International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion
https://ijchr.net | eISSN: 3028-1318

Received: May 22, 2025 | Accepted: July 12, 2025 | Published: July 22, 2025
Volume 7 Special Issue 2 | doi: https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.226

Article

Culturally Rooted Pedagogy in Technology and Livelihood Education: Assessing Curriculum Implementation in Western Visayas State Universities

Ronel A. Edobane
Iloilo Science and Technology University
Correspondence: ronel.edobane@isatu.edu.ph

Abstract

This study evaluated the implementation of the Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) program among State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Western Visayas, focusing on curriculum, instruction, and faculty-related concerns. Employing a descriptive-evaluative research design, the study utilized a validated researcher-made questionnaire to collect data from 35 purposively selected respondents, including academic heads and faculty members from seven SUCs. The findings revealed that most of the identified problems were rarely encountered. However, recurring challenges persisted, such as limited opportunities for faculty to pursue postgraduate education, inadequate participation in relevant trainings and seminars, and insufficient time allotted for lesson preparation and instructional responsibilities. SUCs with Level III accreditation reported the least problems, while non-accredited institutions and those with high enrollment but small faculty size experienced more pronounced issues. Beyond technical and administrative factors, the study emphasized the importance of integrating cultural dimensions into the TLE curriculum. Given the inherently community-based and livelihood-oriented nature of TLE, the absence of strong stakeholder involvement, lack of contextualized content, and weak cultural linkages diminish the relevance of the program in serving its purpose. Embedding indigenous knowledge systems, traditional crafts, local entrepreneurial practices, and community values into instruction enhances both the authenticity and impact of vocational education. The study recommends strengthening faculty development initiatives and fostering a culturally responsive curriculum to make TLE more effective, sustainable, and reflective of the Filipino socio-cultural context. These enhancements are crucial in equipping future educators with the competencies needed to address both the practical and cultural demands of 21st-century vocational education.

Keywords: *Technology and Livelihood Education, cultural integration, curriculum implementation, faculty development, Western Visayas SUCs.*

Suggested citation:
Edobane, R. (2025). Culturally Rooted Pedagogy in Technology and Livelihood Education: Assessing Curriculum Implementation in Western Visayas State Universities. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 7*(SI2), 568-586. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.226

Publisher's Note: IJCHR stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Introduction

Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) is a real-life field that aims to provide practical knowledge, technological and vocational efficiency, and problem-solving abilities relevant to daily life. More than a technical discipline, TLE is deeply rooted in the socio-cultural realities of Filipino communities, where livelihood practices are often interwoven with indigenous knowledge systems, traditional crafts, local entrepreneurship, and culturally shaped labor practices (Nemenzo, 2018; UNESCO, 2013). It mainly intends to train future teachers for technology and livelihood education, preparing them for various methods, strategies, and culturally responsive pedagogical approaches. TLE thus becomes a conduit for sustaining local economies and cultural heritage through education (De Guzman & Choi, 2013).

Fernandez (2018) highlighted the growing focus on technological innovations in education. Three key trends are evident: the shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered instruction; the emphasis on holistic development over rote learning; and the increasing use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in pedagogy. When aligned with cultural contexts, these innovations ensure that modern practices complement rather than displace traditional knowledge (Salazar-Clemeña, 2015). In line with this, culturally adaptive TLE ensures relevance in global and local arenas (Hallinger & Bryant, 2013).

Every Filipino graduate must be prepared for employment, entrepreneurship, or higher education to meet national labor demands (Dela Peña, 1993; Commission on Higher Education [CHED], 2017). Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) must structure their curricula to reflect their mission and equip learners with technical skills and culturally grounded competencies supporting community development (Sibayan, 2016). Vocational subjects in TLE, such as agriculture, culinary arts, and industrial arts, are often informed by time-honored techniques passed down through generations, underscoring the importance of preserving and validating cultural practices in modern instruction (Del Mundo, 2020; Corpuz & Salandanan, 2011).

Following CHED Memorandum Order No. 78, s. In 2017, seven State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Western Visayas transitioned from BSEd TLE to BTLEd during AY 2018–2019. This policy shifts increased enrollment and enhanced learner capabilities through more inclusive and culturally sensitive curricula (CHED, 2017). Students gained technical competence and developed vocational identities shaped by local culture and values (Gadia & Doromal, 2021).

