TEACHERS AND STUDENTS' DIFFICULTY AND COPING STRATEGY TOWARDS TECHNOLOGY AND LIVELIHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

*Aljaven Bruce C. Laganhon

Paper Received: 09.03.2020 / Paper Accepted: 29.05.2020 / Paper Published: 02.06.2020

Corresponding Author: Aljaven Bruce C. Laganhon; Email: aljaven25bruce@gmail.com; doi:10.46360/globus.xxxxxxxx

Abstract

This study sought to determine the teachers and students' difficulty and coping strategy towards Technology and Livelihood Education Program of Domingo Lacson National High School, Bacolod City during the School Year 2016-2017. Respondents were 26 teachers and 313 students. It employed the descriptive research design and utilized self-made questionnaires. Specifically, it identified the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, length of service, educational attainment, and subject taught (for teachers) and age, sex, year level, and specialization (for students). The level of difficulty of teachers was moderate on physical facilities and assessment tools while high on instructional materials and competencies. Students were low on physical facilities and competencies while moderate on instructional materials and assessment tools. The extent of coping strategy of teachers was moderate on physical facilities and instructional materials while great on assessment tools and competencies. Students were moderate on physical facilities, assessment tools, and competencies while low on instructional materials. Significant difference exists in the level of difficulty of teachers on assessment tools when grouped according to age and on physical facilities when grouped according to subject taught. Significant difference exists in the level of difficulty of students on instructional materials and assessment tools when grouped according to age and on physical facilities and assessment tools when grouped according to specialization. Significant difference exists in the extent of coping strategy of teachers on instructional materials and assessment tools when grouped according to age and on physical facilities when grouped according to subject taught. Significant difference exists in the extent of coping strategy of students on instructional materials, assessment tools, and competencies when grouped according to year level and in all areas when grouped according to specialization.

Keywords: Teachers, Students, Difficulty, Coping Strategies, Technology and Livelihood Education Program.

Introduction

Teachers and students' difficulty and coping strategy towards Technology and Livelihood Education Program are essential dimensions to consider as they have significant impacts on the teaching and learning process itself.

However, at Domingo Lacson National High School, both teachers and students have been facing enormous difficulties in relation to teaching and learning TLE courses. Some of the teachers are forced to teach the subject even without formal background and training. These often resulted to poor evaluation. Likewise, the instructional materials and equipment are not sufficient due to lack of funds. In the same manner, due to limited areas offered by these schools, students are forced to get the mandatory TLE subjects.

Hence, to cope with these difficulties, teachers are forced to subject themselves for training and secure instructional materials and equipment at their own expense. Students, likewise, have to exert more time and effort in understanding and memorizing a whole lot of concepts on TLE-related courses.

It is on this premise that the researcher, as TLE teacher, has been motivated to determine the teachers and students' difficulty and coping strategy towards the Technology and Livelihood Education Program of Domingo Lacson National High School, Bacolod City during the School Year 2016-2017.

Objectives of the Study

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the teacher respondents in terms of the following: age, sex, length of service, educational qualification, and subject taught?
2. What is the profile of the student-respondents in terms of the following: age, sex, year level, and specialization?
3. What is the level of difficulty of the teachers and students when variables are taken as a whole?
4. What is the extent of the coping strategy of the teachers and students when variables are taken as a whole?

5. Is there a significant difference in the level of difficulty of the teachers and students when grouped according to variables?
6. Is there a significant difference in the extent of coping strategy of the teachers and students when grouped according to variables?

Methodology

Respondents were the twenty-two (26) teachers and three hundred and thirteen (313) students. In determining the number of student respondents, the researcher resorted to sample survey with the use of stratified sampling technique.

The study employed the descriptive research design. Furthermore, this study utilized self-made questionnaires, that is, one for the level of difficulty of teachers and students and one for the extent of coping strategy of teachers and students. Specifically, Part I of the questionnaire identified the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, length of service, educational attainment, and subject taught (for teachers) and age, sex, year level, and specialization (for students). While Part 2 contained the survey proper that consisted of 40 items on the level of difficulty and extent of coping strategy. Each dimension had

four (4) areas, namely, physical facilities, instructional materials, assessment tools, and competencies. Each area had ten (10) items or indicators.

