



## Examining the Level of Commitment of Minor Seminary Principals and Teachers in the Philippines Towards the Implementation of the Adjusted Curriculum During the COVID-19 Pandemic

John Gilbert Gabriel Lapid Nuqui<sup>1\*</sup>, Rodrigo A. Litao, PhD<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>1, 2</sup> The Graduate School, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines  
Corresponding Author email: [jlnuqui@ust.edu.ph](mailto:jlnuqui@ust.edu.ph)

**Received:** 20 March 2023

**Revised:** 15 April 2023

**Accepted:** 19 April 2023

**Available Online:** 23 April 2023

**Volume II (2023), Issue 2, P-ISSN – 2984-7567; E-ISSN - 2945-3577**

### Abstract

**Aim:** This quantitative study aimed to examine the level of commitment of the different minor seminary principals and teachers in the Philippines in implementing curriculum adjustments during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Methodology:** The study adopted a survey questionnaire by Yaşaroğlu and Manav (2015), distributed using Google Form, and utilized correlation analysis and non-Parametric tests. Data were gathered from 83 respondents, of which 15 are principals and 68 are teachers.

**Results:** Curriculum adjustments were guided by the mandate from the Department of Education (DepEd) and guidelines from the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines (CBCP). Results of the study revealed that most of the principals and teachers exhibited a high degree and level of commitment (Mean=5.37 and Standard Deviation=0.415) in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities towards implementing the adjusted curriculum amid pandemic times. In addition, with a p-value result of 0.88, the study showed no significant difference between the principals' and teachers' level of commitment. Furthermore, results of the correlation analysis (-0.066 for principals and -0.032 for teachers) revealed that there is no significant relationship between their level of commitment.

**Conclusion:** Amid the pandemic, the principals and teachers exhibited a high-level commitment towards the implementation of the changes. There are also no significant difference and relationship in their level of commitment. To ensure curriculum continuity, principals and teachers in the different minor seminaries should remain committed, not just as educators and formators to the student-seminarians, but as well as to the teaching and learning process.

**Keywords:** Commitment, Curriculum, Minor Seminary, COVID-19 Pandemic

### INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic struck the world unexpectedly and continues to affect nations and people (Muñoz & Sanchez, 2023; Salendab, 2023). Various sectors of the society – health, economics, tourism, market and businesses, labor and employment, etc. – suffer tremendously through tolls and losses. Among the many pains and consequences brought by the pandemic, education and educational institutions greatly suffered (Sanchez, 2020a). In addition to the initial suspension of classes, there were also school closures, enrollment declines, and gradual increase in student dropout rates.

Minor seminaries (high school seminary formation) in the Philippines were also not spared from the difficulties brought by the pandemic. Just like the other high school educational institutions, they were caught completely unprepared, either in terms of a lack of media resources or insufficiency of knowledge in navigating the transition from offline to online mode of learning. Trying to find a way into the so-called new normal, minor seminaries have started rethinking their seminary formation program and academic curriculum and methods. They gradually transitioned into their online platform.

Accordingly, rectors, principals, teachers, and staff at all seminary levels have made necessary adjustments and maximized all possible resources to address the needs of student-seminarians and families in their respective seminary contexts. While there is a vast of studies and literature about the commitment of educators in different educational institutions (Murray et. al., 2021; Zamorro et. al., 2021; Demir & Pinar, 2021; Durdukoca, 2021; Sanchez, et al., 2022; Sanchez, 2022; Salendab & Dapitan, 2021a; Tolbe, 2020), there is little which examined the direct link



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7567**  
**E - ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7842**  
**E - ISSN 1908-3181**

between personal characteristics and commitment of educators in minor seminaries. Thus, this study explores the level of commitment of teachers and principals in implementing the curriculum during the pandemic of the different Minor seminaries in the Philippines.

The present study was carried out within the framework of the various minor seminaries situated in the Philippines. It was undertaken as a personal endeavor by the researcher to examine the commitment level exhibited by educators and school administrators in executing the curriculum amidst the ongoing pandemic. This study looked at the viewpoints of school principals and teachers regarding their present capabilities and the resulting effects on the continuity of learning and development in the context of online education. Such is deemed necessary in a proposal of an enhancement program for the teaching and learning continuity plan of the different minor seminaries in the Philippines.

### Objective

This study determined the level of commitment of minor seminary principals and teachers towards the implementation of the adjusted curriculum during the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of commitment of minor seminary principals and teachers towards the implementation of the curriculum adjustments?
2. Is there a significant difference between the respondents' level of commitment when they are grouped according to their
  - 2.1 years of service as principals
  - 2.2 years of service as teachers?
3. Is there a significant relationship between respondents' level of commitment and their years of service as minor seminary principals and teachers?

### Hypothesis

This study proposed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the respondents' level of commitment to the implementation of the curriculum challenges and adjustments based on: a) their years of service as minor seminary principals, and b) years of service as minor seminary teachers.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between the respondents' level of commitment and their years of service as minor seminary principals and teachers.

### METHODS

#### Research Design

This study employed a descriptive, correlational design through the use of surveys in order to determine the level of commitment of minor seminary principals and teachers towards the implementation of the adjusted curriculum.

#### Population and Sampling

Minor seminary principals and teachers participated in the survey. The respondents were chosen using non-probability sampling methods and purposive sampling. In a non-probability sampling, the individuals are selected based on a non-random criterion (Andale, 2015; Sanchez, 2023a). This sampling allows the researcher to select samples based on his subjective judgment and purposes of the research. In particular, this study uses purposive sampling, wherein the researcher chooses respondents whom he deems fit for the study. In this study, the respondents (1) must be from a minor seminary (Region/National Level); and (2) must be principal and/or a teacher in the minor seminary regardless of their years of service. Two minor seminaries run by religious congregations participated in a pre-test.