However, the Philippine Statistics Authority (2019) reported a 20.9% unemployment rate among teacher education graduates, raising concerns about educational relevance and graduate employability. In response, educational reforms

aim to improve quality by ensuring programs like TLE are responsive to labor market needs and cultural realities (Aguado, 2020). Thus, through TLE, the academe must continue producing a workforce with skills and work ethics rooted in local contexts and national development goals (Brillantes & Fernandez, 2008).

On this premise, the researcher seeks to assess the implementation and cultural responsiveness of the TLE Program among State Universities and Colleges in Western Visayas. Hence, this study.

Statement of the Problem

1. What are the problems encountered in the implementation of Technology and Livelihood Education Program in Western Visayas in the following areas: (a) Curriculum and Instruction, (b) Faculty, (c) Physical Plant Facilities, (d) Laboratory Facilities, (e) Administrative Support, (f) Support to Students, and (g) Admission Policy when they are taken as entire group and classified according to SUC level, types of SUC, faculty size, enrolment size, and accreditation status?

Research Methods

This study employed a descriptive-evaluative research design to assess the implementation of the Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) program in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Western Visayas. The design was appropriate for providing detailed insights and evaluating existing practices, which served as the basis for a proposed enhancement program. A researcher-made questionnaire, modeled after the AACCUP tool and reviewed by five field experts, was used to gather data. It included open- and closed-ended questions covering respondents' profiles, program implementation, and challenges encountered in curriculum, faculty, facilities, support systems, and policies. Thirty-five purposively selected evaluators from seven SUCs served as respondents, each institution represented by five officials or faculty members with relevant expertise. The questionnaire underwent content validation and was pilot tested among 30 non-participant TLE faculty members. Reliability was confirmed using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded an overall coefficient of 0.965 for program implementation and 0.959 for problems encountered, indicating high reliability. Following validation, the researcher secured institutional approval and informed consent. Despite COVID-19 restrictions, data was collected in-person and through online platforms like Google Forms and email. The data collected were

encoded and statistically processed to generate findings that would inform program improvement.

Results and Findings

Table 1. Problems Encountered in the Implementation of TLE Program in Terms of Curriculum and Instruction Among SUCs in WV When Classified According to Accreditation Status

	Statements	Accreditation Status											
		Not Accredited			Level1			Level2			Level3		
	The TLE Program…	Mean	Desc	SD	Mean	Desc	SD	Mean	Desc	SD	Mead	Desc	SD
1	Faculty, students, stakeholders, and partner schools have less involvement in program planning.	1.67	Rarely	0.58	2.20	Rarely	0.84	1.80	Rarely	0.76	3.00	Frequently	0.00
2	has few linkages to academic benefactors and constituents.	1.33	Seldom	0.58	1.33	Seldom	0.58	2.16	Rarely	0.94	3.00	Frequently	0.00
3	lacks proper dissemination and publicity.	1.33	Seldom	0.58	1.33	Seldom	0.58	1.88	Rarely	0.73	3.00	Frequently	0.00
4	has an inappropriate faculty-student ratio to meet the program requirements and standards.	1.00	Seldom	0.00	1.00	Seldom	0.00	1.76	Rarely	0.83	4.00	Often	0.00
5	have insufficient training facilities such as computers, supplies, materials, tools, and equipment for instructional purposes.	1.00	Seldom	0.00	1.00	Seldom	0.00	2.00	Rarely	0.91	3.50	Often	0.71
6	Lacks parallel program content to the service area needs.	1.67	Rarely	0.58	1.67	Rarely	0.58	2.00	Rarely	0.76	3.50	Often	0.71

7	Lacks a review program for the students in preparation for the board exam.	2.33	Rarely	1.53	2.33	Rarely	1.53	1.68	Rarely	0.75	3.00	Frequently	0.00
8	has a low passing percentage in the Licensure Examination for Professional Teachers.	2.33	Rarely	1.53	2.33	Rarely	1.53	1.60	Rarely	0.87	3.00	Frequently	0.00
Mean		1.59	Rarely	0.71	1.59	Rarely	0.71	1.86	Rarely	0.65	3.25	Frequently	0.00

Note: 4.50 – 5.00, More Often (MO), 3.50 – 4.49, Often (O), 2.50 - 3.49, Frequently (F), 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R), 1.00 – 1.49 (Seldom)

Faculty. Table 2 presents the mean rating of the problems encountered in implementing the TLE Program regarding faculty among SUCs in WV.