The data were analyzed in relation to the research objectives:

Problems 1 and 2 employed the frequency count and percentage in determining the profile of the respondents.

Problems 3 and 4 employed the mean to determine the respondents' level of difficulty and extent of coping strategy towards TLE program.

Problems 5 and 6 employed the t-test to determine whether or not significant difference existed in the levels of difficulty and extents of coping strategy towards the TLE program when respondents are grouped according to age, sex, length of service, year level, and educational qualification while ANOVA was used to determine whether or not significant difference existed when respondents are grouped according to subject taught and specialization.

Findings

Table 1: Profile of Teacher Respondents

Variables	Categories	F	%
Age	Younger (26 to 39 years old)	13	50.0
	Older (40 to 59 years old)	13	50.0
Sex	Male	13	50.0
	Female	13	50.0
Length of Service	Shorter (1 to 11 years)	13	50.0
	Longer (12 to 37 years)	13	50.0
Educational Qualification	Bachelor's Degree	16	61.5
	Master's Degree	10	38.5
Subject Taught	Agriculture	4	15.4
	Carpentry	3	11.5
	Drafting	3	11.5
	Dressmaking	3	11.5
	HE	4	15.4
	ICT	3	11.5
	Massage	3	11.5
	SMAW	3	11.5

The teacher respondents were evenly distributed when considered by age, sex, and length of service. When segregated by educational qualification, the teachers with bachelor's degree constituted more than half of the total number of respondents. When considered by subject taught, each group was also evenly distributed except

those teaching in agriculture and Home Economics/Home Nursing which constituted a little bit more than the rest of the groups.

Table 2: Profile of Student Respondents

Variables	Categories	f	%
Age	Younger (14 to 15 years old)	136	43.5
	Older (16 to 21 years old)	177	56.5
Sex	Male	155	49.5
	Female	158	50.5
	Total	313	100.0
Year Level	Grade 9	167	53.4
	Grade 10	146	46.6
Specialization	Agriculture	40	12.8
	Carpentry	39	12.5
	Drafting	39	12.5
	Dressmaking	39	12.5
	HE/Home Nursing	40	12.8
	ICT	39	12.5
	Massage	39	12.5
	SMAW	38	12.1

On the other hand, the older group of students dominated its counterpart group. When considered by sex, the female group comprised a little more than the male ones. Segregated by year level, the grade 9 students comprised more than its counterpart. When considered by area of specialization, those taking up carpentry, drafting, dressmaking, Information Communications Technology, and massage were evenly distributed. The group with the least number of respondents came from those taking up Shielded Metal Arc Welding (SMAW).

Table 3.1: Level of Difficulty of Teachers When Variables are taken as a Whole

Variable	Category	Physical Facilities		Instructional Materials		Assessment Tools		Competencies	
		Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
As a whole	-	3.39	M	4.07	H	3.41	H	3.04	M

Legend: VI = Verbal Interpretation

M = Moderate

VH = Very High

H = High

L = Low

VL = Very Low

The level of difficulty of teachers towards Technology and Livelihood Education was moderate on physical facilities and competencies while high on instructional materials and assessment tools.

Table 3.2: Level of Difficulty of Students Grouped When Variables are taken as a Whole

Variable	Category	Physical Facilities		Instructional Materials		Assessment Tools		Competencies	
		Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
As a whole	-	2.60	L	2.94	M	3.04	M	2.54	L

Legend: VI = Verbal Interpretation

H = High

L = Low

M = Moderate

VL = Very Low

The level of difficulty of students was low on physical facilities and competencies while moderate on instructional materials and assessment tools.

Table 4.1: Extent of Coping Strategy of Teachers When Variables are taken as a Whole

Variable	Category	Physical Facilities		Instructional Materials		Assessment Tools		Competencies	
		Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
As a whole	-	3.28	M	3.40	M	3.62	G	3.76	G

Legend: VI = Verbal Interpretation M = Moderate VG = Very Great L = Low G = Great VL = Very Low

The extent of coping strategy of the teachers was moderate on physical facilities and instructional materials while great on assessment tools and competencies.

