

Problems Encountered in the Implementation of Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program in Agusan del Sur: Basis for Proposed Intervention Program

Irish A. Oxtero^{1*}

¹ College of Arts and Sciences, Surigao State College of Technology, Surigao City, Philippines

*Corresponding Author: oxterooxteroirish@gmail.com

Accepted: 15 June 2022 | Published: 30 June 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55057/ajress.2022.4.2.10>

Abstract: *The study aimed to know the problems encountered by the implementers in implementing the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program. The researcher employed a descriptive survey using a research-made questionnaire to gather the data from the implementers of the IPEd Program. Frequency distribution, percentage, ranking, weighted mean with adjectival description, and t-test were used in the data analysis. Based on the study, most implementers came from Bisaya and Cebuano groups with minimal training related to the program. Most of the beneficiaries are males, a recipient of either RCCT or MCCT, with a monthly income categorized in the poverty line. The family is dependent on the environment as farmers. The implementing schools are classified as multi-grade, and additional facilities are needed since the enrolment is increasing. The budget depends on the enrolment of learners; however, other stakeholders also help financially in the schools. There is no significant difference between the problems encountered as perceived by the implementers at a 0.05 level of significance. The problems are more on the absence of culture-based learning materials, and teachers have no expertise in indigenizing the lesson. Hence, there is a need to address the various problems encountered by the implementers and may consider the proposed intervention program for the extensive implementation of the IPEd program.*

Keywords: problems encountered, implementation, Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program, Agusan del Sur, proposed intervention program

1. Introduction

The right to education is one of the enabling rights of the human person. Anyone can benefit from this right regardless of the person's socioeconomic status, language used, religion, race and ethnicity, political preferences, and opinions (Eduardo & Gabriel, 2021). However, it is not enough to have education only; it should be "quality education," as stated in the Sustainable Development Goals 2030 (United Nations Development Programme, n.d.). Obtaining quality education might be challenging in some countries, especially for minorities and indigenous peoples. It is because the indigenous peoples are exposed to mainstream education wherein the concepts they learn are different from their worldviews. On the other hand, some international laws promote the right to education for the IPs.

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2008) has given a well-defined background on the rights of the indigenous peoples regarding appropriate education. They highlighted the right to create and control their educational systems and institutions,

providing education in their own languages in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning (Article 14, Section 1). In addition, the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989 (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights [OHCHR], n.d.) stated that those states with indigenous peoples should not be denied the right to enjoy their own culture, practice their own religion, and their own language within their own community (Article 30). With this conviction, children of indigenous origin should be given a right to education aptly suited to their worldviews.

In the process of giving education aligned with the cultural identity of the indigenous peoples' children, it needs education or teaching that incorporates the histories, texts, values, beliefs, and perspectives of the people from different cultural backgrounds, just like a multicultural education. This kind of education assumes that students learn and think is deeply influenced by their cultural identity and heritage; thus, teaching culturally diverse students requires educational approaches that value and recognize their cultural backgrounds (Great Schools Partnership, 2013).

In the Philippines, it was stated in the 1987 Constitution that the State shall promote quality education among its citizen at all levels and that it is accessible to all, especially the rights of the indigenous cultural communities for the preservation of their cultures, traditions, and institutions (De Leon, 2005). Hence, Republic Act No. 8371, also known as the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) of 1997, was created for indigenous peoples. It was stated in Chapter VI, Section 30 that the State shall provide equal opportunities to the ICCs/IPs through an educational system based on their own language with appropriate cultural methods for the teaching and learning process (National Government Portal, 1997). As a result, the Republic Act No. 10533, or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, stresses that the primary education curriculum shall be flexible. It allows the school to contextualize, localize, and indigenize the lessons for the students that are suited to their social contexts (National Government Portal, 2013). With the various legal bases created aligned to the education of indigenous peoples, the government is serious about giving quality education to these marginalized sectors of society.

With the help of the Department of Education, the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program was realized through its DepEd Order No. 62, s. 2011 or Adopting the National Indigenous Peoples (IP) Education Policy Framework wherein collaboration with various stakeholders is expected in this program. The indigenous peoples are already given a chance to have a culture-sensitive curriculum by intermarrying their Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs) to the national education that is based on the worldview of IP learners and the way they think, and act, and behave.

However, problems may occur in any program during its implementation, especially since it must respect indigenous peoples' beliefs, culture, and tradition. Flor (2013) revealed numerous inhibiting factors that may not be easily disclosed because of the presence of the Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs) protocols. In addition, the use of English teaching materials (Korff, 2012), living conditions of the IPs (Directorate of Primary Education, 2010), gender issues (United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women & the Secretariat of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, 2010 & Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights [OHCHR], 2009), funding (OHCHR, 2009), recruitment of locally teachers, the use of mother tongue in the classroom are among the possible problems.

With this, the researcher wanted to know the problems encountered by the implementers during the implementation of the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program in the Division of Agusan del Sur. The result of the study would be beneficial to the implementers since it will provide feedback on the different problems they encountered for possible enhancement of the said program.

Statement of the Problem

The core purpose of this study is to know the problems encountered in implementing the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program. The proposed intervention to address the problems encountered is also included in the study. It sought to answer the following specific problems;

- 1) What is the profile of the following:
 - 1.1. Implementers;
 - 1.1.1 ethnicity,
 - 1.1.2 age,
 - 1.1.3 sex,
 - 1.1.4 eligibility,
 - 1.1.5 length of service,
 - 1.1.6 highest educational attainment,
 - 1.1.7 relevant training?
 - 1.2 Beneficiaries;
 - 1.2.1 sex,
 - 1.2.2 age,
 - 1.2.3 grade level,
 - 1.2.4 cash grant,
 - 1.2.5 family status?
 - 1.3 Implementing schools;
 - 1.3.1 type of school,
 - 1.3.2 enrollment,
 - 1.3.3 facilities,
 - 1.3.4 school performance,
 - 1.3.5. budget and linkages?
- 2) What are the problems encountered in implementing the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program?
- 3) Is there a significant difference between the problems encountered as perceived by the implementers?
- 4) What intervention program may be proposed to address the problems encountered in the implementation based on the study's findings?

Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between the problems encountered as perceived by the implementers at a 0.05 level of significance.

2. Methodology

Research Design. The researcher employed a descriptive quantitative research design in this study that pertains to the problems encountered in implementing the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program in Agusan del Sur. This research intends to collect information about the variables, classify, analyze the data gathered, and possibly identify the relationships

between variables. Descriptive designs "may be used to develop [a] theory, identify problems with current practice, justify [the] current practice, make judgments, or determine what others in similar situations are doing" (Grove, Burns, and Fray, 2013, as cited by Drummond & Reyes, 2018).

Research Locale. The study was conducted in the Municipality of Esperanza, where the Higaonon and Manobo lived. In this municipality, only nine (9) out of forty-seven (47) barangays had public elementary schools that are said to be IPed implementing schools.

Research Respondents. The study's respondents are the indirect and direct implementers of the IPed Program. The indirect implementers are the administrators of the Department of Education - Division of Agusan del Sur and the supervisors in Esperanza Districts, with six respondents. The direct implementers are the Principal/School Head/Officer-In-Charge/Teacher-In-Charge, and teachers in the three districts of the Municipality of Esperanza, with fifty respondents. A total of fifty-six respondents were part of the said study.

Research Instrument. Only one (1) survey questionnaire tool was used to gather the necessary data in this study. The questionnaire tool was part of a more extensive study conducted by Otxero (2018) entitled "Implementation of Indigenous Peoples Education (IPed) Program in DepEd Esperanza, Agusan del Sur." It was a research-made questionnaire in which the first part is the profile of the IPed implementers with the following content: ethnicity, age, sex, eligibility, length of service, highest educational attainment, and training related to the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPed) Program. An essential component of the questionnaire is the problems encountered by the implementers. The opinion of respondents is put under a 4-point scale varying from "Most Prevailing Problem" to "Less Prevailing Problem" with seventeen (17) items. The researcher also provided a space for the respondents to answer about the other problems.

Validation of the Instrument. The questionnaire tool underwent validation and reliability test. Five (5) experts were asked to rate the questionnaire for the content validation. Four experts are from the Department of Education, Division of Bayugan City, and one from the Surigao del Sur. These are the following: CID – Chief Education Supervisor, two IPed Focal Person, Education Program Specialist II – School Governance and Operations Division, and Teacher-In-Charge in one of the IPed implementing schools in Bayugan City. The questionnaire received a rating of 4.00 with a verbal description of "very good." However, some portions must be revised based on the experts' comments and suggestions. Since the validation process was done, it was also pilot-tested by the researcher for reliability tests.

One IPed implementing school in the Division of Bayugan City was chosen for pilot testing. The researcher asked permission from the Teacher-In-Charge, and five (5) respondents answered the questionnaire upon approval. The researcher administered the questionnaire twice. The researcher retrieved and tallied the data and given to the statistician for reliability tests. The statistician used Spearman Rank Correlation with a result of 0.90, which means that the indicators are positively correlated. The researcher reproduced copies of the questionnaire after the adviser checked it.

Data Gathering Procedure. A formal letter was given to the Schools Division Superintendent (SDS) asking permission to conduct the study. After approval, the researcher gave the survey questionnaire to the Department of Education, Division of Agusan del Sur administrators who are implementers of the IPed Program. The researcher also asked permission from the

supervisors of the three districts in the Municipality of Esperanza. One by one, the researcher visited the different IPed implementing schools and gave questionnaires to the respondents. An additional form was given to the teachers about the profile of the IP learners, and for the Teacher-in-Charge, a form for the school's profile. A total population was included in the study for the beneficiaries and implementing schools. The collection of data was done alone by the researcher. With the guidance of the statistician, the researcher tallied, scored, and classified the data gathered. The analyses and interpretation were based on the problems of the study.

The researcher also underwent a step-by-step process to develop the intervention program. The data gathered from the survey answered by the implementers was the basis for crafting the intervention program as an output of the study. The first draft was submitted to the researcher's adviser and expert for the comments and suggestions for its improvement. After which, the researcher revised and finalized the intervention program. This program aims to develop activities to improve the implementation of the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPed) Program in DepEd Esperanza.

Statistical Treatment of Data. The researcher used different statistical tools in this study. Frequency distribution, percentage, and ranking were used to determine the profile of the IPed implementers, beneficiaries, and implementing schools to solve problem 1. For problem 2, a weighted mean with adjectival description was used to determine the problems encountered during implementation of the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPed) Program. A T-test was used to determine the significant difference between the problems encountered as perceived by the implementers.

Ethical Considerations. The researcher makes sure that permission was granted before the gathering of data. The purpose of the study was explained to the respondents and how their participation could help in the study. To maintain the confidentiality of the IPed implementing schools, the researcher decided to have a code in each school. These are the following: D1-ES1, D2-ES1, D2-ES2, D2-ES3, D3-ES1, D3-ES2, D3-ES3, and D3-ES4.

3. Results and Discussion

Profile of Implementers of the IPed Program

Illustrated in Table 1 is the profile of the indirect and direct implementers. They implemented the IPed Program from the Department of Education – Division of Agusan del Sur as collected from the questionnaire.