Table 2. Problems Encountered in the Implementation of TLE Program in Terms of Faculty Among SUCs in WV

The faculty members in the TLE program…		Mean	Description	SD
1	have limited utilization of sound policy in the faculty hiring process.	1.51	Rarely	0.60
2	They are less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization.	1.91	Rarely	0.65
3	Lack of proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges to the faculty.	1.57	Rarely	0.79
4	Lack opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishment.	1.51	Rarely	0.74
5	Lacks sufficient time for lesson preparation, checking outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities.	1.49	Rarely	0.56
6	have no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education.	1.71	Rarely	0.85
7	have a few relevant trainings and seminars.	1.60	Rarely	0.70
8	lack of motivation and initiative.	1.49	Seldom	0.66
	Mean	1.60	Rarely	0.54

Note: 4.50 – 5.00, More Often (MO), 3.50 – 4.49, Often (O), 2.50 - 3.49, Frequently (F), 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R), 1.00 – 1.49 (Seldom)

The result shows that the faculty obtained (M = 1.60, SD = 0.54). This means that the identified problems were rarely felt as a problem. Among the eight identified problems, the results showed that the most rarely encountered problems were the SUC

faculty having no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education, a lack of proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges to the faculty, and limited utilization of sound policy in the hiring process of faculty. However, the least observed or seldom observed problems were the lack of sufficient time to prepare lessons, check outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities, and the lack of motivation and initiative. This means that the faculty of SUC institutions lacked opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishment and had few relevant trainings and seminars.

Further, the SUCs had limited utilization of sound policy in the faculty hiring process, resulting in less competent and less qualified faculty in their fields of specialization.

SUC Level. Table 3 presents the mean rating of the problems encountered in implementing the TLE Program regarding faculty among SUCs in WV when classified according to SUC Level.

Table 3. Problems Encountered in the Implementation of TLE Program in Terms of Faculty Among SUCs in WV When Classified According to SUC Level

	Statements	SUC Level					
		Level II			Level III		
	The faculty members in the TLE program…	M	Desc	SD	M	Desc	SD
1	have limited utilization of sound policy in the faculty hiring process.	1.73	Rarely	0.59	1.50	Rarely	0.61
2	They are less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization.	1.60	Rarely	0.63	1.55	Rarely	0.69
3	Lack of proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges to the faculty.	1.53	Rarely	0.52	1.45	Seldom	0.60
4	Lack opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishment.	1.60	Rarely	0.83	1.45	Seldom	0.69
5	Lacks sufficient time for lesson preparation, checking outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities.	1.93	Rarely	0.80	1.55	Rarely	0.76
6	have no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education.	1.47	Rarely	0.64	1.55	Rarely	0.76
7	have a few relevant trainings and seminars.	2.07	Seldom	0.70	1.80	Rarely	0.95
8	lack of motivation and initiative.	1.47	Seldom	0.52	1.50	Rarely	0.76

Mean	1.68	Rarely	0.42	1.55	Rarely	0.63

Note: 4.50 – 5.00, More Often (MO), 3.50 – 4.49, Often (O), 2.50 - 3.49, Frequently (F), 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R), 1.00 – 1.49 (Seldom)

The results show that SUC Level II (M = 1.68, SD = 0.42) and SUC Level III (M = 1.55, SD = 0.63) obtained a mean rarely felt as a problem. Among the eight identified problems, the results revealed that rarely observed problems were the lack of sufficient time for preparation of lessons, checking of outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities, limited utilization of sound policy in the hiring process of faculty, and faculty were less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization. However, for SUCs Level III status, the problems seldom observed were a lack of proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges, and the lack of opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishment. In contrast, for SUCs with Level II status, the problems seldom observed were the few relevant trainings and seminars, and the lack of motivation and initiative.

This means that the faculty had no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education and were less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization.

Furthermore, the faculty members at SUC institutions had limited utilization of sound policies in the faculty hiring process. They were less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization.

Type of SUC. Table 4: Mean rating for the problems encountered in implementing the TLE Program in terms of faculty among SUCs in WV when classified according to type of SUC.