There were 22 participating minor seminaries across the 8 regions in the Philippine archipelago including the National Capital Region (NCR) and the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR). Data were gathered from November to February 2023. In order to adhere to ethical guidelines, rigorous compliance with data privacy protocols and restrictions on data usage were observed. There were 83 who participated and completed the survey. This is 81% of

204



**ETCOR** Educational Research Center  
PHILIPPINES  
Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
P - ISSN 2984-7567  
E - ISSN 2945-3577



**The Exigency**  
P - ISSN 2984-7842  
E - ISSN 1908-3181

the 103 recommended sample size – a sample size determined using Raosoft calculator. Of the 83, 68 are teachers and 15 are principals.

### Instrument

To assist in determining the level of commitment of minor seminary principals and teachers, the researcher sought the permission of Yaşaroğlu and Manav (2015) to use the Curriculum Commitment Scale they developed. The scale comprises a total of 20 items, with 16 items phrased in a positive manner, and the remaining 4 items in a negative manner. Although this survey scale was already used in various research or research studies (Durdukoca, 2021; Aşçı & Yıldırım, 2020), the survey questionnaire still underwent validity testing at the University of Santo Tomas (UST) Graduate School. The survey was disseminated through the use of Google Form.

### Data Collection

Data were collected and analyzed – all towards achieving the objectives of the paper. Throughout the process, research code of conduct was strictly followed.

### Treatment of Data

After the profiling and online survey, a statistician from the UST Research Center for Social Sciences and Education (Statistics and Consultation Services) assisted in interpreting the data using Mann-Whitney U Test, Kruskal Wallis Test, and Spearman Correlation Analysis.

### Ethical Considerations

In order to protect the respondents and meet ethical standards that should be considered in the study, which is required in any scientific investigations (Pongyutthaphum & Tolbe, 2021; Salendab & Dapitan, 2021b; Sanchez & Sarmiento, 2020), the researcher secured ethics approval from the UST Graduate School Ethics Review Committee prior to implementing the study. Informed consent was obtained to ensure the right and responsibilities as research respondents. The objectives of the study, potential risks, cessation guidelines, and benefits were indicated in the informed consent. Further explanation and assistance were extended to the respondents in case of some clarification in the survey and interview process. At all times, data gathered were used only for the purposes of this research.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In spite of the different adjustments made and challenges experienced, overall level of commitment is indeed commendable, with their level of commitment receiving a very high rating. No significant relationship and difference were found between the level of commitment of principals and teachers and the number of years of their service respectively. This assumes that the commitment of these educators is springing from some other motives and intentions – a deeper level manifesting professional commitment in their profession as educators – regardless of their years of service and/or position.

The profile of the respondents includes details such as age, designation, and years of service. Out of the 83 respondents, 68 are teachers and 15 are principals. Based on the data, more than half of the respondents are aged 30 years and below. A good number of the principals and teachers are in their 0-3 years of service in the minor seminary.

### Level of Commitment

The study specifically asks, "What is the level of commitment of minor seminary principals and teachers towards the implementation of the adjusted curriculum?" To assist in determining the level of commitment of minor seminary principals and teachers, the researcher conducted a survey and adopted the Curriculum Commitment Scale developed by Yaşaroğlu and Manav (2015).

After getting the overall commitment, the numbers were interpreted as: 1.00 – 1.82 (Very Low), 1.83 – 2.65 (Low), 2.66 – 3.48 (Slightly low), 3.49 – 4.31 (Slightly high), 4.32 – 5.14 (High), 5.15 – 6.00 (Very high). As shown in the next table, through the range and interpretation of Commitment Survey, results indicated that teachers have a Very High Level of Commitment (Mean =5.37 and 0.415 Standard Deviation). A very high of commitment signifies that teachers are aware about lessons which the curriculum wants to impart to the student. Additionally, they ensure that the assignments given to the students are appropriate to the curriculum's objectives, and they plan activities in which students can be active in the lessons. However, in the teaching learning process, there is variation in their

205



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7567**  
**E - ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7842**  
**E - ISSN 1908-3181**

responses on how they care about the relationship of the subject objectives with each other. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of commitment level of the principals and teachers.

Table 1  
 Descriptive Statistics of Commitment Level

Survey Statements	Mean	Std. Dev	Interpretation
1. I am aware of what lessons the curriculum wants to impart to the student.	5.69	.467	Very High
2. I know in which aspects (where) the lessons foreseen by the curriculum are from.	5.40	.562	Very High
3. I ensure to plan activities in which students can be active in the lessons.	5.63	.487	Very High
4. I distinguish which learning area (cognitive, affective, psycho-motor) the lessons are related to.	5.58	.566	Very High
5. I am aware of the role that the curriculum assigns to and expects of the administrator/teacher.	5.55	.500	Very High
6. I am aware of what values the curriculum wishes to impart.	5.51	.571	Very High
7. I ensure that the assignments I give to the students are appropriate to the curriculum's objectives.	5.67	.471	Very High
8. I design the course activities according to the adjusted curriculum.	5.58	.544	Very High
9. I know what the contents in the curriculum are and mean.	5.53	.502	Very High
10. I ensure online classroom interaction and collaboration as the adjusted curriculum sees fit.	5.43	.684	Very High
11. I ensure that the methods and techniques I use/will use in the course are in accordance with the basic approach and expectations of the curriculum	5.52	.526	Very High
12. When I prepare assessments, homework, and performance tasks, I seek to measure whether the students have understood the lessons or not.	5.51	.771	Very High
13. I choose the materials I use/will use in the course according to the basic approach of the curriculum.	5.49	.592	Very High
14. In the learning and teaching process, I do not care about the relationship of the subject objectives with each other.	2.43	1.782	Low
15. When planning the course activities, I use the examples of activities suggested in the curriculum.	5.04	.756	High
16. At the beginning of the school year, I study the curriculum of the course I will teach.	5.51	.527	Very High
17. I try to find out on what basis (general purpose) the curriculum being implemented.	5.19	.772	Very High
18. When planning the curriculum and instruction, I do not need to read and understand the rationale of the change.	2.10	1.393	Low
19. At the beginning of the school year, there is no need to examine the curriculum of the course to be taught.	1.89	1.440	Low
20. I do not take into account the skills that the curriculum wants to impart to the students.	1.90	1.385	Low
<b>COMMITMENT</b>	<b>5.37</b>	<b>.415</b>	<b>Very High</b>