Ethnicity. The majority of indirect implementers belonged to Bisaya, which has a frequency of two (2) or equivalent to 33.32%, while for the direct implementers, the majority belonged to the Cebuano group, which has a frequency of sixteen (16) or equivalent to 32.00%. The result shows that out of fifty direct implementers, only seven of them belonged to Higaonon and five with Manobo ethnicity. Since most of the learners in Esperanza Districts are Higaonon and Manobo, it would be beneficial if hired teachers belonged to this ethnicity since they speak the said language.

Table 1: Profile of Implementers in the IPed Program

INDICATORS	CATEGORIES	IMPLEMENTERS					
		Indirect Implementers			Direct Implementers		
		F	%	Rank	F	%	Rank
ETHNICITY	Ilocana/Ilocano	1	16.67%	3.5	1	2.00%	12
	Manobo	1	16.67%	3.5	5	10.00%	3.5
	Bisaya	2	33.32%	1	4	8.00%	5
	Boholano	1	16.67%	3.5	2	4.00%	6
	Surigaonon	1	16.67%	3.5	5	10.00%	3.5
	Cebuano	0	-	-	16	32.00%	1
	Surigao-non-Bol-anon	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	Ilocano-Bisaya	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	Higaonon	0	-	-	7	14.00%	2
	Bisaya-Sugbuhanon-Bol-anon	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	Ilonggo-Bisaya	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	Kamayo	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	Manobo-Talacognon	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	Cebuano-Manobo	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	Zamboangueño	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	Boholano-Waray	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	Cebuano-Higaonon	0	-	-	1	2.00%	12
	TOTAL	6	100%		50	100%	
AGE	21-30	0	-	-	23	46.00%	1
	31-40	0	-	-	19	38.00%	2
	41-50	2	33.33%	2	8	16.00%	3
	51-60	4	66.67%	1	0	-	-
	TOTAL	6	100%		50	100%	
SEX	MALE	3	50.00%	1.5	14	28.00%	2
	FEMALE	3	50.00%	1.5	36	72.00%	1
	TOTAL	6	100%		50	100%	
ELIGIBILITY	LET	6	100%	1	45	90.00%	1
	Contractual	0	-	-	5	10.00%	2
	TOTAL	6	100%		50	100%	
YEARS	0 – below 1 year	0	-	-	21	42.00%	1
	1 - 2 years	0	-	-	17	34.00%	2
	3 - 4 years	6	100%	1	12	24.00%	3
	TOTAL	6	100%		50	100%	
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	Ed.D. Units	1	16.67%	3.5	0	-	-
	Ph.D. Graduate	1	16.67%	3.5	0	-	-
	Ph.D. Units	1	16.67%	3.5	0	-	-
	MA Graduate	2	33.32%	1	1	2.00%	3
	MA Units	1	16.67%	3.5	16	32.00%	2
	Bachelor's Graduate	0	-	-	33	66.00%	1
	TOTAL	6	100%		50	100%	
	Prime Training Immersion in IP School	1	14.28%	4	0	-	-
	Conference Cum Planning Workshop for IPed	1	14.28%	4	0	-	-
	Capacity Building in Supervision and SIP Enhancement for IPed	1	14.28%	4	0	-	-
	Orientation Workshop in Community Engagement for IPed	1	14.28%	4	0	-	-
	Workshop in the Preparation of IP Transition	1	14.28%	4	0	-	-
	Regional Participatory, Orthography Development Workshop for MTB-MLE	1	14.28%	4	0	-	-

TRAINING (Multiple Response)	Implementation in Schools with IP Learners						
	Regional Basic Training on Indigenous Peoples Education for New Public School Teachers to be Deployed in Indigenous Communities in Caraga	1	14.28%	4	7	33.33%	1.5
	Regional Training for Teachers and School Heads Assigned in Schools Serving Indigenous Peoples (IP) Communities	0	-	-	7	33.33%	1.5
	IPEd Retooling	0	-	-	4	19.05%	3
	Three-Day District Training-Workshop on Contextualized Curriculum in Grade 3-6	0	-	-	1	4.76%	5
	Three-Day Seminar-Workshop on IPEd	0	-	-	2	9.52%	4
	TOTAL	7	100%		21	100%	

The role of the teacher in the classroom is critical since the teacher serves as the primary instructional material inside the classroom. When the teacher knows the learners' mother tongue, it is expected to have good interaction inside the classroom since better communication is prevalent. Plant & Chakma (2011) emphasized the importance of hiring teachers of primary schools from among the local people speaking the same language as most students from the area. Locally recruited teachers can use the local language to explain concepts and key learning points to indigenous learners. As a result, learners can comprehend the lesson discussed by the teacher since it was delivered using the learners' first language.

It could be further noted in the study of Pondar (2013) that the implementation of Mother Tongue (MT) in Basic Education showed the use of MT as a medium of instruction helped the pupils express themselves freely and comfortably. Furthermore, lessons are best explained to the pupils through an appropriate teaching strategy. Also, communication is best enhanced by using varied IMs; learning assessment is more effective if facilitated with IMs. Hence, it was recommended that the teachers in Grade I undergo rigid training for MT instruction to understand the program entirely.

Age. Most indirect implementers belonged within the age bracket from 51-60, with a frequency of four (4) or 66.67%. The result signifies that most of the indirect implementers are in the category of middle and late adulthood. It only means that they have sufficient experience in the field of education and have earned appropriate graduate and postgraduate degrees. However, IPEd Program only started in the year 2013-2014. It only means that indirect implementers are new to this Program. The result also signifies that there are no young adult leaders, especially since this kind of higher position has a tremendous responsibility attached to the shoulder.