Table 4.2: Extent of Coping Strategy of Students When Variables are taken as a Whole

Variable	Category	Physical Facilities		Instructional Materials		Assessment Tools		Competencies	
		Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
As a whole	-	2.84	M	2.57	L	2.66	M	2.68	M

Legend:
 VI = Verbal Interpretation
 VG = Very Great
 G = Great
 M = Moderate
 L = Low
 VL = Very Low

The students' extent of coping strategy was moderate on physical facilities, assessment tools, and competencies while low on instructional materials.

Table 5.1: Difference in the Level of Difficulty of Teachers According to Age, Sex, Length of Service, and Educational Qualification

Selected Variables	Category	N	df	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Age	Younger	13	12	3.79	0.79	2.977	0.007	Significant
	Older	13	12	3.00				
Sex	Male	13	12	3.50	0.21	0.706	0.487	Not Significant
	Female	13	12	3.29				
Length of Service	Shorter	13	12	3.53	0.28	0.913	0.370	Not Significant
	Longer	13	12	3.25				
Educational Qualification	Bachelor's degree	16	15	3.46	0.18	0.580	0.567	Not Significant
	Master's degree	10	9	3.28				

A significant difference existed in the level of difficulty on the use and provision of assessment tools when teachers were grouped according to age, except in the three areas.

Table 5.2: Difference in the Level of Difficulty of Teachers in the aforementioned Areas When Grouped According to Subject Taught

Area	Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Between Groups	4.302	7	0.615	2.664	0.044	Significant
	Within Groups	4.152	18	0.231			
	Total	8.454	25				
Instructional Materials	Between Groups	4.660	7	0.666	1.496	0.231	Not Significant
	Within Groups	8.010	18	0.445			
	Total	12.670	25				

Assessment Tools	Between Groups	7.837	7	1.120	1.287	0.311	Not Significant
	Within Groups	15.654	18	0.870			
	Total	23.491	25				
Competencies	Between Groups	6.941	7	0.992	2.343	0.069	Not Significant
	Within Groups	7.618	18	0.423			
	Total	14.559	25				

A significant difference also existed on physical facilities, except on the other three areas when teachers were grouped according to subject taught.

Table 5.3: Difference in the Level of Difficulty of Students in the Aforementioned Areas when Grouped According to Age

Area	Age Category	n	df	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Younger	137	136	3.43	-0.06	-0.945	0.345	Not Significant
	Older	177	176	3.49				
Instructional Materials	Younger	137	136	2.85	-0.16	-2.136	0.033	Significant
	Older	177	176	3.01				
Assessment Tools	Younger	137	136	3.04	-0.14	-1.850	0.065	Not Significant
	Older	177	176	3.18				
Competencies	Younger	137	136	3.02	-0.22	-2.606	0.010	Significant
	Older	177	176	3.24				

There was a significant difference existed in the level of difficulty on instructional materials and competencies when students were grouped according to age.

Table 5.4: Difference in the Level of Difficulty of Students in the Aforementioned Areas when Grouped According to Sex

Area	Sex Category	n	Df	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Male	155	154	3.44	-0.05	-0.784	0.434	Not Significant
	Female	158	157	3.49				
Instructional Materials	Male	155	154	2.90	-0.08	-0.979	0.328	Not Significant
	Female	158	157	2.98				
Assessment Tools	Male	155	154	3.12	0.00	0.031	0.975	Not Significant
	Female	158	157	3.12				
Competencies	Male	155	154	3.16	0.03	0.346	0.729	Not Significant
	Female	158	157	3.13				

When students were grouped according to sex, the level of significance revealed no significant difference existed in the level of their difficulty in the four areas.

Table 5.5: Difference in the Level of Difficulty of Students in the Aforementioned Areas when Grouped According to Year Level

Area	Category	n	df	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Grade 9	167	166	2.83	-0.30	-3.242	0.001	Significant
	Grade 10	146	145	3.13				
Instructional Materials	Grade 9	167	166	3.29	-0.15	-1.591	0.113	Not Significant
	Grade 10	146	145	3.44				
Assessment Tools	Grade 9	167	166	3.39	-0.18	-2.413	0.016	Significant
	Grade 10	146	145	3.57				

Competencies	Grade 9	167	166	2.91	0.00	0.005	0.996	Not Significant
	Grade 10	146	145	2.91				

Also a significant difference existed on physical facilities and assessment tools when they were grouped according to year level.