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7567**  
**E - ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7842**  
**E - ISSN 1908-3181**

- 1.00 – 1.82      *Very Low*
- 1.83 – 2.65      *Low*
- 2.66 – 3.48      *Slightly low*
- 3.49 – 4.31      *Slightly high*
- 4.32 – 5.14      *High*
- 5.15 – 6.00      *Very high*

Razak et al. (2009) identified four types of teacher commitment, i.e. to the school, student, teaching work, and profession. All these four different types of teachers' commitment have a major role to play in delivering the curriculum at the most crucial moments during the pandemic. In the aforementioned study, the utilization of technology has led to swift transformations, consequently giving rise to a new and unprecedented need pertaining to the commitment of educators to a specific set of competencies, beliefs, and proficiencies relevant to their respective subject matter. Coming from the results of the study, the authors highlighted the importance of another yet important type of teacher commitment, i.e. commitment to knowledge, attitude, and skills. Interestingly, the 3 items which received the highest mean in the study's survey are reflective of the different types of commitment presented by Razak, Darmawan, and Keeves. *Item 1* (mean: 5.69) tells that teachers are aware about lessons the curriculum wants to impart to the student; *item 3* (mean: 5.63) states that they ensure that the assignments given to the students are appropriate to the curriculum's objectives; and *item 7* (mean: 5.67) mentions they plan activities in which students can be active in the lessons (refer to Table 2). Such results point to the fact that, as Sawchuk (2009), Dizon and Sanchez (2020), and Salendab (2021) cited, the educators' responsibilities are not limited to their respective subject areas, but are extended as well in facilitating student engagement in activities that require the utilization of 21st century competencies. This is also consistent with the findings in Sanchez, Sanchez and Sanchez (2023) which highlighted the importance of extending extra efforts on the part of educators to help the ultimate beneficiaries of any educational process, the students.

Shukla (2014) and Nayci (2022) explained that the concept of professional commitment encompasses two fundamental elements, namely a sense of pride in the teaching profession and a fervent aspiration for professional growth. Salendab and Cogo (2022) pointed on the same proposition, arguing among others the call for educators to be of service to their students as part of personal and professional commitment. In addition, commitment to the curriculum is defined as "determining the compatibility between the designed program and the implemented program" (Furtak et al., 2008), and "the determination of how well programs is implemented compared to the original program design" (Mihalic, 2004,). As seen in Table 2, such components and definitions are indeed reflected in the results of the survey especially in survey items number 1, 5, 8, 11, and 13 – all which got a "very high" rating and interpretation. These items point to how well the minor seminary principals and teachers embraced the adjustments in the curriculum and did necessary actions that are deemed fit in the new curriculum. Pride and professional development are concretely expressed in how well these educators are versed in the adjusted curriculum and in the adjustments they did in making their classroom materials and assessments.

**Significant Difference in Level of Commitment**

The table 2 which follows shows the level of commitment of principals according to their years of service. Kruskal Wallis Test was used to determine if there is a significant difference in the principals' level of commitment towards the implementation of the curriculum adjustments according to their years of service. Results in the table showed that their overall level of commitment does not differ according to their years of service, Chi-square (2) = 0.084, p > 0.05. However, principals who have at most 3 years of service have the highest mean rank of 10.89.

Table 2  
 Commitment of Principals According to their Years of Service

Survey Statements	Principal's Years of Service (Mean Ranks)			Kruskal Wallis Test	
	0-3 years (n=9)	4-6 years (n=5)	7 years and above (n=6)	Chi-Square (df=2)	p-value
1. I am aware of what lessons the curriculum wants to	8.94	10.50	12.83	2.155	0.340



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7567**  
**E - ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7842**  
**E - ISSN 1908-3181**