The table also shows that for the direct implementers, most of them are in the age bracket of 21-30 with a frequency of twenty-three (23) or 46.00%, while only a few direct implementers are in the age bracket of 41-50 with a total frequency of eight (8) or 16.00%. The result entails that most of the teachers hired in the schools with IP learners in Esperanza Districts are in their early adulthood when they are active in the work environment and seek an opportunity to uplift their professional development. Most of them are new in the profession with less experience.

Sex. For the indirect implementers, it was found that there is an equal frequency between male and female implementers with a total of three (3) each or 50%. It only means that there is equality between males and females in attaining a higher position as administrators in the

Department of Education. Furthermore, the table also shows that on the side of the direct implementers, there are more female teachers than males in the field, with about thirty-six (36) female teachers or 72%, while there are only fourteen (14) male teachers which equal only to 28%.

Eligibility. All indirect implementers have LET eligibility with a total frequency of six (6) or 100%, while the direct implementers have a total of forty-five (45) or 90%. The rest of the direct implementers are on a contractual basis with a total of five (5) or 10%, which means they are given a specific year to pass the Licensure Examination for Teachers for them to be appointed in a permanent teaching position. The DepEd Order No. 50, s. 2016 stresses that one of the requirements for a permanent teaching position is to acquire a license to ensure that teaching personnel in the field possess the qualification expected from them as a catalyst of change. Teachers should be eligible to be hired by the Department of Education.

Length of Service. The IPed Program in the Division of Agusan del Sur started in School Year 2013-2014. For the indirect implementers, six (6) or 100% are in 3-4 years, while the direct implementers have only 0-below one year of experience with a frequency of twenty-one (21) or 42%. Other direct implementers have a length of service of 3-4 years with a frequency of twelve (12) or 24%. The data also revealed that more direct implementers are new in the teaching field with some experience.

The Department of Education is hiring 583 teachers in the school year 2016-2017 with permanent positions for the new schools and will be trained to implement the IPed Program (Alcober, 2016). It explains the result of the study in which most direct implementers are in 0-below one year of experience. However, there are some instances when teachers assigned to the schools with IP learners transfer from one station to another for specific reasons. As a result, untrained teachers take over to continue the service. Increased funding and incentives for teachers to remain in remote areas were, to some degree, found to be effective (Plant & Chakma, 2011.)

Highest Educational Attainment. Table 1 shows that most indirect implementers are master's degree holders, with a respondent of two (2) or 33.32%. It is found out also that there are no indirect implementers with only a baccalaureate degree holder. The result only proves that only those qualified administrators are appointed to higher positions in the Department of Education since they have a degree aligned in education that can provide a quality education for the children in the schools with IP learners. The table further reveals that for the direct implementers, most are still on their baccalaureate degree with a respondent of thirty-three (33) or 66%, while only one (1) or 2% have a master's degree holder. The result reveals further that there are no direct implementers who pursue higher postgraduate education.

The difficulty in pursuing graduate and postgraduate degrees may be attributed to the proximity of the IP schools to universities and colleges offering the degrees. Transportation cost is another factor that can hinder their plans since the fare is costly depending on the location of these IP schools. However, graduate studies courses can help the teacher in their teaching since it will uplift their learnings in education that could be shared with their learners and co-educators. They can also use it for future promotion to uplift their economic conditions.

Relevant Training. Out of seven (7) training, only one (1) or 14.28% of the indirect implementers were capacitated. These training are sponsored by the Department of Education from divisional to a regional level aligned with the IPed Program. Indirect implementers

become facilitators, documenters, and participants in the said training. The indirect implementers attend only a few trainings while others have no training at all. Based on the table, there is a need for the indirect implementers to invest in training related to Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program. This training can enhance their knowledge in the implementation process.

Based on the table, the direct implementers are trained in the following. The "Indigenous Peoples Education for New Public School Teachers to be deployed in Indigenous Communities in Caraga" and "Regional Training for Teachers and School Heads Assigned in Schools Serving Indigenous Peoples (IP) Communities" in which each training has seven (7) participants or 33.33%. As a result, 7,767 teachers and school heads nationwide have undergone fundamental retooling on IPEd to ensure that education is culturally rooted (Alcober, 2016).

Only a few direct implementers attended the Three-Day District Training-Workshop on Contextualized Curriculum in Grade 3-6, with only one (1) teacher or 4.76%. The majority of the direct implementers have no training related to IPEd Program. This result indicates that the direct implementers need more training related to IPEd since they are soldiers in the field. Most learners are indigenous people, which teachers are expected to know and understand. Based on the ethnicity of the direct implementers in Table 1, only a few implementers belong to Higaonon and Manobo. That is why rigid training is vital to understand and educate them using the IP lens.

The role of the teacher is vital in indigenous education. However, teachers who are non-IP may have different perspectives on IP learners. Zheng (2014) suggested that effective school-based teacher professional development activities can improve and strengthen teachers. It is crucial to instill the cultural elements in the teacher and cultivate multicultural equality. Plant & Chakma (2011) emphasized that teacher training is essential to implement any curriculum successfully. Successful teacher training programs include strategies for teachers to teach culturally appropriate curricula and indigenous languages and enhance indigenous learners' engagement and academic achievement. In addition, Pondar (2013) also recommends in her study that the teachers in Grade I should undergo rigid training in mother-tongue instruction to understand the program entirely.

Profile of the Beneficiaries

Table 2 is the profile of the beneficiaries who receive the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program as determined by their sex, age, grade level, cash grant, and family status.

