

Ways forward: proposed contextualized curriculum model

Oliver E. Ortiz Jr.

Part-time Professor, Graduate School
Greenville College
Teacher III, Ciudad Nuevo De Naic National High School

April Rey D. Ranay

Student, Graduate School, Greenville College
Teacher II, Santiago National High School

Maria Elisa B. Balbuena

Student, Graduate School, Greenville College
Teacher II, Libtong Gamay Elementary School

Rusell A. Madrona

Student, Graduate School, Greenville College
Senior High School Teacher I, Hupi National High School

Rea S. Carangian

Student, Graduate School, Greenville College
Teacher I, Gulap Elementary School

Abstract: This study proposed a contextualized curriculum model based on the current educational trends. This study also aimed to assess the practicality, usability, relevance, feasibility and replicability of the developed contextualized curriculum model across subject areas. In assessing the proposed curriculum model, the researchers selected 100 school heads and 100 curriculum experts among selected basic education institution in the Philippines. The study used validation tool which was crafted by the researchers. Results showed that the respondents strongly agreed that the developed contextualized curriculum model was highly practical, relevant, useful, feasible and replicable. Also the study concluded that the developed contextualized curriculum model generally adhered to the 21st Century teaching and learning process and also being responsive with the SDGs (Quality Education) domain. Thus, the study recommended that further empirical investigation should be conducted to practically test the implication of the developed contextualized curriculum model to actual teaching and learning process.

Keywords: proposed, contextualized, curriculum, practical, relevant, useful, feasible, replicable, school heads, teaching, learning, process

Date Submitted: May 13, 2025

Date Accepted: May 17, 2025

Date Published: May 23, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum is the spine and back of an educational system. It contains standards primarily consists by teaching and learning competencies. As for the historical beginnings of Philippine educational system, imperialist nations like Spain, United States of America and Japan have greatly influence the country's present educational system. In this line, it can visibly deduce that most of the current system that the Philippine educational system enjoys today, is drawn from the American

contributions. Apparently, curriculum is responsive, progressive and dynamic to effect effective and retentive teaching and learning process. In the words of VanTassel-Baka (2022), curriculum model emphasizes the importance of learning skills and concepts within the predetermined domain of inquiry using a deliberate instructional approach. Also, similar study shows that in curriculum model contains process and product in the dimension places heavy emphasis on lifelong learning skills. Design and development of relevant and responsive curriculum is also one of the difficult tasks of the teachers and school heads. On the other hand, Mondebelu (2015) shows that policy-makers, curriculum experts, school heads, teachers and other stakeholders should put emphasis in the creation, design and development of contextualized curriculum models which include learners' needs. The researchers comprehensively observed that curriculum developed and designed which is still used today becomes less responsive to the apparent needs and demands of teachers and learners in each local communities across regions in the Philippines. Thus, the researchers also observed that there are different needs and concerns in line with the teaching and learning competencies that are to be based locally or contextually on the knowledge, skills and attitudes of the learners among communities in the country. In this regard, the researchers carefully observe what most pressing indicators that can be utilized in order to design and develop contextualized curriculum model where school heads, teachers and other stakeholders can use as reference to proceed with highly contextualized teaching and learning process.

Research Objectives

This study designed and developed a contextualized curriculum based in the current observations and concerns experienced by the researchers. Also, the study specifically assessed the proposed contextualized curriculum model in terms of practicality, usability, relevance, feasibility and replicability as assessed school heads and selected curriculum experts. In addition, the study aimed to examine if there would be a significant difference between the assessment of school heads and curriculum experts in assessing the proposed contextualized curriculum model.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized descriptive research design in order to describe and assess the proposed contextualized curriculum model in terms of practicality, usability, relevance, feasibility and replicability across subject areas. In other words, the proposed contextualized curriculum model aimed to integrate among subject areas. Descriptive research is an appropriate research design to be used in this study as school heads and selected curriculum experts only described and assessed the proposed contextualized curriculum model.

Respondents and Locale of the Study

The subject respondents of the study were the 100 randomly selected school heads among selected public schools in the Philippines and 100 curriculum experts across division offices under the Department of Education. Selection of the respondents was based on the willingness of the school heads and curriculum experts to participate in the study.

Research Instrument

The study utilized a researcher-made-validation tool in the form of survey-questionnaire which contained five (5) parts. For part 1, it contained items relating to the practicality of the proposed curriculum model while part 2 contained items relating to the usability of the proposed contextualized curriculum. Meanwhile, part 3, contained items relating to the relevance while part 4, contained items relating to the feasibility of the proposed contextualized curriculum model. Lastly, part 5 contained items relating to the replicability of the proposed curriculum.

The developed tool used a 4-Likert Scale across all parts where: 4-Likert Scale such as: 4-Highly Evident, 3-Evident, 2-Not Evident and 1-Highly Not Evident. The researcher-made survey questionnaire underwent reliability testing through pilot testing among non-included respondents who were participated by 15 school heads. The result of reliability testing obtained a Cronbach Alpha of .718 for items in part 1 while .812 Cronbach Alpha result for items under part 2 and .811 for items in part 3. Meanwhile, items in part 4 obtained a Cronbach Alpha result of .912 while items under part 5 obtained .876. These results signified that all items across five parts were “Acceptable.”

Data Analysis

The researchers sent a formal letter of request to the respondents’ immediate head and informed consents to the subject respondents. In this line, the researchers established active and consistent line of communication through their social media account. Google form was used in order to administer the survey-questionnaire. Link was shared through the respondents’ social media account. When all the data have been collected and encoded on a digital facility created by the researchers through MS Excel, appropriate statistical tools were applied.