Table 4. Problems Encountered in the Implementation of TLE Program in Terms of Faculty Among SUCs in WV When Classified According to Type of SUC

Statements		Type of SUC					
		State College			State University		
	The faculty members in the TLE program…	M	Desc	SD	M	Desc	SD
1	have limited utilization of sound policy in the faculty hiring process.	2.10	R	0.80	2.20	R	0.84
2	They are less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization.	2.10	R	0.88	2.60	F	1.14
3	Lack of proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges to the faculty.	1.90	R	0.88	2.00	R	0.71

4	Lack opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishment.	1.77	R	0.94	2.00	R	1.00
5	Lacks sufficient time for lesson preparation, checking outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities.	1.97	R	0.81	2.60	F	1.14
6	have no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education.	2.03	R	1.13	2.00	R	1.00
7	have a few relevant trainings and seminars.	2.00	R	1.17	2.40	R	0.89
8	lack of motivation and initiative.	1.70	R	1.06	2.00	R	1.00
	Mean	1.95	R	0.74	2.23	R	0.80

Note: 4.50 – 5.00, More Often (MO), 3.50 – 4.49, Often (O), 2.50 - 3.49, Frequently (F), 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R), 1.00 – 1.49 (Seldom)

As shown in Table 4, both types of SUC institutions obtained the following (M= 1.95, SD = 0.74) and (M= 2.23, SD = 0.80), respectively. This means that regardless of its type, the problems identified were rarely felt as a problem.

Among the eight identified problems, the results revealed that the rarely observed problem were as follows: limited utilization of sound policy in the hiring process of faculty, lack of proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits and other privileges to the faculty and the lack of opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishment. Furthermore, the faculty members of both SUC institutions had no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education, had few relevant trainings and seminars, and lacked motivation and initiative.

However, it could be observed that for State University, the following identified problems were frequently felt as problems by their faculty members: the faculty were less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization, and they lacked

sufficient time for preparation of lessons, checking of outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities.

This means that the faculty members in the SUCs institutions had no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education, and they had few relevant trainings and seminars because they lacked motivation and initiative.

Faculty Size. Table 5 presents the mean rating of the problems encountered in implementing the TLE Program regarding faculty among SUCs in WV when classified according to faculty size.

Table 30. Problems Encountered in the Implementation of TLE Program in Terms of Faculty among SUCs in WV When Classified According to Faculty Size

	Statements	Faculty Size under the TLE Program					
		10 or below			Above 10		
	The faculty members in the TLE program…	Mean	Desc	SD	Mean	Desc	SD
1	have limited utilization of sound policy in the hiring process of faculty.	1.68	Rarely	0.57	1.46	Seldom	0.66
2	are less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization.	1.64	Rarely	0.66	1.46	Seldom	0.66
3	lack proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits and other privileges to the faculty.	1.55	Rarely	0.60	1.38	Seldom	0.51
4	lack opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishment.	1.64	Rarely	0.79	1.31	Seldom	0.63
5	lack sufficient time for preparation of lessons, checking of outputs, record keeping, evaluation and other instructional activities.	1.59	Rarely	0.80	1.38	Seldom	0.51
6	have no time to pursue (higher) post graduate education.	2.00	Rarely	0.98	1.77	Rarely	0.60
7	have few relevant trainings and seminars.	1.77	Rarely	0.81	1.62	Rarely	0.77
8	lack of motivation and initiative.	1.50	Rarely	0.74	1.46	Seldom	0.52
	Mean	1.67	Rarely	0.58	1.48	Seldom	0.48

Note: 4.50 – 5.00, More Often (MO), 3.50 – 4.49, Often (O), 2.50 - 3.49, Frequently (F), 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R), 1.00 – 1.49 (Seldom)

As shown in Table 5, when classified according to faculty size, SUCs with 10 or fewer TLE faculty members obtained (M = 1.67, SD = 0.58). This means that the identified problems were rarely felt as a problem in the program's implementation,

while for SUCs with above 10 faculty members obtained (M =1.48, SD = 0.48). This means that identified problems were seldom felt as a problem.

Among the eight identified problems, the results revealed that the rarely observed problems for both SUC institutions were the faculty having no time to pursue (higher) post graduate education and having few relevant trainings and seminars.

The rest of the problems were rarely felt by SUCs with fewer than 10 TLE faculty members, and seldom felt by SUCs with more than 10 TLE faculty members.

This means that the number of TLE faculty members affected the problems encountered in implementing the TLE Program.

Enrolment Size. Table 6 presents the mean rating of the problems encountered in implementing the TLE Program regarding faculty among SUCs in WV when classified according to enrollment size.

