



ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES ON CONTEXTUALIZATION AND LOCALIZATION OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN EASTERN SAMAR DIVISION

Picardal, Benchel M.¹, Lorna D. Capito, Ed. D.²

¹Teacher III, Cadi-an Elementary School, Dep.Ed Division of Eastern Samar

²Adviser

Picardal, Benchel Montiangodo, Eastern Samar State University, Borongan City, Eastern Samar, Philippines. 1st Semester, School Year 2019 - 2020.

ABSTRACT

With the full swing implementation of the K to 12 curriculum, contextualization and localization has become integral in support of the principle that learners learn best when lessons are presented with meaning and are relevant to their lives. Using the correlation research method and an adapted data gathering instrument, this study tried to examine the relationship between the attitudes and practices of 289 elementary school teachers in Oras Districts, Oras, Eastern Samar towards the implementation of contextualization and localization. It also examined set of profile characteristics which may have relationship with attitudes and practices. From the findings it was found that respondents are less anxious towards the implementation of contextualization and localization, making them receptive to change, and with high sense of community. Implementation practices have manifested a dissonance among the teachers in the districts indicating a need to create a synergy among schools. Further, it was revealed that age and length of service have positive weak relationship with respondents' anxiety. Work position on the other hand indicated a negative weak relationship with sense of community and networking and linkages. Meanwhile, educational attainment and work position have shown negative correlation with practices while only anxiety among four attitudes evaluated was not significantly related with practices. It is recommended that implementation practices be improved by strengthening networks and linkages, formulating policies responsive to local situations, and providing relevant trainings to teachers.

KEYWORDS: *K to 12 curriculum, attitudes, practices, contextualization, localization*

INTRODUCTION

By virtue of Republic Act 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, monumental change happened to the Philippine educational system--the implementation of the K to 12 Program of the Enhanced Basic Education Curriculum. Not only that this newly implemented curriculum changed the conventional ways of teaching but has imposed upon the education sector changes in many aspects of the curriculum under the basic education programs (Ocampo, 2014).

Recently, much attention has been poured upon the contextualization and localization of the curriculum marked by series of national and local workshop trainings on the creation of contextualized and localized learning resources. This move to create contextualized and localized curriculum is primarily anchored on the principles that learners learn best when lessons in class are presented with meaning and are relevant to the lives of the learners (Pecson, 2014).

The current concern on the importance of the inclusion of contextualization and localization as an overall purpose of the curriculum is rooted on the need to uplift educational performance in the country. Recently, the National Achievement Test (NAT) revealed alarming educational gaps. Through an improved NAT mean percentage score (MPS) in Math, Science, Filipino, English, and Social Studies is recorded at 54.66% to 66.9% from 2005 to school year 2012 – 2013, the results for Grade 6 level NAT is still far below the national acceptable standards of 75%. This is also true to records set by the high schools in the country. Participation rate for 12-15 years improved from 61.16% from 2005 to 64.8% by 2013, yet it is still below the planning standard of 100%.

Serious implications these problems are seen by Perin (2011) especially for the trajectory in academics of learners who have not been well equipped with all foundation skills as they enter secondary and post-secondary education. Literature suggests that teaching the basics across fields of discipline may provide answer to these problems (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007; Lee & Spratley, 2010). One way to address this relationship is through contextualization.

In Eastern Samar, there have been no studies concerning implementation of contextualization and localization of the K to 12 Curriculum though the newly implemented curriculum covers these two important features. More so, attitudes and practices of



the teachers have not been investigated. It is believed that, along the advent of the K to 12 curriculum, delivery of instruction goes with the changes in the curriculum facets. The introduction of contextualization and localization needs further strengthening; thus much foci and attention must be given to its implementation. This study therefore focused on evaluating the attitudes and practices of teachers towards contextualization and localization in the primary level in order to provide salient feedbacks on efficacy of the implementation. This study, therefore, aimed at identifying first-hand information that would support the increasing call for a contextualized and localized curriculum implementation.