Table 5.6: Difference in the Level of Difficulty of Students in the Aforementioned Areas when Grouped According to Specialization

Area	Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Between Groups	10.531	7	1.504	4.413	0.000	Significant
	Within Groups	103.973	305	0.341			
	Total	114.504	312				
Instructional Materials	Between Groups	6.870	7	0.981	2.137	0.040	Significant
	Within Groups	140.055	305	0.459			
	Total	146.924	312				
Assessment Tools	Between Groups	4.552	7	0.650	1.502	0.166	Not Significant
	Within Groups	132.023	305	0.433			
	Total	136.575	312				
Competencies	Between Groups	11.498	7	1.643	3.005	0.005	Significant
	Within Groups	166.718	305	0.547			
	Total	178.217	312				

Significant difference existed in the areas of physical facilities, instructional materials, and competencies except on assessment tools when students were grouped according to area of specialization.

Table 6.1: Difference in the Extent of Coping of Teachers According to Age, Sex, Length of Service, and Educational Qualification

Selected Variables	Category	n	df	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Age	Younger	13	12	3.81	0.57	3.898	0.001	Significant
	Older	13	12	3.24				
Sex	Male	13	12	3.50	0.19	0.681	0.502	Not Significant
	Female	13	12	3.31				
Length of Service	Shorter	13	12	3.69	0.57	2.223	0.036	Significant
	Longer	13	12	3.12				
Educational Qualification	Bachelor's degree	16	15	3.59	0.48	1.729	0.097	Not Significant
	Master's degree	10	9	3.11				

There was a significant difference in the extent of coping strategy of teachers when teachers were grouped according to age and length of service.

Table 6.2: Difference in the Extent of Coping Strategy in the given areas When Teachers are Grouped According to Subject Taught

Area	Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Between Groups	9.322	7	1.332	2.664	0.044	Significant
	Within Groups	3.068	18	0.170			
	Total	12.390	25				
Instructional Materials	Between Groups	4.282	7	0.612	1.496	0.231	Not Significant
	Within Groups	5.068	18	0.282			
	Total	9.350	25				
Assessment Tools	Between Groups	7.482	7	1.069	1.287	0.311	Not Significant
	Within Groups	7.356	18	0.409			

Competencies	Total	14.838	25				
	Between Groups	13.005	7	1.858			
	Within Groups	21.466	18	1.193	2.343	0.069	Not Significant
	Total	34.471	25				

Likewise, a significant difference existed on physical facilities when teachers were grouped according to subject taught.

Table 6.3: Difference in the Extent of Coping Strategy of Students in the given Areas when Grouped According to Age

Area	Age Category	n	df	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Younger	137	136	2.94	-0.06	-0.685	0.494	Not Significant
	Older	177	176	3.00				
Instructional Materials	Younger	137	136	3.37	0.01	0.115	0.908	Not Significant
	Older	177	176	3.36				
Assessment Tools	Younger	137	136	3.43	-0.07	-0.907	0.365	Not Significant
	Older	177	176	3.50				
Competencies	Younger	137	136	2.93	0.04	0.441	0.659	Not Significant
	Older	177	176	2.89				

The data displayed no significant difference existed in the extent of coping strategy of students when grouped according to age across the four areas.

Table 6.4: Difference in the Extent of Coping Strategy of Students in the given areas when Grouped According to Sex

Area	Sex Category	n	df	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Male	155	154	2.98	0.02	0.297	0.767	Not Significant
	Female	158	157	2.96				
Instructional Materials	Male	155	154	3.33	-0.56	-0.631	0.529	Not Significant
	Female	158	157	3.89				
Assessment Tools	Male	155	154	3.47	0.00	-0.049	0.961	Not Significant
	Female	158	157	3.47				
Competencies	Male	155	154	2.85	-0.11	-1.316	0.189	Not Significant
	Female	158	157	2.96				

When students were grouped according to sex, the data revealed no significant difference existed in the extent of their coping strategy in all four areas.