Sex. Concerning the sex of the beneficiaries, the majority of them are males, with seven hundred eighty-two (782) or 53.37% of the total population. In comparison, the females have only seven hundred-eleven (711) or 47.62% of the total population. There is more male who pursues education rather than their female counterpart based on the result. The same scenario can be found in Laos, where 34% of rural Tai girls had never attended school in 2002-2003 (King, 2010 as cited in United Nations Department of Public Information, 2014). Gender issues are a common barrier to education for both boys and girls in indigenous communities. Based on the study of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, families often prefer girls to remain at home to perform domestic chores and care for children and siblings. Girls are regularly prevented from attending school (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2009).

In addition, parents prefer their daughters to be married off at a young age and leave their natal homes after marriage and work for their husband and his family. Some parents also look education not beneficial or productive (United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women & the Secretariat of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, 2010.)

Age. Most IP learners are 6-10 years old, with eight hundred thirty-nine (839) or 56.20% of the total population. Some learners are in the age bracket of 16 and above with a frequency of forty-five (45) or 3.01% of the population. This result signifies that the beneficiaries attended school based on their age requirement. Learners are compulsory to participate in school at the age of five (5) years old for Kindergarten and six (6) years old for Grade I. Learners are also expected to graduate from primary education at the age of eleven (11) or twelve (12) years old. However, the data shows that there are learners who attended elementary in the age bracket of 16 and above. This age bracket is expected to be in Junior and Senior High Schools, but they are still in elementary pursuing their education because of some factors.

Table 2: Profile of the Beneficiaries

INDICATORS	CATEGORIES	F	%	RANK
SEX	Male	782	53.37%	1
	Female	711	47.62%	2
	TOTAL	1,493	100%	
AGE	1-5 years old	183	12.26%	3
	6-10 years old	839	56.20%	1
	11-15 years old	426	28.53%	2
	16 and above	45	3.01%	4
	TOTAL	1,493	100%	
GRADE LEVEL	Kinder	147	9.85%	7
	Grade 1	222	14.87%	4
	Grade 2	247	16.54%	1
	Grade 3	245	16.41%	2
	Grade 4	212	14.20%	5
	Grade 5	229	15.34%	3
	Grade 6	191	12.79%	6
	TOTAL	1,493	100%	
CASH GRANT	RCCT (Regular Conditional Cash Transfer)	204	47.55%	2
	MCCT (Modified Conditional Cash Transfer)	225	52.45%	1
	TOTAL	429	100%	
FAMILY STATUS	Number of Persons in a Family	f	%	
	1 – 5	404	30.98%	2
	6 – 10	805	61.73%	1
	11 – 15	73	5.60%	3
	16 – up	22	1.69%	4
	TOTAL	1,304	100%	
	Monthly Income	f	%	
	500 – 2,500	1040	69.66%	1
	2,501 – 4,500	228	15.27%	2
	4,501 – 6500	161	10.78%	3
	6,501 – up	64	4.29%	4
	TOTAL	1,493	100%	
	Sources of Income	f	%	
	Farming	1,417	94.91%	1
	Sari-Sari Store	24	1.61%	3
	Pump Boat Driver	2	0.13%	8
	Laborer	25	1.67%	2

	Motorcycle Driver	3	0.20%	6.5
	Vendor	1	0.07%	10.5
	Barangay Employee	7	0.47%	5
	Teaching	3	0.20%	6.5
	Barangay Official	8	0.53%	4
	Saleslady	1	0.07%	10.5
	OFW	1	0.07%	10.5
	CAFGU	1	0.07%	10.5
	TOTAL	1,493	100%	

Grade Level. The highest enrollment of learners is in Grade II, with a frequency of two hundred forty-seven (247) or 16.54%. In comparison, the lowest is the enrollment in Kinder, with only one hundred forty-seven (147) or 9.85% of the total population. This quantitative result signifies that only a few beneficiaries are enrolled in Kinder, and only a few can make it up until Grade VI.

Cash Grant. The Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program, also known as 4P's or CCT through the Department of Social, Welfare, and Development, is the agency assigned by the government to monitor and give allowances to the beneficiaries. There are two types of CCT cash grants. The first one is the Regular Conditional Cash Transfer (RCCT) and the second one is the Modified Conditional Cash Transfer (MCCT).

RCCT beneficiaries are those households tagged as poor based on the National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (NHTS-PR). At the same time, MCCT is known as IPs since the direct beneficiaries of this Program are those indigenous peoples who reside in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas. Since there are areas in Esperanza where barangays are located in GIDAs, they are one of the program's beneficiaries. Out of nine schools with IP learners included in the study, only D2-ES2 and D2-ES3 have no MCCT beneficiaries since the location of the barangays is accessible and near the center of Esperanza.

For the CCT, it was found that two hundred four (204) or 47.55% of the learners are beneficiaries of this Program, while two hundred twenty-five (225) or 52.45% are beneficiaries of MCCT. The data shown in Table 2 for cash grants are given by the DSWD-Regional Office, Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program section. Only those updated beneficiaries are included in the master list; that is why the actual number of beneficiaries cannot be determined. Some learners are still beneficiaries of the said Program but need to be updated first to trace them if they continue their studies.

On the side of the local government unit, they have a scholarship for the IPs in terms of education. However, the Program has no sustainability because of some factors. Just like in the Philippines, the government of Bangladesh gave initiatives to the school children, just as stipends, school feeding, and special projects to their school-children (Directorate of Primary Education, 2010).

Family Status. Table 2 depicts the family status with the following inclusions: number of persons in a family, monthly income, and sources of income. Based on the study, most beneficiaries have a family size of 6-10 with several eight hundred five (805) or 61.73% of the total frequency. In comparison, some families have a family size of 16-up with twenty-two (22) or 1.69% of the total population. The result signifies that the family of beneficiaries was composed of a vast family who lived in one house.