METHODOLOGY

This investigation utilized the quantitative research design specifically the correlational method. Total enumeration of respondents was employed in this study. Teachers in the elementary schools in Oras Districts served as the research respondents. These teachers are working as regular permanent employees of the Department of Education (DepEd) and have been teaching in the elementary level for at least one year during the implementation of contextualization and localization.

Two sets of adapted questionnaires were administered in order to gather essential data that addressed the objectives set for the study. The first instrument is based on some indicators/statements adapted from Schrubba (2008) that were modified to describe attitudes towards contextualization and localization. The second set of instrument is based on some indicators taken from Kenea (2014). Indicators were modified to fit into the research objectives.

Data on the profile characteristics of the respondents was measured using nominal and ratio measurement. Age, length of service, number of relevant trainings attended was measured using absolute number.

Sex was measured utilizing a nominal scale:

- 1- Male
- 2- Female

Highest Educational Attainment was measured using the following ordinal scale:

- 1- BS Degree
- 2- BS Degree with MA units
- 3- Master's Degree
- 4- MA with PhD/EdD/DA(other related doctoral degree) units
- 5- Doctoral Degree

Responses on indicators of the attitude towards the contextualization and localization of the K-12 curriculum were measured through a five-point Likert scale, as follows:

- 1- Strongly Disagree
- 2- Disagree
- 3- Neutral
- 4- Agree
- 5- Strongly Agree

Data on teachers' practices towards contextualization and localization of the K to 12 curriculum was measured through a five-point Likert scale, as follows:

- 1- Rarely/never
- 2- Sometimes
- 3- Half of the Time
- 4- Often
- 5- Always

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data contained in the following sections serve as benchmark information in understanding contextualization and localization implementation as this is an initial evaluation on focusing on attitudes and practices regarding the aforementioned curriculum implementation.

Profile Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of respondents' profile characteristics. As to educational attainment, Data reveals that on average respondents' are holders of BS Degree and are holding Teacher I positions. It can be gleaned that on average, respondents are at their late 30's, have been working for more than a decade, and at an average have attended relevant professional development activities more than two times only.



Table 1. Frequency distribution of respondents' profile characteristics

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
BS Degree	197	68.2
BS with MA	90	31.1
MA Degree	2	.7
Total	289	100.0
Rank/Position	Frequency	Percent
Teacher I	206	71.3
Teacher II	60	20.8
Teacher III	23	8.0
Total	289	100.0
Age	Frequency	Percent
25-36	162	56.1
37-49	74	25.6
50-61	53	18.3
Total	289	100.0
Years of Teaching	Frequency	Percent
1-12	202	69.9
13-24	47	16.3
25-34	40	13.8
Total	289	100.0
Number of Trainings	Frequency	Percent
1 to 3	252	87.2
4 to 6	16	5.5
7 to 10	21	7.3
Total	289	100.0

Networking and Linkages

Table 2 provides statistical information on respondents' attitudes on contextualization and localization in terms of networking and linkages. Respondents were made to rate themselves according to their agreement regarding eight (8) indicators on the aforementioned parameter. As can be seen in table 4, on average respondents have a "neutral" agreement with respect to networking and linkages. This is supported by a median of three (3) except for indicator 36 which obtained a median of 4.



Table 2. Summary statistics of respondents’ attitude towards networking and linkages

Attitudes Indicators	Median	Range
5. I show little interest in asking support my from my school head in view of contextualization and localization of curriculum.	3	4
17. I always seek technical assistance administrators and authorities to make contextualization and localization easier for me.	3	4
21. Whenever I have difficulty in contextualizing and localizing lessons, I always seek motivation from my administrators and coworkers.	3	4
26. I always let my school head know whenever I am having trouble with contextualization and localization.	3	4
27. I enjoy talking to other educators about contextualization and localization of curriculum.	3	4
28. In view of the pursuit for curriculum contextualization and localization, I let my school head know that I am have great interest.	3	4
32. I am willing to extend help to other teachers who like me, have difficulty in delivering contextualized and localized lessons.	3	4
36. I share my knowledge about contextualization and localization to my school head and coworkers.	4	4

Receptiveness

Relative to respondents’ receptiveness on contextualization and localization, 13 indicators were presented and rated using a 5-point Likert scale.