Table 6. Problems Encountered in the Implementation of TLE Program in Terms of Faculty Among SUCs in WV When Classified According to Enrolment Size

	Statements	Enrolment Size of the TLE Program								
		50 - 99			100- 149			150 or more		
	The faculty members in the TLE program…	M	Desc	SD	M	Desc	SD	M	Desc	SD
1	have limited utilization of sound policy in the faculty hiring process.	1.30	S	0.48	2.10	R	0.91	1.60	R	0.89
2	They are less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization.	1.30	S	0.48	1.75	R	0.66	2.20	R	0.84
3	Lack of proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges to the faculty.	1.30	S	0.48	1.80	R	0.83	1.60	R	0.55
4	Lack opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishment.	1.30	S	0.67	1.65	R	0.81	1.40	S	0.55
5	Lacks sufficient time for lesson preparation, checking outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities.	1.30	S	0.48	1.55	R	0.60	1.60	R	0.89

6	have no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education.	1.60	R	0.84	1.75	R	0.55	1.80	R	0.45
7	have a few relevant trainings and seminars.	1.30	S	0.48	1.65	R	0.81	1.40	S	0.55
8	lack of motivation and initiative.	1.20	S	0.42	1.60	R	0.75	1.60	R	0.55
	Mean	1.33	S	0.45	1.73	R	0.56	1.65	R	0.53

Note: 4.50 – 5.00, More Often (MO), 3.50 – 4.49, Often (O), 2.50 - 3.49, Frequently (F), 1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R), 1.00 – 1.49 (Seldom)

Table 6 shows enrolment size with 100 - 149 students obtained (M=1.73, SD = 0.73) and 150 students obtained (M = 1.65, SD = 0.53). This means that the identified problems were rarely felt to be problems. At the same time, SUCs with 50 - 99 students were obtained (M = 1.33, SD = 0.45). This means that the identified problems were seldom considered problems in implementing the TLE Program.

Among the eight identified problems, the results revealed that among the enrolment sizes, the three groups rarely observed the problem of having no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education. Whereas the remaining rarely observed problems for SUCs with small (50-99) enrolment sizes were the lack of proper dissemination of policies on salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges to faculty, the lack of opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishments, and the lack of sufficient time for lesson preparation, checking of outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities.

For SUCs with average (100–149) and large (150 or more) enrollment sizes, the rarely observed problems were the limited utilization of sound policy in the hiring process of faculty, less competent and less qualified faculty in their fields of specialization, lack of proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges to the faculty, lack of sufficient time for preparation of lessons, checking of outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities, and lack of time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education.

This means that in SUCs institutions with average and large enrollment, the faculty members were not motivated, which is why they had no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education, and that they lack sufficient time for lesson preparation, checking of outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities.

This implies that faculty members at SUC needed proper dissemination of the policies regarding their salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges and

opportunities. They must also receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishments.

Accreditation Status. Table 7 presents the mean rating of the problems encountered in implementing the TLE Program regarding faculty among SUCs in WV when classified according to Accreditation Status.

Table 7. Problems Encountered in the Implementation of TLE Program in Terms of Faculty Among SUCs in WV When Classified According to Accreditation Status

Statements		Accreditation Status											
		Not Accredited			**Level 1**			**Level 2**			**Level 3**		
	The TLE Program…	M	Desc	SD	M	Desc	SD	M	Desc	SD	Mean	Desc	SD
1	have limited utilization of sound policy in the faculty hiring process.	2.50	F	0.71	1.60	R	0.58	1.40	S	0.55	1.33	S	0.58
2	They are less competent and less qualified in their fields of specialization.	2.50	F	0.71	1.60	R	0.65	1.40	S	0.55	1.00	S	0.00
3	Lack of proper dissemination of the policies on salaries, fringe benefits, and other privileges to the faculty.	2.00	R	0.00	1.52	R	0.59	1.40	S	0.55	1.00	S	0.00
4	Lack opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishment.	2.50	F	0.71	1.48	S	0.71	1.60	R	0.89	1.00	S	0.00
5	Lacks sufficient time for lesson preparation, checking outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities.	2.50	F	0.71	1.76	R	0.83	1.40	S	0.55	1.33	S	0.58