impart to the student.					
2. I know in which aspects (where) the lessons foreseen by the curriculum are from.	7.39	12.70	13.33	5.907	0.052
3. I ensure to plan activities in which students can be active in the lessons.	10.06	8.50	12.83	2.155	0.340
4. I distinguish which learning area (cognitive, affective, psycho- motor) the lessons are related to.	9.67	9.20	12.83	1.722	0.423
5. I am aware of the role that the curriculum assigns to and expects of the administrator/teacher.	9.44	9.00	13.33	2.666	0.264
6. I am aware of what values the curriculum wishes to impart.	9.22	11.20	11.83	1.244	0.597
7. I ensure that the assignments I give to the students are appropriate to the curriculum's objectives.	9.44	9.00	13.33	0.296	0.264
8. I design the course activities according to the adjusted curriculum.	9.56	9.80	12.50	0.187	0.537
9. I know what the contents in the curriculum are and mean.	9.94	11.50	10.50	3.209	0.863
10. I ensure online classroom interaction and collaboration as the adjusted curriculum sees fit.	10.39	9.90	11.17	1.599	0.911
11. I ensure that the methods and techniques I use/will use in the course are in accordance with the basic approach and expectations of the curriculum	8.44	10.80	13.33	3.209	0.201
12. When I prepare assessments, homework, and performance tasks, I seek to measure whether the students have understood the lessons or not.	9.33	10.00	12.67	4.667	0.499
13. I choose the materials I use/will use in the course according to the basic approach of the curriculum.	8.44	10.80	13.33	5.794	0.201
14. In the learning and teaching process, I do not care about the relationship of the subject objectives with each other.	12.33	11.80	6.67	1.599	0.097
15. When planning the course activities, I use the examples of activities suggested in the curriculum.	10.11	6.60	14.33	5.794	0.055
16. At the beginning of the school year, I study the curriculum of the course I will teach.	9.33	10.00	12.67	1.599	0.449
17. I try to find out on what basis (general purpose) the curriculum being implemented.	8.78	12.90	11.08	2.144	0.342
18. When planning the curriculum and instruction, I do not need to read and understand the rationale of the change.	14.44	7.60	7.00	9.214	0.010
19. At the beginning of the school year, there is no need to examine the curriculum of the course to be taught.	14.22	8.60	6.50	8.323	0.016
20. I do not take into account the skills that the curriculum wants to impart to the students.	14.06	8.80	6.58	8.010	0.018
<b>COMMITMENT</b>	<b>10.89</b>	<b>10.40</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>0.084</b>	<b>0.959</b>

Kruskal Wallis Test was again used to determine if there is a significant difference in the teachers' level of commitment towards the implementation of the curriculum adjustments according to their years of service. Results in table 3 showed that their overall level of commitment does not differ according to their age, Chi-square (2) = 0.945,  $p > 0.05$ .



Table 3  
Commitment of Teachers According to their Years of Service

Survey Statements	Teachers' Years of Service (Mean Ranks)			Kruskal Wallis Test	
	0-3 years (n=9)	4-6 years (n=5)	7 years and above (n=6)	Chi-Square (df=2)	p-value
1. I am aware of what lessons the curriculum wants to impart to the student.	39.92	35.91	29.25	4.497	0.106
2. I know in which aspects (where) the lessons foreseen by the curriculum are from.	38.49	33.97	32.69	1.496	0.473
3. I ensure to plan activities in which students can be active in the lessons.	36.53	37.91	33.22	0.699	0.705
4. I distinguish which learning area (cognitive, affective, psycho- motor) the lessons are related to.	39.32	31.75	32.94	28.76	0.237
5. I am aware of the role that the curriculum assigns to and expects of the administrator/teacher.	37.61	32.03	36.22	1.102	0.577
6. I am aware of what values the curriculum wishes to impart.	38.08	36.84	30.97	1.918	0.383
7. I ensure that the assignments I give to the students are appropriate to the curriculum's objectives.	37.41	35.91	33.19	0.786	0.675
8. I design the course activities according to the adjusted curriculum.	35.70	34.13	38.28	0.531	0.767
9. I know what the contents in the curriculum are and mean.	35.73	37.47	35.25	0.148	0.928
10. I ensure online classroom interaction and collaboration as the adjusted curriculum sees fit.	39.64	32.34	31.78	3.115	0.211
11. I ensure that the methods and techniques I use/will use in the course are in accordance with the basic approach and expectations of the curriculum	35.69	36.47	36.22	0.025	0.987
12. When I prepare assessments, homework, and performance tasks, I seek to measure whether the students have understood the lessons or not.	37.91	31.97	35.67	1.278	0.528
13. I choose the materials I use/will use in the course according to the basic approach of the curriculum.	34.47	33.03	41.78	2.606	0.272
14. In the learning and teaching process, I do not care about the relationship of the subject objectives with each other.	32.39	43.59	36.67	3.710	0.156
15. When planning the course activities, I use the examples of activities suggested in the curriculum.	38.92	33.59	32.14	1.839	0.399
16. At the beginning of the school year, I study the curriculum of the course I will teach.	33.62	35.50	41.33	2.246	0.325
17. I try to find out on what basis (general purpose) the curriculum being implemented.	36.47	36.41	34.67	0.127	0.939
18. When planning the curriculum and instruction, I do not need to read and understand the rationale of the change.	34.00	40.91	35.75	1.432	0.489
19. At the beginning of the school year, there is no need to examine the curriculum of the course to be taught.	36.35	40.09	31.64	1.760	0.415
20. I do not take into account the skills that the curriculum wants to impart to the students.	35.12	44.63	30.14	5.166	0.076



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
 P - ISSN 2984-7567  
 E - ISSN 2945-3577



**The Exigency**  
 P - ISSN 2984-7842  
 E - ISSN 1908-3181

<b>COMMITMENT</b>	37.28	31.59	37.28	0.945	0.623
-------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine if there is significant difference in the level of commitment of teachers and principals towards the implementation of the curriculum adjustments. The Table 4 that follows shows the difference between the level of commitment of principals and teachers.