Table 4. Summary statistics on respondents’ receptiveness to contextualization and localization

Attitudes Indicators	Median	Range
2. Contextualizing and Localizing learning contents and resources is something that I enjoy very much.	4	3
3. I like the concept of contextualization and localization in the teaching and learning process.	4	3
6. Looking for local resources and transforming them into learning materials is a thing that I enjoy the most.	4	3
7. I feel at ease delivering contextualized lessons and creating localized materials	4	3
8. I would like to do some extra readings on contextualization and localization	4	4



10. Contextualization and localization is an easy work for me.	3	4
14. Sometimes, I find time to understand deeper the strategies of curriculum contextualization and localization.	4	3
16. I understand the rudiments or basic principles of contextualization and localization.	3	4
25. It does not disturb or upset me to do contextualization and localization.	4	4
29. I like the challenge associated with contextualization and localization of some learning contents.	4	4
34. It is important for me to understand the work I do in the class.	4	4
35. I have a good feeling toward contextualization and localization.	4	4
38. I have a real desire to learn everything about contextualization and localization of subject matter.	4	4

Anxiety

On the measure of respondents' anxiety on contextualization and localization, Table 4 reveals, that on average, respondents have disagreement to more than 50% of the indicators. As such, it is implied that majority of the teacher-respondents do not feel anxious about the implementation of contextualization and localization of the k to 12 curriculum. As presented in the previous section, respondents have a strong agreement that they are receptive to the contextualization and localization features of the new curriculum, thus supporting their low anxiety.

Table 4. Summary statistics on respondents' anxiety towards contextualization and localization

Attitudes Indicators	Median	Range
4. I do not do very well in contextualization and localization of learning contents in the subjects that I teach.	3	4
9. Contextualization and localization do not clearly impact to the society where learners live.	3	4
11. When I hear the word "contextualization and localization I have a feeling of dislike.	2	4
13. I would like to spend less time contextualizing and localizing curriculum content, instead, I would like to deliver the lessons the way they are presented in the curriculum.	3	4
18. I do not like anything about the process of contextualization and localization.	2	3
19. No matter how hard I try, I cannot understand the concept of contextualization and localization.	2	4



20. I feel tense or upset when someone talks or asks about contextualization and localization.	2	4
22. I often think, I cannot do contextualization and localization of curriculum.	2	4
30. It makes me nervous to even think about doing contextualization.	3	4
31. The idea of contextualization is not really helpful to the learners and to the overall learning process.	2	4
33. The only reason I am doing contextualization is because I am obliged to.	3	4
37. I do not like to ask questions to curriculum experts concerning contextualization and localization.	2	4
39. If I do not see how to contextualize/localize a lesson right away, I never get to finish it.	3	4

Sense of Community

On respondents' attitude towards building a sense of community with respect to practicing contextualization and localization of the k to 12 curriculum, a consensus on 4 out of 5 indicators was evident among majority of the respondents. This result indicated that on top of respondents' receptiveness to the curricular change as supported by their low anxiety, teachers have high sense of community in the implementation of contextualization and localization. This reveals that elementary teachers in Oras districts embrace curricular changes by way of creating a collaborative network. These findings are supported by the median and range values of 4.

Table 5. Summary statistics of respondents' sense of community towards contextualization and localization

Attitudes Indicators	Median	Range
1. I believe that Contextualization and Localization provide significant contribution to preserving local culture and tradition of the community.	5	4
12. Most teachers should learn to embrace contextualization and localization in the context of preserving community's identity.	4	4
15. Contextualization and localization is helpful in understanding the community and society at present.	4	3
23. The concept of contextualization and localization is of great importance to the country's development.	4	4
24. It is important to contextualize and localize instructions for learners to become more globally competent.	4	4

The preceding discussion suggests that majority of the respondents exhibited healthy disposition on contextualization and localization as new features of the k to 12 curriculum. This is supported by a high degree of receptiveness to the change in curriculum and their low level of anxiety. This finding corroborates Uche (2014) as she found that teachers in Nigeria have positive attitude and views towards inclusive education which is reflective of a contextualized and localized classroom. This also supports the study of Areekkuzhiyil (2014) which revealed that the teachers have a positive attitude towards the restructured curriculum at under graduate level in Kerala.