6	have no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education.	2.00	R	0.00	1.96	R	0.79	2.00	R	1.41	1.33	S	0.58
7	have a few relevant trainings and seminars.	1.50	R	0.71	1.56	R	0.71	1.60	R	0.89	1.00	S	0.00
8	lack of motivation and initiative.	1.50	R	0.71	1.52	R	0.65	1.60	R	0.89	1.00	S	0.00
	Mean	2.13	R	0.18	1.63	R	0.52	1.55	R	0.76	1.13	S	0.22

Note: 4.50 – 5.00, More Often (MO), 3.50 – 4.49, Often (O), 2.50 - 3.49, Frequently (F),
1.50 – 2.49 Rarely (R), 1.00 – 1.49 (Seldom)

As shown in Table 7, the faculty members at SUC institutions were classified as follows: Not accredited (M = 2.13, SD = 0.18), Level 1 (M = 1.63, SD = 0.52), and Level 2 (M = 1.55, SD = 0.76). This means that the identified problem was rarely felt to be a problem. Meanwhile, Level 3 (M = 1.13, SD = 0.22) obtained a mean that is seldom felt as a problem. Among the eight identified problems, the results revealed that the most rarely observed problems were having no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education, having few relevant trainings and seminars, and lacking motivation and initiative.

This means that the faculty at SUC institutions needed time to get (higher) postgraduate degrees, the chance to attend relevant training and seminars, and the drive to do their jobs well.

On the other hand, for SUC institutions, which is not accredited, the frequently felt problems were the limited utilization of sound policy in the hiring process of faculty, less competent and less qualified faculty in their fields of specialization, the lack opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishments, and the lack of sufficient time for the preparation of lessons, checking of outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities.

For SUC institutions with Level 1 and Level 2 accreditation, the problems rarely felt were as follows: having no time to pursue (higher) postgraduate education, having few relevant trainings and seminars, and lacking motivation and initiative.

Moreover, for SUCs Level 3 status, the seldom felt problems were the lack of opportunities to receive recognition, awards, and incentives for their outstanding accomplishments, lack of sufficient time for preparation of lessons, checking of outputs, record keeping, evaluation, and other instructional activities, having no time

to pursue (higher) postgraduate education and the lack of relevant trainings and seminars.

The findings in Table 1 revealed that accreditation status significantly influenced the degree of problems encountered in implementing the TLE program in terms of Curriculum and Instruction. SUCs with Level 3 accreditation consistently reported higher levels of concern, particularly in areas such as stakeholder involvement, program linkages, publicity, faculty-student ratio, and availability of training facilities. All these issues were rated as "Frequently" to "Often" felt, with mean scores ranging from 3.00 to 4.00. In contrast, SUCs that were Not Accredited to Level 2 reported these problems as "Seldom" to "Rarely" felt, with lower means and standard deviations. This contrast implies that institutions with higher accreditation levels may have more robust internal quality assurance mechanisms that uncover systemic gaps, especially in aligning programs with community needs, licensure preparation, and instructional support.

Table 2 shows that overall faculty-related problems across SUCs were rated as "Rarely" encountered (M = 1.60, SD = 0.54), suggesting a generally stable faculty environment. However, recurring concerns included the lack of postgraduate study opportunities, few relevant trainings and seminars, and insufficient dissemination of faculty-related policies. Notably, two indicators, lack of time for lesson preparation and motivation issues, were rated "Seldom", indicating more significant issues that may impact instructional quality.

Table 3 further contextualized these problems by SUC level, where Level II institutions reported a slightly higher mean (M = 1.68) than Level III (M = 1.55). Both remained in the "Rarely" category. The most persistent problems in both levels were related to faculty workload and preparation time. For Level II institutions, few training opportunities and low motivation were seldom felt. This implies that challenges in professional development and workload balance remain even as the accreditation level increases.

Table 4, based on the type of SUC, indicated that both State Colleges (M = 1.95) and State Universities (M = 2.23) encountered faculty-related issues "Rarely", but with State Universities showing slightly higher concern. For State Universities, two issues were rated as "Frequently" encountered: faculty competency and insufficient time for instructional tasks. These findings suggest that larger institutions may face more

pressure despite broader resources due to enrollment size, higher standards, or broader program offerings.

Table 5, which examined faculty size, showed that SUCs with 10 or fewer faculty members had a higher mean (M = 1.67) than SUCs with more than 10 faculty members (M = 1.48). This implies that smaller faculty sizes correlated with more pronounced challenges, possibly due to heavier teaching loads or limited internal support. Again, the most consistently observed concerns across faculty sizes were the lack of postgraduate study opportunities and training access.