The family's monthly income is also included in the family status of the beneficiaries. Based on the findings, most of them have the lowest monthly income ranges to 500-2,500 with a frequency of one thousand forty (1,040) or 69.66%, while the highest monthly income is 6,501-up with only sixty-four (64) or 4.29% of the total population. It can be deduced from the data that the family of beneficiaries or the indigenous peoples' learners is at the poverty line. The monthly income of the family cannot suffice for their everyday living. IP learners have difficulty attending school because they have no food to eat. The financial aspect is the main problem regarding the education of IP learners.

Sources of income are also included in the family status of the beneficiaries. Most of their families are farmers with one thousand, four hundred seventeen (1,417) frequency or 94.91% of the total population. Only a few families have a job as a vendor, saleslady, OFW, and CAFGU (Civilian Armed Forces Geographical Units) with a frequency of one (1) or 0.07%.

This data denotes that the families of the beneficiaries are solely dependent on the environment where they live. The raw materials found in their environment are rattan, wild abaca, etc. However, due to the high transportation cost, only minimal profit can be taken home by the family. This profit is not enough for a family of vast size. Moreover, they still practice the barter system and plant native rice, camote, banana, corn, and cassava for additional food. Others become hunters since there is a presence of wild pigs in the forest. About the study by Maeda & Okano (2013), Ainu people living outside Hokkaidô were relatively disadvantaged in terms of income and educational achievement.

Profile of the Implementing Schools

Table 3 is the profile of the implementing schools that implements the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program from the Department of Education-Division of Agusan del Sur, specifically in Esperanza Districts I, II, and III, as determined by its type of school, enrollment, facilities, school performance, budget, and linkages.

Type of School. Part of Table 3 is the type of school in Esperanza Districts. It is categorized into three: monograde, multi-grade, and combined. Most schools are multi-grade with a frequency of four (4) or 44.44%, while only a few are monograde with two (2) or 22.22% of the total frequency. Based on the result, teachers in the schools with IP learners taught two or three grade levels each. Because some schools have small enrollment, only a few teachers are assigned. However, there are schools with one teacher in each grade level. These schools are D1-ES1 and D3-ES1. Due to high enrollment, they are given enough teachers to teach their learners.

Enrollment. For the School Year 2016-2017, the total population of males is seven hundred eighty-two (782) or 53.37%, while the females are seven hundred eleven (711) or 47.62%, with a total enrollment of one thousand, four hundred ninety-three (1,493) learners. Based on the enrollment, there are more males enrolled rather than females.

Facilities. Table 3 revealed the facilities of the implementing schools. These facilities were divided into four: existing building/structure, water and sanitation, furniture, and other facilities/amenities. In this finding, most buildings are DepEd-DPWH School Building Type, comprising fifteen (15) or 21.43%. The DepEd All Wood Building Type followed it with a frequency of twelve (12) or 17.14%. Only a few building/structure that was built with only one (1) or 1.43% of the total population. These are the following: Reading Hut, Kitchen, Kinder Room, DepEd Modified School Building, Bulletin, Transparency Board, and Teacher's

Cottage. This building/structure was built from the PTA Fund, Barangay Fund, JBIC-World Bank, School MOOE, and DSWD through KALAH-CIDSS.

Based on the data shown, there is a need to build the necessary building/structure for the schools with IP learners, especially since these schools have an increasing population (Table 3.1). However, there should be a touch of cultural identity to be reflected in their classrooms. As the DepEd Secretary stresses, the architectural designs of the schools will be kept to preserve the rich and varied cultures of Mindanao to be identified by the cultural preference of the community they are in (National Government Portal, 2016).

Table 3: Profile of the Implementing Schools

INDICATORS	CATEGORIES	F	%	RANK
SCHOOL	Type			
	Monograde	2	22.22%	3
	Multi-grade	4	44.44%	1
	Combined	3	33.33%	2
	TOTAL	9	100%	
ENROLLMENT	School Year (2016 – 2017)			
	Male	782	53.37%	1
	Female	711	47.62%	2
	TOTAL	1,493	100%	
FACILITIES	Existing Building/Structure			
	Reading Hut	1	1.43%	14
	Kitchen	1	1.43%	14
	Learning Center	5	7.14%	6.5
	Reading Center	4	5.71%	8
	Kinder Room	1	1.43%	14
	DepEd-DPWH School Building	15	21.43%	1
	DepEd Modified School Building	1	1.43%	14
	Makeshift	6	8.57%	4
	KALAH-CIDSS	6	8.57%	4
	DepEd Standard School Building	5	7.14%	6.5
	TEEP School Building	6	8.57%	4
	DepEd All Wood Building Type	12	17.14%	2
	Flagpole	2	2.86%	9.5
	Marcos Pre-Fabricated Building	2	2.86%	9.5
	Bulletin	1	1.43%	14
	Transparency Board	1	1.43%	14
	Teacher's Cottage	1	1.43%	14
	Water and Sanitation			
	Comfort Rooms (Functional)	13	46.43%	1
	Comfort Rooms (Not Functional)	6	21.43%	3
	Faucet	8	28.57%	2
	Sink/ Washbasin	1	3.57%	4
	Furniture			
	Arm Chairs	1,234	66.52%	1
	Teacher's Tables	39	2.10%	4
	Teacher's Chairs	38	2.05%	5
	Kinder Chair	20	1.08%	6
	Science Laboratory Table	1	0.05%	9
	Monobloc Chair	350	18.87%	2
	School Desk	166	8.95%	3
	Classroom Table	5	0.27%	7
	Classroom Chair	2	0.11%	8
	Other Facilities/ Amenities			
	Concrete Quadrangle	0	0	-

	Entrance Gate	8	27.59%	2.5
	Perimeter Fence	4	13.79%	4
	Playground	8	27.59%	2.5
	School Garden	9	31.03%	1

For the water and sanitation, there is only thirteen (13) or 46.43% of the total frequency for functional comfort rooms, while the rest is not functional, with six (6) or 21.43% of the total number. Included in these facilities are faucets with eight (8) or 28.57% of the total frequency and sink/washbasin with only one (1) or 3.57%. Based on the data gathered, water and sanitation facilities were not given attention in constructing the schools with IP learners. These facilities are minimal, while nine schools are in the total population.