Table 4  
 Difference of the Level of Commitment between Principals and Teachers

Survey Statements	Teacher (n=68)		Principal (n=15)		Test of Mean Ranks Difference		
	Mean	Mean Ranks	Mean	Mean Ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Z	p-value
1. I am aware of what lessons the curriculum wants to impart to the student.	5.72	43.40	5.53	35.63	414.50	-1.41	0.16
2. I know in which aspects (where) the lessons foreseen by the curriculum are from.	5.38	41.52	5.47	44.17	477.50	-0.44	0.66
3. I ensure to plan activities in which students can be active in the lessons.	5.63	42.24	5.60	40.90	493.50	-0.23	0.82
4. I distinguish which learning area (cognitive, affective, psycho- motor) the lessons are related to.	5.62	43.41	5.40	35.60	414.00	-1.33	0.18
5. I am aware of the role that the curriculum assigns to and expects of the administrator/teacher.	5.54	41.58	5.60	43.90	481.50	-0.39	0.70
6. I am aware of what values the curriculum wishes to impart.	5.49	41.03	5.60	46.40	444.00	-0.89	0.37
7. I ensure that the assignments I give to the students are appropriate to the curriculum's objectives.	5.71	43.29	5.53	36.13	422.00	-1.28	0.20
8. I design the course activities according to the adjusted curriculum.	5.68	45.40	5.13	26.60	279.00	-3.20	0.00
9. I know what the contents in the curriculum are and mean.	5.53	41.97	5.53	42.13	508.00	-0.03	0.98
10. I ensure online classroom interaction and collaboration as the adjusted curriculum sees fit.	5.49	43.03	5.20	37.33	440.00	-0.94	0.35
11. I ensure that the methods and techniques I use/will use in the course are in accordance with the basic approach and expectations of the curriculum	5.56	43.41	5.33	35.60	414.00	-1.31	0.19
12. When I prepare	5.50	42.43	5.53	40.07	481.00	-0.40	0.69



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7567**  
**E - ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7842**  
**E - ISSN 1908-3181**

assessments, homework, and performance tasks, I seek to measure whether the students have understood the lessons or not.							
13. I choose the materials I use/will use in the course according to the basic approach of the curriculum.	5.53	42.76	5.33	38.57	458.50	-0.70	0.49
14. In the learning and teaching process, I do not care about the relationship of the subject objectives with each other.	2.47	41.56	2.27	44.00	480.00	-0.37	0.71
15. When planning the course activities, I use the examples of activities suggested in the curriculum.	5.10	43.79	4.73	33.87	388.00	-1.56	0.12
16. At the beginning of the school year, I study the curriculum of the course I will teach.	5.50	41.81	5.53	42.87	497.00	-0.18	0.86
17. I try to find out on what basis (general purpose) the curriculum being implemented.	5.21	42.71	5.13	38.77	461.50	-0.65	0.52
18. When planning the curriculum and instruction, I do not need to read and understand the rationale of the change.	2.21	43.29	1.60	36.17	422.50	-1.11	0.27
19. At the beginning of the school year, there is no need to examine the curriculum of the course to be taught.	2.00	43.06	1.40	32.20	438.00	-0.95	0.34
20. I do not take into account the skills that the curriculum wants to impart to the students.	2.01	43.41	1.40	35.60	414.00	-1.25	0.21
<b>COMMITMENT</b>	5.37	41.82	5.38	42.83	497.50	-0.15	0.88

As seen in the table above, there is no significant difference in their level of commitment. The commitment of teachers received a mean of 5.37 and a mean rank of 41.82, while the principals received a mean and mean ranks of 5.38 and 42.83 respectively. However, in designing the course activities according to the adjusted curriculum, teachers (mean = 5.68, mean rank = 45.40) have higher commitment level as compared to the principals (mean = 5.13, mean rank = 26.60). According to the interpretation of data, if the p value is less than 0.05, the hypothesis is rejected. However, since the p-value for is at 0.88, the first hypothesis of the study is accepted.

As mentioned, the study revealed no significant difference between the respondents' level of commitment when they are grouped in terms of their years of service (cf. Tables 2, 3, and 4). Though there is no significant difference in their overall commitment, one particular item – survey item number 8 which states "I design the course activities according to the adjusted curriculum – reveals that teachers have higher commitment level than the principals. In addition, the study revealed no significant difference in the level of commitment among the principals. Overall, their level of commitment does not vary according to their years of service.



However, delving into the particular indicators, the study showed that in item numbers 18, 19, and 20, the principals who are in their 0-3 years in service exhibit the highest level of commitment. These items state "When planning the curriculum and instruction, I do not need to read and understand the rationale of the change" (mean: 14.44); "At the beginning of the school year, there is no need to examine the curriculum of the course to be taught" (mean: 14.22); and "I do not take into account the skills that the curriculum wants to impart to the students" (mean: 14.06), respectively. Finally, there is no significant difference in the overall commitment of teachers, even in particular indicators.

**Significant Relationship in Level of Commitment**

This study also asked, "Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' level of commitment and their years of service as minor seminary principals and teachers?" The table 5 below shows the correlation analysis conducted in determining the significant relationship.

Table 5  
 Correlation Analysis of Commitment and Years of Service of Principals and Teachers