In Table 6, classified by enrollment size, SUCs with 50–99 students reported the lowest mean (M = 1.33) or "Seldom" felt problems, while those with 100–149 and 150 or more students showed slightly higher means (M = 1.73 and 1.65), classified as "Rarely" encountered. This trend suggests that as enrollment increases, so does the burden on faculty, particularly in areas such as lesson preparation and professional development. Larger SUCs appear to have faculty facing higher workloads and lower motivation, possibly stemming from resource-student ratio challenges.

Finally, Table 7 analyzed problems by accreditation status. SUCs with no accreditation reported the highest level of concern (M = 2.13), nearing "Frequently" felt problems, while Level 3-accredited SUCs reported the least (M = 1.13), or "Seldom" encountered. The most pressing issues for non-accredited SUCs included hiring policy gaps, faculty qualifications, lack of incentives, and lesson preparation time, all consistently marked as frequent challenges. Conversely, SUCs with Level 3 accreditation reported better faculty support systems, including stronger policies, more recognition, and better time management.

Summary and Implications

Across classifications, the most persistent faculty-related issues include limited access to postgraduate education, few training opportunities, and inadequate time for instructional preparation. Institutions with higher accreditation levels and smaller enrollment sizes demonstrated more effective mitigation of these issues. Meanwhile, non-accredited institutions and those with high enrollments or small faculty sizes faced compounded faculty capacity and development challenges. These results suggest the need for more targeted interventions such as faculty development programs, increased support for advanced studies, and streamlined hiring and

incentive policies to strengthen the quality and sustainability of the TLE programs in Western Visayas SUCs.

Conclusion

The implementation of the Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) program in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Western Visayas revealed that most of the identified problems related to curriculum, instruction, and faculty were rarely or seldom encountered across different institutional classifications such as accreditation status, SUC level, faculty size, and enrollment. SUCs with higher accreditation levels and larger faculty size demonstrated greater organizational stability and fewer instructional challenges. Conversely, institutions without accreditation and those with limited human resources or high enrollment burdens experienced more pronounced issues, particularly in faculty competency, training, workload, and policy dissemination.

Despite the generally low frequency of problems, persistent concerns across all SUCs included the lack of opportunities for faculty to pursue postgraduate education, limited access to relevant training and seminars, and insufficient time for instructional preparation. These issues point to systemic gaps in professional development and institutional support that can affect the quality of teaching and student outcomes.

Notably, the findings underscore the critical role of culturally grounded pedagogy in vocational education. As TLE inherently draws from the livelihood practices, skills, and values embedded in Filipino culture, its practical implementation relies not only on technical resources and faculty competence but also on how well the curriculum reflects the socio-cultural realities of local communities. The insufficient involvement of stakeholders, weak linkages with partner institutions, and lack of culturally contextualized program content in some SUCs suggest that cultural integration remains underdeveloped. A culturally responsive TLE program that validates indigenous knowledge systems, promotes local entrepreneurship, and aligns with community needs can significantly enhance both the relevance and effectiveness of vocational education.

Therefore, the enhancement of the TLE program must go beyond technical and procedural improvements. It must also embrace the cultural dimension of education by supporting faculty as cultural mediators, integrating local knowledge into the curriculum, and fostering institutional partnerships that reflect the lived experiences and traditions of the Filipino people.

References

[1] Aguado, C. L. (2020). Graduate employability in the Philippines: Issues and concerns. International Journal of Educational Development, 75, 102198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102198

[2] Amoy, L. A. (2022). Technology and livelihood education (TLE) teachers' professional development and the use of innovative teaching methods. International Journal of Science and Education, 1(1). https://nijse.org/index.php/home/article/view/1

[3] Arnold, J. (2022). Prioritising students in Assessment for Learning: A scoping review of research on students' classroom experience. Review of Education, 10, e3366. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3366

[4] Auckaraaree, N. (2013). Developing pedagogical tools to improve teaching multiple models of the gene in high school (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison).