For the schools that implement the IPed Program, most of the furniture are armchairs with one thousand, two hundred thirty-four (1,234) frequency or 66.52%. The rest of the furniture is minimal in number. These include a classroom table with five (5) or 0.27% of the frequency; only two (2) classroom chairs or 0.11%; and only one (1) science laboratory table or 0.05% in frequency. Based on the data, it can be deduced that furniture is scarce for all nine schools implementing the IPed Program.

When it comes to education-related for indigenous peoples, some factors are barriers for them to learning, and one of these is the lack of infrastructure (Korff, 2012). Enough facilities can enhance the knowledge of the IP learners. It can also encourage them to go to school since they have materials that can be used.

However, there are 251 new public schools to be built for the school year 2016-2017 in Mindanao. It is also partnered with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) to construct 605 classrooms through its KALAHY-CIDSS National Community-Driven Development Program (Alcober, 2016).

For other facilities/amenities, nine (9) schools have a school garden or 31.03% of the total frequency. Eight (8) or 27.59% have an entrance gate and playground, and only four (4) or 13.79% of schools have a perimeter fence.

The table below is the profile of the implementing schools in terms of school performance in Esperanza Districts.

Table 3.1: Profile of the Implementing Schools in Terms of School Performance

School Performance Indicators	School Year 2013-2014			School Year 2014-2015			School Year 2015-2016		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Enrollment	637	595	1,232	736	637	1,373	758	700	1,458
Participation Rate	98.08	97.71	97.89	95.84	96.75	96.29	98.53	98.70	98.62
Cohort-Survival Rate	61.15	66.77	63.96	76.50	83.04	79.77	92.95	84.81	88.88
Drop-Out Rate	1.14	0.49	0.82	0.83	0.62	0.73	0.54	0.61	0.58
Promotion Rate	96.02	95.65	95.84	96.52	97.99	97.26	95.69	96.92	96.31
Failure Rate	1.95	2.54	2.25	1.26	1.12	1.19	5.92	2.66	4.29
Repetition Rate	1.27	1.73	1.50	1.25	0.92	1.09	1.59	1.10	1.35
Transition Rate	88.43	103.32	95.88	93.62	105.39	99.51	91.09	83.18	87.14
Completion Rate	84.56	63.06	73.81	67.84	73.41	70.63	81.24	87.56	84.41
Retention Rate	69.27	72.02	70.65	89.62	100.91	95.27	83.54	89.70	86.62
Graduation Rate	81.21	83.14	82.18	96.86	98.43	97.65	97.62	98.71	98.17

The table indicates that in the past three years, enrollment of the implementing schools is increasing from 1,232 in SY 2013-2014 to 1,458 SY 2015-2016. It can be attributed to the cash grant given by the government to the families to augment their financial condition and send their children to school. Additional facilities also may encourage the students to go to school since they have facilities and materials that can be used. Concerning the result of enrollment, Bangladesh has progressed substantially in improving access to primary education. As per the Annual Sector Perform Report in 2010, gross and net enrollments in primary education have increased from 93.7% and 87.2% in 2005 to 103.5% and 93.9%, respectively, in 2009 (DPE, 2010).

For the participation rate, there is also an increase in enrollment among the children aged 5-11 over the total population of children aged 5-11. It can also be deduced in the table that enrollment of females is higher than males in the two succeeding years. The same with the cohort-survival rate, there has been an increase in the percentage of pupils who can reach Grade VI in the past three years from 63.96% (SY 2013-2014) to 88.88% (SY 2015-2016).

In Table 3.1, the result also shows the school's performance in terms of drop-out rate. It indicates that in the past three years, the drop-out rate has decreased from 0.82% in SY 2013-2014 to 0.58% in SY 2015-2016. It can be attributed to the efforts of school heads and teachers to follow up with their learners through home visitation with proper verification to know the learners' situation and avoid the possibility of dropping out of school. This finding negates in Bangladesh that the drop-out scenario among the students is very high; 65% of children discontinue their education before completion of primary schooling and 19% after completion of the same (DPE, 2010).

Moreover, the promotion rate of pupils in schools with IP learners is increasing from 95.84% in SY 2013-2014 to 97.26% in SY 2014-2015. However, the promotion rate decreased to 96.31% in the current year. It means more students failed in the current year and did not reach the following year's level. Furthermore, the failure rate decreased from 2.25% in SY 2013-2014 to 1.19% in SY 2014-2015 but increased to 4.29% in SY 2015-2016. It means that more pupils fail in school and should repeat the grade level they failed.

The same with the failure rate, there is also a decrease in repetition rate from 1.50% in SY 2013-2014 to 1.09 in SY 2014-2015, but it was increased to 1.35% in SY 2015-2016. It means that more pupils repeat a grade level. For the transition rate, more females move to the next year level for the past two years than males, as shown in the data. In SY 2013-2014, only 88.43% of males while 103.32% in females, and SY 2014-2015, there are only 93.62% males while 105.39% females. However, the results decreased from 91.09% of males while 83.18% are females.