Survey Statements	Years of Service	
	Principal	Teacher
1. I am aware of what lessons the curriculum wants to impart to the student.	0.332	-.245*
2. I know in which aspects (where) the lessons foreseen by the curriculum are from.	.532*	-0.144
3. I ensure to plan activities in which students can be active in the lessons.	0.199	-0.060
4. I distinguish which learning area (cognitive, affective, psycho- motor) the lessons are related to.	0.236	-0.184
5. I am aware of the role that the curriculum assigns to and expects of the administrator/teacher.	0.299	-0.064
6. I am aware of what values the curriculum wishes to impart.	0.299	-0.150
7. I ensure that the assignments I give to the students are appropriate to the curriculum's objectives.	0.299	-0.103
8. I design the course activities according to the adjusted curriculum.	0.228	0.044
9. I know what the contents in the curriculum are and mean.	0.065	0.002
10. I ensure online classroom interaction and collaboration as the adjusted curriculum sees fit.	0.056	-0.203
11. I ensure that the methods and techniques I use/will use in the course are in accordance with the basic approach and expectations of the curriculum	0.410	0.016
12. When I prepare assessments, homework, and performance tasks, I seek to measure whether the students have understood the lessons or not.	0.271	-0.085
13. I choose the materials I use/will use in the course according to the basic approach of the curriculum.	0.410	0.139
14. In the learning and teaching process, I do not care about the relationship of the subject objectives with each other.	-0.443	0.146
15. When planning the course activities, I use the examples of activities suggested in the curriculum.	0.270	-0.160
16. At the beginning of the school year, I study the curriculum of the course I will teach.	0.271	0.167
17. I try to find out on what basis (general purpose) the curriculum being implemented.	0.235	-0.036
18. When planning the curriculum and instruction, I do not need to read and understand the rationale of the change.	-.660**	0.074
19. At the beginning of the school year, there is no need to examine the curriculum of the course to be taught.	-.653**	-0.068
20. I do not take into account the skills that the curriculum wants to impart to the students.	-.643**	-0.038
<b>COMMITMENT</b>	-0.066	-0.032



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
 Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7567**  
**E - ISSN 2945-3577**



**The Exigency**  
**P - ISSN 2984-7842**  
**E - ISSN 1908-3181**

Correlation analysis was conducted to determine if commitment of teachers and principals are related to their years of service. Rank-order correlation coefficient shown in the table revealed that overall commitment is not significantly related to their years of service. Thus, the second hypothesis of the study is accepted as well.

Popoola (2006) conducted a study which revealed that personal factors, such as length of service, have an impact on the level of organizational commitment exhibited by records management personnel in Nigerian state universities. According to McNeese-Smith and Mowdy et al. (2003), there exists a significant positive correlation between organizational commitment, occupational commitment, and the length of service of employees. However, as seen in the results of this study, principals and teachers – regardless of their years of service – exhibited almost the same level of commitment. Though there are minimal particular indicators wherein they differ in their commitment level – as will be noted in the next paragraphs – overall they manifested a very high level of commitment.

In analyzing the data of this research – in particular in determining the significant relationship between the level of commitment of principals and teachers – a negative correlation, i.e. an inverse relationship, would mean that the longer they are in service, the lower the level of commitment becomes (see Table 6). On the contrary, a positive correlation, i.e. a direct relationship would mean that the longer they stay in service, the higher the commitment becomes (or even vice versa, i.e. the shorter in service, the lower the commitment). Having these indicators, the study revealed that there is no significant relationship in the overall commitment of principals and teachers.

Going however into the particular items reveals certain significant relationships in the commitment of principals and teachers. Survey item number 1—which states “I am aware of what lessons the curriculum wants to impart to the students – resulted in a negative relationship between the principals and teachers, with a result of -.245. This means that the longer the teacher is in service, the lower the commitment becomes towards item number 1. However, item number 2 – “I know in which aspects (where) the lessons foreseen by the curriculum are from – resulted in a positive relation, i.e. the longer the principals are in their service, the higher their commitment towards item number 2 becomes. Having these results, truly, education can be a vital stabilizing force for society as it navigates a pandemic, a situation that is fluid and unpredictable (Sanchez, 2020b). A resilient community must constantly and consistently rebuild itself in the same way that teachers and principals must maintain their commitment to implementing the curriculum. The road ahead may have bumps but shared goals can make significant advances. The effects of this pandemic will be widespread, and educational communities will be forced to reimagine 21st-century education.

Furthermore, in terms of significant relationship, item numbers 18, 19, and 20 prove to be insightful as they are significantly related to the years of service of principals. *Item 18* states, “When planning the curriculum and instruction, I do not need to read and understand the rationale of the change (-660); *Item 19* states “At the beginning of the school year, there is no need to examine the curriculum of the course to be taught (-653); and *Item 20* states, “I do not take into account the skills that the curriculum wants to impart to the students (-643). The items aforementioned were expressed negatively in the commitment survey. All three used negated words like “no need” or “do not.” Such formulation may have had a bearing in the results.

While a number of studies do not recommend the inclusion of negative statements in survey – primarily because of the response bias it produces, and thus serves as a threat in reliability and validity (Cronbach, 1942; Chyung et al., 2018) – a good number of experts gave recommendations on how to avoid such bias when mixing positive and negative survey statements. For instance, according to Likert (1932), an American social psychologist and the originator of the Likert scale, it is advisable to construct 50% of survey items to be linked with agreement and the remaining 50% with disagreement. Furthermore, it is imperative for survey developers to take into account the manner in which outcomes are presented, rather than solely focusing on the formulation of survey statements or response scales. Hartley (2013) suggests that instead of utilizing reverse-coding techniques to amalgamate data obtained from negatively phrased items with data obtained from positively phrased items, researchers should present survey results derived from negatively phrased items and positively phrased items separately.

Having said these, the negatively worded statements in the survey were indeed balanced by a majority of positively worded statements. As in the case of items 18, 19, and 20, these yielded negative results. – meaning, the longer the principals stay in service, the lower the commitment becomes. However, this is in fact expected as the statements were in its negative form. When these statements are formulated positively, the correlation coefficient will likely be also positive. One possible and significant benefits of using negatively worded statement/s is that it gained a positive outcome on the part of the principals and teachers who were between 0-3 years in service. Although they were new in their profession or in their position, it is an empowering experience for them. The three items – *relationship of subject objectives, rationale of the change, course to be taught, and even the skills to be*



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
PHILIPPINES  
Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
P - ISSN 2984-7567  
E - ISSN 2945-3577



**The Exigency**  
P - ISSN 2984-7842  
E - ISSN 1908-3181

*imparted* – were considered consciously or unconsciously in the process. Teachers have the tendency to incorporate the aforementioned items since these are considered to be given or can be said to be implied in the process. These things happen in the teaching profession especially in implementing some components of the curriculum. The data readily reveals the changes, the process, and even the decisions along the way. During pandemic, it can be said that ultimately, the teachers remain the significant implementor of the curriculum (Salendab & Dapitan, 2020; Sanchez, 2023b).

### Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Amid the pandemic, the principals and teachers exhibited a high-level commitment towards the implementation of the changes in the curriculum. A very high level of commitment signifies teacher's awareness of the lessons, giving of appropriate assignments, and careful planning of activities. Moreover, there are also no significant difference and relationship in their level of commitment. This implies that commitment of educators spring from some other motives and intentions – a deeper level manifesting professional commitment in their profession as educators.

Additionally, it showed that their overall level of commitment does not differ according to their years of service. Lastly, correlation analysis showed no significant relationship between the level of commitment of principals and teachers and their years of service. It means that years of service does not directly influence the overall commitment of the respondents – though specific indicators pave way for minute differences.

The Yaşaroğlu and Manav (2015) Commitment Scale has a good reliability and construct validity for assessing the commitment in implementing the curriculum of the different minor seminary principals and teachers in the Philippines. Commitment level of principals and teachers should not be based exclusively on age, designation, and years of service, as these are not necessarily indicative of principals and teachers' ability to cope with pandemic.

While this study has limited the respondents to teachers and principals from the different minor seminaries in the Philippines, future researchers may pursue the same study, measuring the same construct but with the participation of student-seminarians from major seminaries to help generate new insights, experiences, and perspectives. Although the results of this study yielded a more or less definite set of data on commitment in the implementation of the curriculum, the researcher invites future researchers for further probing by considering the insights and lived experiences of student-seminarians. This could be an effective way to understand and address the challenging issues related to seminary education in the Philippines today.

Given the inherent limitations of the study, it is recommended that the study be further developed by improving and designing models to allow time to pilot a curriculum before actual implementation occurs. In addition, the results of this research suggest an analysis of the parameters by which the minor seminaries operate from the perspective of other stakeholders. It is recommended to conduct further research on the level of commitment as well of seminary collaborators, parents, and parish priests. Grounded on data, the levels of commitment of principals and teachers is indeed crucial in implementing the curriculum and ensuring teaching and learning continuity. The ongoing evaluation, adaptation, and improvement of strategic measures are imperative in order to effectively address the dynamic and unpredictable circumstances that arise during periods of crisis, such as the current COVID-19 pandemic.

### REFERENCES

- Asci, M., & Yildirim, R. (2021). Turkish Adaptation of Online Teaching Effectiveness Scale. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 16(3), 299-315. <https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2021.373.15>.
- Chyung, S. Y., Barkin, J. R., & Shamsy, J. A. (2018). Evidence-Based Survey Design: The Use of Negatively Worded Items in Surveys. *Perf. Improv.*, 57(3), 16-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21749>.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dizon, E. C., & Sanchez, R. D. (2020). Improving select grade 7 Filipino students' reading performance using the eclectic model. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 2(2), 216-221.
- Durdukoca, S. (2021). Teachers' Commitment to the Curriculum and Relevant Parent Opinons: A Case Study on Turkey. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 17(4), 222-238. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2021.366.14>.



**ETCOR** Educational Research Center  
**PHILIPPINES**  
Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
P - ISSN 2984-7567  
E - ISSN 2945-3577



**The Exigency**  
P - ISSN 2984-7842  
E - ISSN 1908-3181

- Furtak, E. M., Ruiz-Primo, M. A., Shemwell, J. T., Ayala, C. C., Brandon, P. R., Shavelson, R. J., & Yin, Y. (2008). On the Fidelity of Implementing Embedded Formative Assessments and Its Relation to Student Learning. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 21(4), 360-389. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/08957340802347852>.
- Göloğlu Demir, C., & Kizilhan, P. (2021). The Examination of the Relationship between Teachers' Commitment to the Curriculum and Teacher Autonomy Behaviors. *Psycho-Educational Research Reviews*, 10(3), 221-238.
- Hartley, J. (2013). Some thoughts on Likert-type scales. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 14(1), 83-86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1697-2600\(14\)70040-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1697-2600(14)70040-7).
- Hooper, D. (2012). *Exploratory Factor Analysis, in Chen, H. (Ed.), Approaches to Quantitative Research – Theory and its Practical Application: A Guide to Dissertation Students*, Cork, Ireland: Oak Tree Press.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. In R. S. Woodworth (Ed.), *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 5-55. New York: The Science Press.
- McNeese-Smith, D. (1995). Job Satisfaction, Productivity, and Organizational Commitment. *The Result of Leadership*, 25(9), 17-26. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005110-199509000-00006>.
- Mihalic, S. (2004). The Importance of Implementation Fidelity. *Emotional & Behavioral Disorders in Youth*, 4(4), 83-105. <https://www.incredibleyears.com/wp-content/uploads/fidelity-importance.pdf>.
- Muñoz, M. C., & Sanchez, R. D. (2023). Exploring Fernandino Teens TV as a supplementary learning delivery modality: Opportunities and challenges from the lens of select learners. *International Journal of Open-access, Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR)*, 2(1), 358-374.
- Murray, A., Brown, K., & Barton, P. (2021). Montessori Education at a Distance, Part 1: A Survey of Montessori Educators' Response to a Global Pandemic. *Journal of Montessori Research*, (7)1. 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.17161/jomr.v7i1.15122>.
- Nayci, Ö. (2021). Examination of Professional Commitment Levels of Primary and Secondary School Teachers during COVID-19 Pandemic Period. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 3(2), 1825-1844. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1292151.pdf>.
- Pongyutthaphum, N., & Tolbe, E. T. (2021). The Management of Thai Restaurant Business in Khonkaen, Thailand. *UNP Research Journal*, 30(1), 35-46.
- Popoola S. O. (2006) Personal Factors Affecting Organizational Commitment of Records Management Personnel in Nigerian State Universities. *IFE Psychologia*, 14(1), 183-97. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.4314/ifep.v14i1.23702>.
- Razak, N., Darmawan, I., & Keeves, J. (2009). Teacher Commitment. *International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching / Saha, L., Dworkin, A. (ed.s)*, 343-360. [https://doi.org/10.007/978-0-387-73317-3\\_22](https://doi.org/10.007/978-0-387-73317-3_22).
- Salendab, F. A., & Dapitan, Y. C. (2021). School Heads' Administrative Supervision: Its Relation to the Program Accreditation of Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs) in Region XII. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, 12(13), 194-202.
- Salendab, F. A., & Dapitan, Y. C. (2021). Performance of Private Higher Education Institutions and the School Heads' Supervision in South Central Min-danao. *Psychology and Education*, 58(3), 3980-3997.