[5] Basal, D. V. (2022). Instructional competencies of Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) teachers: Basis for a competency-based module. International Journal of Research Publications, 96(1), 145–157. https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100961320222948

[6] Beasley, L. (2022). Teaching in the gap: Understanding special educators' experiences teaching in between education policies (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. https://indigo.uic.edu/ndownloader/files/36189654

[7] Bragado, N. P. (2023). Performance tasks enriched material in cookery 9 to enhance students' practical skills. International Journal of Social Science, Humanities and Management Research, 2(9), 03. https://doi.org/10.58806/ijsshmr.2023.v2i9n03

[8] Brillantes, A. B., & Fernandez, M. T. (2008). Is there a Philippine public administration? Or better still, for whom is the Philippine public administration? Philippine Journal of Public Administration, 52(2–4), 245–304.

[9] Caione, A., Guido, A. L., Paiano, R., Pandurino, A., & Pasanisi, S. (2016). E-learning project assessment: A new approach through the analysis of learners' posts on social media. EAI Endorsed Transactions on e-Learning, 3(9), e4-e4. http://dx.doi.org/10.4108/eai.11-4-2016.151152

[10] CHED. (2017). CMO No. 78, series of 2017: Policies and standards for the Bachelor of Technology and Livelihood Education (BTLEd) program. Commission on Higher Education.

[11] Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2013). Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. The Psychologist, 26(2), 120–123. https://resources.nu.edu/c.php?g=1013606&p=8395539

[12] Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2015). Sources of evidence-of-learning: Learning and assessment in the era of big data. Open Review of Educational Research, 2(1), 194–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2015.1074869

[13] Corpuz, B. B., & Salandanan, G. G. (2011). Principles of teaching 1. Lorimar Publishing, Inc.

[14] Creswell, J. W. (2018). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design (4th ed.). https://us.sagepub.com/site/default/files/creswell_qualitative_inquiry_and_research_design_4e_comparing_the_five_approaches.pdf

[15] Crockett, H. (2020). Activities and teacher practices for the high school dance classroom to promote the development of self-directed learners. https://hdl.handle.net/11274/12482

[16] Darling-Hammond, L., & Adamson, F. (2014). Beyond the bubble test: How performance assessments support 21st century learning. John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119210863

[17] De Guzman, A. B., & Choi, K. O. (2013). The dynamics of cultural sensitivity in Philippine education: A critical review. Asia Pacific Education Review, 14(4), 523–532. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-013-9278-4

[18] Del Mundo, R. V. (2020). Preserving indigenous knowledge through technical-vocational education. Journal of Technical Education and Training, 12(1), 77–86.

[19] Department of Education. (2015). Policy guidelines on classroom assessment for the K to 12 basic education program (DepEd Order No. 8, S. 2015). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/DO_s2015_08.pdf

[20] Department of Education. (2020). Interim guidelines for assessment and grading considering the basic education learning continuity plan (DepEd Order No. 31, S. 2020). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/DO_s2020_031.pdf

[21] Fernandez, M. T. (2018). Innovation in teacher education: A Philippine perspective. Philippine Normal University Journal, 10(1), 25–38.

[22] Fook, C. Y., & Sidhu, G. K. (2010). Authentic assessment and pedagogical strategies in higher education. Journal of Social Sciences, 6(2), 153–161. https://doi.org/10.3844/jssp.2010.153.161

[23] Gadia, E. L., & Doromal, J. R. (2021). Teaching livelihood education in culturally diverse communities: A qualitative inquiry. Philippine Journal of Education Studies, 9(1), 45–62.

[24] Gregorio, E. (2016). Technology and livelihood (TLE) instruction of technical vocational and selected general secondary schools in Catanduanes. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 15(1), 1–22.

[25] Gulikers, J., Bastiaens, T., & Kirschner, P. (2006). Authentic assessment, student and teacher perceptions: The practical value of the five-dimensional framework. Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 58(3), 337–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820600955443

[26] Hallinger, P., & Bryant, D. A. (2013). Mapping the terrain of educational leadership and management in East Asia. Journal of Educational Administration, 51(5), 618–637.

[27] Hart, J. M. (2020). Stakeholders' perceptions of organizational goal attainment at the secondary school level through the lens of authentic learning theory (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. https://www.proquest.com/openview/d817383d8120bdd83652b7d30d7a4df7/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

[28] Rosal, H. C. O. (2024). Narratives of Technology and Livelihood Education Teachers in the Use of Authentic Assessment. Journal of Education, Learning, and Management, 1(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.69739/jelm.v1i2.173

[29] UNESCO. (2013). Technical and vocational education and training for the twenty-first century: UNESCO and ILO recommendations. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.