Table 6.5: Difference in the Extent of Coping Strategy of Students in the given Areas when Grouped According to Year Level

Area	Category	n	df	Mean	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Grade 9	167	166	3.45	-0.04	-0.618	0.537	Not Significant
	Grade 10	146	145	3.49				
Instructional Materials	Grade 9	167	166	2.86	-0.17	-2.154	0.032	Significant
	Grade 10	146	145	3.03				
Assessment	Grade 9	167	166	3.01	-0.23	-3.034	0.003	Significant

Tools	Grade 10	146	145	3.24				
Competencies	Grade 9	167	166	2.99	-0.34	-4.027	0.004	Significant
	Grade 10	146	145	3.33				

There was a significant difference in the coping strategy of students on instructional materials, assessment tools, and competencies when they were grouped according to year level.

Table 6.6: Difference in the Extent of Coping Strategy of Students in the given areas when Grouped According to Specialization

Area	Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Physical Facilities	Between Groups	25.142	7	3.592			
	Within Groups	174.539	305	0.572	6.276	0.000	Significant
	Total	199.682	312				
Instructional Materials	Between Groups	38.098	7	5.443			
	Within Groups	152.575	305	0.500	10.880	0.000	Significant
	Total	190.673	312				
Assessment Tools	Between Groups	14.938	7	2.134			
	Within Groups	124.510	305	0.408	5.227	0.000	Significant
	Total	139.448	312				
Competencies	Between Groups	17.880	7	2.554			
	Within Groups	172.767	305	0.566	4.509	0.000	Significant
	Total	190.647	312				

Likewise, there was a significant difference in all four areas-namely, physical facilities, instructional materials, assessment tools, and competencies when the students were grouped according to specialization.

Conclusion

On the bases of the foregoing findings of the study, the researcher arrived at the following conclusions:

There was inadequacy of instructional materials which are the primary medium for the delivery of the Technology and Livelihood Education. In effect, the teachers' competencies are affected for not being able to connect the subject area content to real life applications. With this, valued learning outcomes were also hampered.

The available facilities, materials, and tools conform to the recommended numbers which are required to support the students' needs such as improving their competencies in the Technology and Livelihood Education subject.

Due to inadequacy of assessment tools, Technology and Livelihood Education teachers exerted a great deal of effort in looking for related materials.

The students were a bit adjusted to the environmental components of Technology and

Livelihood Education classes; hence, they still have to cope in moderate extent in getting the most out of the Technology and Livelihood Education lessons.

Generally, teachers' difficulties in teaching Technology and Livelihood Education cannot be said to exist due to problems associated with their grouping, except their age and subject taught, but to indicators relative to physical facilities or those things that are essentially needed for effective teaching and learning process to take place.

Difficulties in learning Technology and Livelihood Education could not be attributed to factors which are personal in nature but to matters relative to instructional materials.

The inadequacy of the provision of the needed assessment tools necessitates the young and inexperienced teachers to find ways to properly measure how well their students have understood their lessons.

Teachers teaching different subjects needed to deal to some extent on these inadequacies for them to discharge their functions well and help students learn effectively.

The extent of coping strategy of the students essentially differed due to the fact that each year

level and specialization has distinct difficulties, problems, and needs.

Recommendations

In light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are advanced for potential improvements:

The school officials should provide additional instructional materials such as textbooks, modules, worksheets among others for teachers and students' use.

The school officials should provide additional assessment tools particularly laboratory rooms and tools to match the increasing number of users (i.e. teachers and students alike).

The school officials should provide the students with adequate classrooms equipped with proper lighting and ventilation to facilitate quality learning.

The school officials should sufficiently provide the newly hired and inexperienced teachers with necessary instructional and assessment tools to help them deliver their Technology Livelihood Education lessons well. Likewise, they should be sent to training to enhance their teaching skills.

The teachers should continue to upgrade themselves through attending related seminars and trainings to further enhance their teaching skills.

The young and inexperienced teachers should be sent to training to make them equip with the right knowledge and skills in teaching Technology and Livelihood Education.

The students can be provided trainings on coping strategies to address their individual problems and needs.

The students can be provided with proper orientation program so that they may be able to understand the underlying strengths and weaknesses on the implementation of the TLE programs.

Finally, the proposed enhancement program should be implemented to reinforce the teachers' teaching skills and students' learning capabilities.

Conflict of Interest

There is no Conflict of Interest in this work.