Practices

A total of 10 indicators describing different practices revolving around the subject matter were presented to and rated by the teacher-respondents according to the degree of implementation. A dissonance is observed from among the responses provided by the teachers. Only 40% of the indicators are “often” practiced by the respondents,” another 40% are “half of the time” implemented, while about 20% are sometimes practiced.

Results implicate that despite strong attitude towards receptiveness and sense of community, there is still a gap between respondents’ attitudes and their actual contextualization and localization practices. From the dissonance of the results, it can further be implied that there is much variability in terms of what teachers actually implement in their classroom than what they think and feel about contextualization and localization. This may be explained by their neutrality in terms of building networks and linkages, because however positive their attitudes are if they solitary work on the implementation, synergistic practices may be neglected.

Table 6. Summary statistics of respondents’ contextualization and localization practices.

Practices Indicators	Median	Range
1. I utilize actual site visitations where applicable in order to make my lesson more vivid.	3	4
2. I invite local community elders/leaders to my classroom so that they talk to the class on some local issues related to my subject matter	2	4
3. I invite experts in the locality to my classroom so that they train my students on practical matters.	2	4
4. There are some differences between what I teach and what is in the textbooks	3	4
5. Community studies (in the form of projects and assignments on community structures, health, relationships, governance, etc.) form important part of the subject I teach.	4	3
6. I indulge myself in professional development activities (i.e. trainings/workshops/online readings) on curriculum contextualization and localization	4	3
7. I ask technical assistance from experts on how to contextualize the curriculum (for e.g., discussions after classroom observations included contextualization as an issue)	3	4
8. I see to it that mechanisms are in place to follow up curriculum contextualization through students’ feedbacks and comments.	3	4
9. I include Curriculum adaptation as an agenda for discussion on quarterly review of performance	4	4
10. I create materials (other than those suggested in the textbook) to be used in my instruction.	4	4

The aforementioned results somewhat support the study of Kenea (2014). It was revealed that effort at contextualizing the curriculum is terribly lacking. Further, she elaborated that though there is institutional concern over curriculum relevance, in practice, the attempt made to model the process through inclusion of elements of curriculum contextualization into teachers’ performance assessment criteria and textbook evaluation guides is extremely lacking.



Relationship between Respondents’ Profile Characteristics and Attitudes towards Contextualization and Localization

In order to understand respondents’ profile characteristics in relation to their contextualization and localization attitudes and practices, test on correlation was performed.

Among the profile variables, three (3) characteristics (age, work position, and length of service) manifested significant relationship with three (3) of the four (4) attitudes assessed. At 0.01 and 0.05 levels of significance, respondents’ work position revealed a negatively weak relationship with their sense of community and networking and linkages ($r = -0.127, 0.030; r = -0.156, 0.028$).

Though relatively weak, results imply that work position co-varies negatively with respondents’ sense of community and networking and linkages. With p-values lower than the level of significance, there is suffice evidence to say that as teacher’s position go higher an inverse variation is exhibited by respondents’ attitudes on sense of community and networking . Implications may suggest that as teachers get promoted and occupy higher ranks, they acquire more knowledge and understanding regarding contextualization and localization thereby inhibiting them to collaborate and get dependent with other faculty. They gain autonomy thus diminishing collaborative culture evident in their attitudes towards creating a sense of community and networking.