Consequently, the researchers utilized appropriate statistical tools such as mean, standard deviation and general weighted mean in order to assess the practicality, usability, relevance, feasibility and replicability of the proposed curriculum model. On the other hand, ANOVA was used in order to examine if there would be a significant difference on the assessment of school heads and curriculum experts to the proposed contextualized curriculum model.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Assessment on the proposed contextualized curriculum model

Proposed contextualized curriculum model is a crafted based on the significant concerns and the prevailing educational conditions observed by the researchers. Hence, the results show that the respondents assessed the proposed model as highly practical, highly useful, highly relevant feasible and highly replicable. Apparently, the contextualized curriculum model is assessed as highly practical because in so far as resources to be used are concerned, the proposed model significantly emphasized the optimization of localized resources which may potentially address resource deficiencies including instructional materials. The proposed model is assessed based on its proposition to provide contextual and locally made resources that can be directly used by the teachers and learners across subject areas. Further, the result shows that the respondents assessed that the model is highly useful to address the needs and concerns of schools dependent on their

current situations. The model introduces significant reformation to community-based education where it offers situational-practical forms of teaching and learning process.

Meanwhile, the respondents also assessed that the proposed contextualized curriculum model is highly relevant. The result means that the respondents examine that the elements contained on the model directly or indirectly address several concerns in terms of educational relevance. The grandeur of the model exhibits in its localized or contextualized aspect. Teachers and learners share their on-ground experiences that can be a critical point for the improvement of teaching and learning process. Experiences and community exposure are also fused in the model. Further, the respondents assessed that the proposed model is feasible. This suggests that the model can be a great contributory mechanism or machinery to help the department obtain quality-based education. Moreso, the model needs no large funding in order to take effect quality instruction because materials and other resources are to be drawn locally. Lastly, the respondents assessed that the proposed contextualized curriculum model is highly replicable where other schools can use the same contextualized curriculum model to respond with the prevailing needs and educational concerns they face within their respective institutions. In addition, the respondents emphasized that elements contained in the model are the vital to create more progressive and highly inclusive teaching and learning process.

The results affirmed the study of Azano et al. (2017) which reveals that design and development of contextualized curriculum model named: CLEAR (Challenge Leading to Engagement, Achievement and Results) helped teachers and learners to qualify differentiation gearing towards meaningful teaching and learning experiences. Also, similar study has shown that curriculum model based on bigger ideas and essential questions of discipline make it more complex and perceived to be an effective machinery for the development of educative process.

Assessed effects of visionary leadership to modern approach to curriculum planning and development

The computed t-values for practicality, usability and feasibility which are 5.732, 3.058, 2.653 and 5.273 respectively. All are greater than the critical value of 1.969 and corresponding p-values which are 0.000, 0.002, 0.007 and 0.000 are all less than the level of significance alpha .05. Thus, there are significant differences on the assessments of the respondents on the proposed contextualized curriculum model as to practicality, usability and feasibility. This suggests that the assessments differed in the majority of the variables hence, the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference between the assessment of school heads and curriculum experts in assessing the proposed contextualized curriculum model" is rejected. The result implies that in the general assessments of school heads and curriculum experts on the proposed contextualized curriculum model are significantly differed on they assessed proposed model. School head-respondents gave higher ratings on the proposed curriculum model which suggests that they significantly affirmed the validity and implications of the model as it reflects the on-ground educational conditions of their school confronted with diverse local challenges in education.

The findings negated the study of Cheung and Wong (2011) which reveals that there is an agreement and support of school heads and curriculum experts on the reformation and modification

of curriculum that are to be met based on the local needs. Also, similar study shows that school heads agree on the changes on curriculum emphasizing its practices, teaching and learning strategies and cross-curricula learning.

CONCLUSION

Contextualized curriculum model was based on the current needs and conditions faced by school heads and teachers in the delivery of basic and adequate education. The necessity of relating the elements in the curriculum to local needs is a paramount aspect to create more meaningful and highly inclusive educational system. The proposed contextualized curriculum model contained five (5) significant elements such as: resource-based teaching, situational-practical teaching, community-based instructional materials, concrete-authentic assessment and collaborative monitoring and supervision. Hence, school heads and curriculum experts assessed that the proposed contextualized curriculum model was highly practical, relevant, useful, feasible and replicable. Also the study concluded that the developed contextualized curriculum model generally adhered to the 21st Century teaching and learning process and also being responsive with the SDGs (Quality Education) domain. Apparently, there was a significant difference on the assessments of school heads and curriculum experts on the proposed contextualized curriculum model in terms of practicality, usability and feasibility.

RECOMMENDATION

The study recommends further investigation on the practical implication of the proposed contextualized curriculum model on actual teaching and learning process. Thus, the study also recommends to include the participation of different stakeholders in assessing the content of the model. In addition, the study also recommends to test the model in a one-school year period so as to examine its effectiveness and the potential challenges it may face during the actual implementation.

REFERENCES

- Azano, A. P., Missett, T. C., Tackett, M. E., & Callahan, C. M. (2017). The clear curriculum model. *Fundamentals of Gifted Education*, 293–309. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315639987-27>
- Cheung, A. C. K., & Man Wong, P. (2011). Effects of school heads' and teachers' agreement with the Curriculum Reform on curriculum development progress and student learning in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(5), 453–473. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541111146369>
- Modebelu, M. N. (n.d.). Curriculum development models for quality educational system. *Educational Leadership and Administration*, 262–281. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-1624-8.ch015>
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (2022). Introduction to the integrated curriculum model. *Content-Based Curriculum for Advanced Learners*, 17–36. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003310426-4>