References

1. American Psychological Association, (2011). The Guidelines for Psychological Practice. Adopted by the APA Council of

- Representatives, February 18-20, 2011, The Guidelines are available on the APA website at <http://www.apa.org/pi/lgbt/resources/guidelines.aspx>; accessed 12/30/2016.
2. Agarwal, Nidhi, (2007). A Matter of Styles in Education. *Asian Journal of Psychology & Education*, 69(5).
3. Agarwal, Nidhi, (2018). A Study on Content Generation for Internet Usage. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Development*, 3(2); 1380-1382.
4. Bhattacharjee, A., (2012). *Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices*. University of South Florida, U.S.A.
5. Calderon, J., (2012). *Methods of Research and Thesis Writing*. National Book Store, Quad Alpha Centrum Building, 125 Pioneer Street, Mandaluyong City, 1550 Philippines.
6. Chaaban, Y. and Moloney, R., (2016). *An Exploratory Study of the Factors Associated With Literacy Teachers' Integration of Technology: A Study of Lebanese Schools*. Qatar University.
7. Chang, I.H., (2012). The Effect of Principals' Technological Leadership on Teachers' Technological Literacy and Teaching Effectiveness in Taiwanese Elementary Schools. *Educational Technology & Society*, 15 (2), 328–340.
8. Chow, P., (2015). *Teacher's Attitudes Towards Technology in the Classroom*. Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Canada.
9. Cristobal, A. and Cristobal, M.C., (2013). *Research Made Easier: A Step-by-Step Process*. C & E Publishing, Inc. 839 EDSA, South Triangle, Quezon City, Philippines.
10. Deauna, M., (2011). *Applied Educational Statistics*. C & E Publishing, Inc., 839 EDSA, South Triangle, Quezon City, Philippines.
11. Department of Education Order No. 37, (2003). DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City, Metro Manila, Philippines.
12. Department of Education Memorandum No. 468, (2008). DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City, Metro Manila, Philippines.
13. Department of Education Memorandum No. 399, (2009). DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City, Metro Manila, Philippines.
14. Department of Education Order No. 76, (2010). DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City, Metro Manila, Philippines.
15. Department of Education Order No. 67, (2012). Enclosure No. 2. DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City, Metro Manila, Philippines.

16. De Belen, R. and Feliciano, J., (2015). Basic Statistics for Research. First Edition, Wiseman's Books Trading, Inc., Philippines.
17. Garcia, Y., et al, (2014). Difficulties in Reading Comprehension and Metacognitive Strategies for Technology Livelihood Education Students. College of Education Mindanao State University-Iligan Institute of Technology, Philippines.
18. Gravetter, F. and Walnau, L., (2012). Statistics for Behavioral Sciences. Cengage Learning Asia Pte. Ltd., 5 Shenton Way #01-01 UIC Building, Singapore.
19. Guiner, D., (2013). Competencies of Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) Instructors: Input to a Training Module in Industrial Arts. Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University Bacnotan, La Union, Philippines.
<https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=744>; accessed 12/30/2016
<http://www.simplypsychology.org/attitudes.html>; retrieved 12/30/16
<http://study.com/academy/lesson/coping-strategy-definition-lesson-quiz.html>; retrieved 12/30/16
20. Lazarus, R.S. & Folkman, S., (1984). Stress, Appraisal and Coping. New York: Springer.
21. Ronald John C. Sayson, Enna S. Bodoso, (2019). Basic English Skills Training (BEST) E-Learning Tool: CHMSC Experience, Globus An International Journal of Management & IT, 10(2); 44-50, ISSN: 0975-721X.
22. Retome, et al, (2012). Instructional Assessment of Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) Program. Education Department, Southern Leyte State University San Juan Campus, 6611 San Juan, Southern Leyte, Philippines.
23. Salwa, Saeed Al-Harbi, (2019). The Influence of Media in Children's Language Development. Globus Journal of Progressive Education, 9(2); 23-27, doi: 10.46360/globus.9.2.2020.23-27.
24. Sweller, J., (1988). Cognitive Load Theory, Learning Difficulty, and Instructional Design. University of NSW, Sydney, Australia.
25. Vygotsky, M.E., (1973). Understanding the Learning theory, New York: Rutledge Publishers.

How to cite this article:

Laganhon, Aljaven Bruce C. (2020). Teachers and Students' Difficulty and Coping Strategy Towards Technology and Livelihood Education Program. Globus Journal of Progressive Education, 10(1): 82-91.