Table 7. Test on correlation between respondents’ profile characteristics and attitudes

Variable 1	Variable 2	Corr. Coefficient	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Age	Networking	.063	.289	Fail to Reject	Not Significant
Educational Attainment		-.034	.570	Reject	Significant
Work Position		-.156**	.008	Reject	Significant
Length of Service		-.038	.522	Fail to Reject	Not Significant
Number of Trainings		.006	.922	Fail to Reject	Not Significant
Age		Receptive- ness	.045	.446	Fail to Reject
Educational Attainment	.053		.373	Reject	Significant
Work Position	-.074		.211	Reject	Significant
Length of Service	-.041		.486	Fail to Reject	Not Significant
Number of Trainings	-.033		.579	Fail to Reject	Not Significant
Age	Anxiety		.215**	.000	Reject
Educational Attainment		.046	.437	Fail to Reject	Not Significant
Work Position		.129*	.028	Reject	Significant
Length of Service		.214**	.000	Reject	Significant
Number of Trainings		-.077	.191	Fail to Reject	Not Significant



Age		-0.058	.324	Fail to Reject	Not Significant
Educational Attainment		.027	.652	Fail to Reject	Not Significant
Work Position	Sense of Community	-0.098	.097	Reject	Not Significant
Length of Service		-.127*	.030	Reject	Significant
Number of Trainings		.004	.945	Fail to Reject	Not Significant

*significant at 0.01 confidence level

**significant at 0.05 confidence level

Further, age and length of service have indicated weak but positive significant relation with respondents' anxiety. This implies that the older the teachers become, the higher the positions they hold, and longer service they render the lesser anxiety they feel about contextualization and localization implementation. This may be explained by the sense of autonomy and confidence teachers develop as they become tenured in their work.

Meanwhile, Table 9 presents the test on hypothesis to validate the relationship between respondents profile characteristics and their contextualization and localization practices. As shown in table 9, respondents' educational attainment and work position both manifest weak and negative correlation with their practices ($r = -0.144^*$, $r = -0.187^{**}$). As supported by p-values lower than the level of significance, there is enough statistical information to say that these two variables have negative significant relationship with contextualization and localization practices.

Table 8. Test on correlation between respondents' profile characteristics and practices towards contextualization and localization

Variable 1	Variable 2	Corr. Coefficient	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Age		-0.015	.793	Fail to Reject	Not significant
Educational Attainment		-.144*	.014	Reject	Significant
Work Position	Practices	-.187**	.001	Reject	Significant
Length of Service		-0.069	.239	Fail to Reject	Not significant
Number of Trainings		.112	.056	Fail to Reject	Not significant

*significant at 0.01 confidence level

**significant at 0.05 confidence level

Findings reveal that as teachers advance and become progressive with their education and get promoted to higher ranks, a significant and negative variation is observed in their performance of strategies and activities in line with contextualization and localization. This result may further lead to a presumption that position tenure may render teachers' complacent thus resulting to a negative variation in the performance of activities in line with contextualization and localization.



Correlation between Attitudes and Practices

The last set of information shows the test on correlation between respondents' attitudes and practices towards k to 12 curriculum contextualization and localization. It can be gleaned from Table 10 that both respondents' receptiveness and sense of community have shown moderate positive correlation with their practices ($r = .491$, $r = .447$) while networking and linkages have manifested a strong positive correlation ($r = .647^{**}$). From these findings, it is implied that respondents' practices on curriculum contextualization and localization moderately depend on their receptiveness and sense of community. In addition, it is implicated that variance in the performance of various classroom activities to contextualize and localize the curriculum they are implementing may be determined by their attitudes towards building strong network and linkages. This means that as collaboration becomes evident the healthier the practices become and the greater the networks established the more define practices become.

Table 9. Test on correlation between respondents' attitudes and practices towards contextualization and localization

Variable 1	Variable 2	Corr.	p-	Interpretation	
		Coefficient	value		
Networking and Linkages	Practices	.647**	.000	Reject	Significant
		.491**	.000	Reject	Significant
Receptiveness	Practices	.008	.893	Fail to Reject	Not Significant
Anxiety		.447**	.000	Reject	Significant
Sense of Community					

*significant at 0.01 confidence level

**significant at 0.05 confidence level

From the foregoing findings, this initial assessment provides information that in Oras, Eastern Samar, positive attitudes are exhibited among teachers with respect to implementation of contextualization and localization. However, despite this healthy disposition, variability in employed strategies that would give a defining identity to teachers' actual practices on contextualization and localization is still highly evident. This observation is suggestive of the need to create a collaborative environment among teachers in which knowledge on contextualization and localization is shared by and among teachers in the same locality perhaps through the formulation of local and contextualized policies. Kenea (2014) mentioned that among the important roles educational leaderships at various levels play in curriculum contextualization is providing policy back-up and professional support for teachers. In fact, it can be argued that teachers' role ineffectively contextualizing the curriculum is largely a function of effective leadership support.