**ETCOR Educational Research Center**  
**PHILIPPINES**  
Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
P - ISSN 2984-7567  
E - ISSN 2945-3577



**The Exigency**  
P - ISSN 2984-7842  
E - ISSN 1908-3181

- Salendab, F. A. (2021). Effectiveness of Performance-Based Assessment Tools (PBATs) and the Students' Academic Performance. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, 12(10), 6919-6928.
- Salendab, F. A., & Cogo, D. A. (2022). Implementation of Alternative Learning System: Basis for Policy Review and Recommendation. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 5457-5467.
- Salendab, F. A., & Dapitan, Y. C. (2020). Accuracy of Use of Alternative Language Assessment (ALA) Tools and the Students' Performance. *Psychology And Education*, 57(9), 6679-6688.
- Salendab, F. A. (2023). Proposed Instructional Scheme in the New Normal Education: Basis for Pedagogical Strategies/Practices. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(8), 712-719.  
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7502764>
- Sanchez, A. M. P. (2022). HR practitioners' perceptions on boosting employees' loyalty and commitment: Inputs for a 21st century-responsive human resource system. *International Journal of Open-access, Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR)*, 1(4), 89-102.
- Sanchez, R. (2023). Utilization of the daily lesson logs: An evaluation employing the CIPP model. *International Journal of Open-access, Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR)*, 2(1), 199-215.
- Sanchez, R. D. (2020, December 27). "Preserving the Honor of the 'Honoris Causa': Revisiting the Guidelines on the Conferment of Honorary Degrees". SunStar Pampanga. Retrieved from <https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/sunstar-pampanga/20201227/281608128045257>
- Sanchez, R. D. (2020, December 28). Parent-Teacher Collaboration in the Time of Pandemic. SunStar Pampanga. Retrieved from <https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/sunstar-pampanga/20201228/281608128046465>
- Sanchez, R. D. (2020, December 29). Three Qualities of a Successful Leader. SunStar Pampanga. Retrieved from <https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/sunstar-pampanga/20201229>
- Sanchez, R. D. (2023). Unveiling the moral-theological foundations of the nullity of marriage due to psychological incapacity. *International Journal of Open-access, Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR)*, 2(1), 397-404.
- Sanchez, R., & Sarmiento, P. J. (2020). Learning together hand-in-hand: An assessment of students' immersion program in a schools division. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 9(1), 85-97.
- Sanchez, R., Sarmiento, P. J., Pangilinan, A., Guinto, N., Sanchez, A. M., & Sanchez, J. J. (2022). In the name of authentic public service: A descriptive phenomenological study on the lives of Filipino teachers in select coastal villages. *International Journal of Open-access, Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR)*, 1(1), 35-44.
- Sanchez, R. D., Sanchez, A. M. P., & Sanchez, J. J. D. (2023). Delving into the Integration of Research Subjects in the Junior High School Curriculum from the Learners' Point of View. *International Journal of Open-access, Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR)*, 2(1), 432-442.
- Shukla, S. (2014). Teaching Competency, Professional Commitment and Job Satisfaction-A Study of Primary School Teachers. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 4(3), 44-64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.9790/7388-04324464>.
- Tolbe, E. (2020). Management Practices and Economic Benefits of the Income Generating Projects of the State



**ETCOR** Educational Research Center  
PHILIPPINES  
Sta. Ana, Pampanga, Philippines

INTERNATIONAL  
MULTIDISCIPLINARY  
RESEARCH CONFERENCE



Website: <https://etcor.org>



**iJOINED ETCOR**  
P - ISSN 2984-7567  
E - ISSN 2945-3577



**The Exigency**  
P - ISSN 2984-7842  
E - ISSN 1908-3181

Universities and Colleges. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(11), 156-161.

Yaşaroğlu, C., & Manav, F. (2015). Öğretim Programına Bağlılık Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. [Curriculum Commitment Scale: A Validity and Reliability Study]. *International Education Sciences Journal*, 17(4), 247-258. [https://doi.org/10.52963/PERR\\_Biruni\\_V10.N3.14](https://doi.org/10.52963/PERR_Biruni_V10.N3.14).

Zamarro, G., Camp, A., Fuchsman, D., & McGee, J. B. (2021). Understanding how COVID-19 has Changed Teachers' Chances of Remaining in the Classroom. *Education Reform Faculty and Graduate Students Publications*. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/edrepub/127>.