High    |
| FS 2.6           | 3.59 | Very High |
| **FS 2 MEAN**    | 3.48 | High    |
| FS 3.7           | 3.65 | Very High |
| FS 3.8           | 3.51 | Very High |
| FS 3.9           | 3.55 | Very High |
| **FS 3 MEAN**    | 3.57 | Very High |
| FS 4.10          | 3.20 | High    |
| FS 4.11          | 3.25 | High    |
| FS 4.12          | 3.41 | High    |
| **FS 4 MEAN**    | 3.29 | High    |
| FS 5.13          | 3.39 | High    |
| FS 5.14          | 3.43 | High    |
| FS 5.15          | 3.37 | High    |
| **FS 5 MEAN**    | 3.39 | High    |
| FS 6.16          | 3.67 | Very High |
| FS 6.17          | 3.59 | Very High |
| FS 6.18          | 3.43 | High    |
| **FS 6 MEAN**    | 3.56 | Very High |

Table 3 presents the level of competencies of Pre-Service Teachers of Rizal Technological University College of Education with regards to their FSCs. The respondents have recorded a very high level of competencies in FSCs 1, 3 and 6 this means that they are confident in exemplifying concepts regarding Learners’ Development and Environment, Technology in the Learning Environment and the nature of On Becoming 21st Century Teacher. Moreover, the table reveals that respondents’ attained high level of competencies in Field Study 2, 4 and 5 which means that there are still need of improvement in terms of Experiencing the Teaching-Learning Process, Exploring the Curriculum and Learning Assessment Strategies.

Above findings can be related to the study of Ambag, wherein she measured the level of competencies on field study courses of the Pre-Service Teachers from
Public and Private Universities in the National Capital Region with the use of the National Competency-Based Teachers Standards (NCBTS) tools. In her study, she found out that the pre-service teachers level of competencies ranges from very high extent to high extent. Moreover, she found out that regardless of the classification of universities the personal perception of the pre-service teachers towards their level of competencies on field study courses lies in the same range/bracket. She further concluded that “the pre-service teachers should improve the competencies and work performance through personal and professional development. Professional development activities may be an independent study or the professional developments are those of the formal programs.”

Table 4. Relationship between the Respondents’ Level of Competencies on Field Study Courses and the Academic Performance on Field Study Courses

| Field Study Courses | Coefficient/Values | P-Values | Verbal Interpretation |
|---------------------|--------------------|----------|----------------------|
| FS 1                | 0.040              | 0.530    | Not Significant      |
| FS 2                | 0.020              | 0.749    | Not Significant      |
| FS 3                | -0.016             | 0.800    | Not Significant      |
| FS 4                | 0.044              | 0.490    | Not Significant      |
| FS 5                | -0.035             | 0.579    | Not Significant      |
| FS 6                | -0.021             | 0.741    | Not Significant      |

*correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Using Pearson’s R Formula, Table 4 shows that p-values above do not have 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the respondents’ level of competencies on FSCs and academic performance on FSCs is - accepted. We conclude that based on this sample; the respondents’ level of competencies on FSCs does not have any correlation with their academic performance on FSCs. This is because the respondents are graded based on criteria and not on their personal perception towards their level of competencies on the said subject.
Table 5. Relationship between the Respondents’ Level of Competencies on Field Study Courses and the Academic Performance on In-Campus and Off-Campus Teaching

| Field Study Courses | Coefficient/Values | P-Values | Verbal Interpretation |
|---------------------|--------------------|----------|-----------------------|
| **In-Campus Teaching** |                    |          |                       |
| FS 1                | 0.092              | 0.144    | Not Significant       |
| FS 2                | 0.087              | 0.171    | Not Significant       |
| FS 3                | 0.021              | 0.739    | Not Significant       |
| FS 4                | 0.057              | 0.364    | Not Significant       |
| FS 5                | 0.077              | 0.227    | Not Significant       |
| FS 6                | 0.072              | 0.254    | Not Significant       |
| **Off-Campus Teaching** |                |          |                       |
| FS 1                | -0.120             | 0.057    | Not Significant       |
| FS 2                | -0.019             | 0.762    | Not Significant       |
| FS 3                | -0.123             | 0.052    | Not Significant       |
| FS 4                | -0.023             | 0.711    | Not Significant       |
| FS 5                | 0.020              | 0.748    | Not Significant       |
| FS 6                | -0.062             | 0.329    | Not Significant       |

*correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Using Pearson’s R Formula, the table presents that the p-values do not have 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the respondents’ level of competencies on field study courses and academic performance on in-campus and off-campus teaching is - accepted. Based on the results, the respondents’ level of competencies on FSCs does not have any correlation with their academic performance on in-campus and off-campus PTCs. This is because the respondents are graded on their on-campus and off-campus based on certain criteria. Grades for both practicums may vary as what Abbott stated: “It may be because grades may be calculated differently from school to school or teacher to teacher.”
Table 6. Relationship between the Respondents’ Academic Performance on Field Study Courses and the Academic Performance on In-Campus and Off-Campus Teaching

| Field Study Courses | Coefficient/Values | P-Values | Verbal Interpretation |
|---------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------|
| In-Campus Teaching  |                     |          |                       |
| FS 1                | 0.174               | 0.006    | Significant           |
| FS 2                | 0.374               | <0.0001  | Significant           |
| FS 3                | 0.282               | <0.0001  | Significant           |
| FS 4                | 0.060               | 0.344    | Not Significant       |
| FS 5                | 0.197               | 0.002    | Significant           |
| FS 6                | 0.451               | <0.0001  | Significant           |
| Off-Campus Teaching |                     |          |                       |
| FS 1                | 0.249               | <0.0001  | Significant           |
| FS 2                | -0.025              | 0.695    | Not Significant       |
| FS 3                | 0.079               | 0.212    | Not Significant       |
| FS 4                | 0.288               | <0.0001  | Significant           |
| FS 5                | 0.118               | 0.063    | Not Significant       |
| FS 6                | -0.029              | 0.645    | Not Significant       |

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 6 shows the relationship between the academic performance on FSCs and academic performance on in-campus and off-campus PTCs of the Pre-Service Teachers of Rizal Technological University College of Education.

As revealed from the table, most of the respondents’ academic performance in Field study courses is positively correlated with the academic performance on In-campus and Off-Campus teaching.

Field Study 1 with p-values of 0.006 for In-campus Teaching and <0.0001 for Off-campus Teaching is the only subject who have a significant relationship for both practicum. This only means that the Pre-Service teachers have mastered learned theories and concepts of Learner’s Development and Environment which have been evidently manifested during their final demonstration on the said practicum.

All Academic Performance on FSCs has a significant relationship with the Academic Performance for In-Campus Teaching except for Field Study 4 who happened to have a p-value of 0.344. This connotes that there were problems that arise during the time when the pre-service teachers underwent exploring the Curriculum thus, manifested a low mastery of the learned concepts and theories.
on the said subject.

Pre-service teachers’ Academic performance for Field Study 1 and Field Study 4 has a significant relationship with the Academic Performance for Off-Campus Teaching both having a p-value of <0.0001. This goes to show that learned concepts and theories on Learner’s Development and Environment plus Exploring the Curriculum was evidently manifested by the respondents during their Off-Campus Teaching. However, learned concepts and theories on some Field Study Courses were not justified during Off-Campus Teaching as reflected in the respondents’ grades on the subject.

Therefore, the hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the academic performance on field study courses and academic performance on in-campus and off-campus teaching of the pre-service teachers is – rejected. We conclude that based on this sample; the academic performance on field study courses does have a correlation with the academic performance on in-campus and off-campus teaching. This means that grades on Field study courses are directly proportional to the grades on in-campus and off-campus teaching. The higher the grades in Field Study Courses, the Higher the grades in In-Campus and Off-campus teaching. However, certain factors greatly affect the results. (e.g., Teacher Matter, Curriculum Implementation, etc.)

Above findings can be related to the study of Timbol, wherein he tried to look for a significant relationship between the academic achievement of both BSED and BEED pre-service teachers on their General Education, Professional Education, Field of Specialization and Field Study Courses with the Academic Achievement on Student Teaching Performance. He found out that Saint Michael’s College of Laguna’s Pre-Service Teachers’ Academic Achievement has a significant relationship with Academic Achievement in Student Teaching Performance.
CONCLUSION

With the findings mentioned above, the following conclusions are drawn: Pre-service teachers manifested a good academic performance of Field Study Courses and have performed very well during practice teaching as reflected in their grades. They also showed a very high level of competencies on field study courses. Among all the Field Study Courses, the pre-service teachers have mastered competencies on Learners’ Development and Environment and Technology in Learning Environment. However, there are competencies on Field Study Courses which still needs to be developed by the pre-service teachers while the level of competencies on field study courses has nothing to do with the grades obtained by the pre-service teachers on both Field Study and Practice Teaching. Lastly, the higher the grades on field study courses, the higher the grades on practice teaching can get.
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