Further, with the data indicating positive and negative relationships among variables, this study claims that attitudes and practices may be affected by one's personal characteristics. Teachers, as links between the learners, the curriculum resources and the instructional environment play central role in contextualizing the curriculum. It is the teacher who has to recognize if there is any gap between the espoused curriculum element/material and the situation of the child. For this, teachers' knowledge of the learner and their situation is very important Kenea (2014); hence, attitudes and practices matter a lot with respect to successful implementation of contextualization and localization.

CONCLUSIONS

From the careful analyses of the salient findings of the study, the following conclusions are formulated:

1. On average, respondents have been working for more than 10 years already but have been occupying the lowest work position/rank. They have not been progressive in their advanced education, evident by majority of them holding BS degrees only. This might have hindered them from advancing in their promotions that require advanced education unit among other qualification standards. Since implementation of the K to 12 curriculum, on average, they have been to relevant trainings twice only which indicate the need to intensify capability building on these areas.
2. At an average, it is suffice to conclude that majority of the respondents exhibited healthy disposition towards k to 12 curriculum contextualization and localization; they are more receptive and less anxious towards its implementation. In addition, they have high sense of community but have shown neutrality in terms of networking and linkages.
3. In terms of their practices, a divide is evidently shown in the level of practices on contextualization and localization, thus it is safe to say that there is no single best and defining practices among elementary schools in Oras districts. This conclusion



may indicate that practices are not well-defined among schools, hence variability in the strategies implemented by teachers are highly evident.

4. Work position shows a positive correlation with anxiety and a negative correlation with sense of community and networking. Age and length of service have manifested positive correlation with anxiety.
5. Only educational attainment and work position have revealed a significant but negative correlation with respondents' practices while all others have not shown any significant relationship at all; and
6. Among the four attitudes evaluated, only anxiety does not have significant relationship with respondents' practices. This implies that the degree to which variance in the performance of contextualization and localization is achieved does not depend upon teachers feeling of anxiety towards the change in the curriculum implementation features.

REFERENCES

1. Areekuzhiyil, S., (2014). *Attitude of teachers towards the Restructured Curriculum at undergraduate level in Kerala. Journal of Research, Extension and Development. Vol: 2(5); January 2014*
2. Heller, R., & Greenleaf, C. L. (2007). *Literacy instruction in the content areas: Getting to the core of middle and high school improvement. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.*
3. Kenea, A. (2014). *The Practice of Curriculum Contextualization in Selected Primary Schools in Rural Ethiopia. Journal of Education and Practice ISSN 2221735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online) Vol.5, No.10, 2014. Retrieved from www.iiste.org.*
4. Ocampo, D. S., (2014). *Presentation on The K-12 Curriculum.*
5. Pecson, R., (2014). *Localization and Contextualization in Teaching Social Studies. Online Article retrived at ryanramoletepecson. Blogspot.com*
6. Perin, D. (2011). *Facilitating student learning through contextualization. Community College Research Center.*
7. Perin, D., Hare, R. J., Pevely, S. T., & Mason, L. H. (2010). *Contextualized written summarization by academically-underprepared community college students. Unpublished manuscript.*
8. *Philippine National Education Testing and Research Center. (2013). NAT Overview and 2012 Test Results. Retrieved January 7, 2016, from*
9. Uche, I., (2014). *Teachers Attitude to Curriculum Change: Implications for Inclusive Education in Nigeria. Research on Humanities and Social Sciences. Vol.4, No.11, 2014. Retrieved at www.iiste.org*