For the completion rate, only a few Grade 1 entrants completed the elementary level from SY 2013-2014 with 73.81% to SY 2014-2015 with 70.63%. But the percentage swells up to 84.41, where there are more Grade 1 pupil who completed their elementary school year. It means pupils are more eager to finish school than in the past. For the retention rate, the data shows that more females continue to be in school in the succeeding year than males. In SY 2013-2014, 69.27% were males while 72.02% were females. In SY 2014-2015, 89.62% were males while 100.91% were females. While in 2015-2016, there are 83.54% males, and 89.70% were females. It means that more females continue their education rather than males. In addition, there is an increase in retention rate from 70.65% in SY 2013-2014 to 95.27% in SY 2014-2015. However, it decreased the following year to only 86.62% of the total population.

The table also shows the percentage of pupils who graduated in the last three years. Based on the data, more females graduated from elementary schools. For SY 2013-2014, only 81.21% were males, while 83.14% were females. In SY 2014-2015, only 96.86% were males, while 98.43% were females. While in SY 2015-2016, only 97.62% were males, while 98.71% were females. It also denotes in the data that there has been an increase in the graduation rate for the last three years, as reflected in the table from 82.18% to 97.65 and 98.17%. This data proves that IP learners are still interested in graduating from primary school despite uncertainties.

For the profile of the implementing schools in terms of budget and linkages, findings are revealed in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Profile of the Implementing Schools in Terms of Budget and Linkages

IPEd Implementing Schools	MOOE (Fiscal Year 2016)	Linkages, Others Sources of Funds/Income (SY 2016-2017)							
		PTA	Donations (Individuals /NGO's)	MLGU	BLGU	Fund Raising	School Production	Canteen	TOTAL
D1-ES1	157,000		5,000	133,000	23,500	13,300	1,800		333,600
D2-ES1	90,000	20,000			5,000				115,000
D2-ES2	89,000	3,000			2,000		5,000	100	99,100
D2-ES3	98,000	3,000			2,000		5,000		108,000
D3-ES1	228,000	5,000		120,000	35,000				388,000
D3-ES2	113,000	3,000		5,000					121,000
D3-ES3	137,000	1,500	1,000		5,000				144,500
D3-ES4	137,000	500	1,000 /1,500		5,000				145,000
D3-ES5	138,000								138,000
TOTAL	1,187,000	36,000	7,000/1,500	258,000	77,500	13,300	11,800	100	1,592,200

Table 3.2 indicated that the implementing schools have sources of budget and different linkages of funds and income. These findings mean that the nine schools implementing IPEd Program have a budget from Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) and other sources of funds and income that helps with its operation. The data shows that MOOE has different numerations since it depends upon the school's enrollment. As of the Fiscal Year 2016, D3-ES1 got the highest MOOE with Php228,000, while D2-ES2 earned the lowest MOOE with only Php89,000. A total of 1,187,000 is allocated to the schools with IP learners in Esperanza Districts in MOOE.

According to the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, education is one of the best long-term financial investments states can make (OHCHR, 2009). However, some organizations and private individuals are willing to donate a certain amount to schools with IP learners. As of SY 2016-2017, a total of Php36,000 is given by the PTA, while the individuals and NGOs provide Php8,500. It means that parents and private individuals are ready to help with the education of the learners.

In addition, local government units through municipal and barangay levels also give some funds to the schools. However, because of limited funds and several schools to be allocated, only a few schools are granted by the MLGU, while the BLGU gave few amounts. Nevertheless, schools with IP learners did not only depend on its MOOE, donations, and LGU

funds. They also have initiatives to generate funds, just like fundraising, income from school production, and income from the canteen. Only D1-ES1 initiated fundraising with Php13,300 of income. For school production, D2-ES2, D2-ES3, and D1-ES1 have an income from the crops amounting to Php11,800, while D2-ES2 has an income from their canteen of Php100.

Problems Encountered

Problems encountered by the indirect and direct implementers are reflected in Table 4. The table demonstrates that the implementers have a prevailing problem when implementing the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program, as shown by its overall weighted mean value of 2.11. This finding indicates that the implementers encountered problems during the Program implementation.

Furthermore, the result of the study revealed that the more prevailing problems they encountered were lack of materials, textbooks, and references with Indigenous Peoples (IP) context, as shown by its overall mean value of 3.21. Another prevailing problem is teachers have no expertise in the indigenous content of the topics to be discussed, with an overall mean value of 2.63. According to Korff (2012), some factors are barriers for indigenous peoples to learn related to education. One of these is the use of English teaching materials and inappropriate context.

Table 4: Problems Encountered

INDICATORS	INDIRECT IMPLEMENTERS		DIRECT IMPLEMENTERS		Overall Mean	Overall Adjectival Rating
	WEIGHTED MEAN	ADJECTIVAL DESCRIPTION	WEIGHTED MEAN	ADJECTIVAL DESCRIPTION		
1. The school is situated far from the learner's home.	2.33	Prevailing Problem	2.14	Prevailing Problem	2.24	Prevailing Problem
2. It causes an additional burden to the teachers since they need to contextualize, localize and indigenize the topics to be discussed.	2.83	More Prevailing Problem	2.26	Prevailing Problem	2.55	More Prevailing Problem
3. Lack of materials, textbooks, and references with Indigenous Peoples (IP) context.	3.00	More Prevailing Problem	3.42	Most Prevailing Problem	3.21	More Prevailing Problem
4. Teachers have no expertise in the indigenous content of the topics to be discussed.	2.67	More Prevailing Problem	2.58	More Prevailing Problem	2.63	More Prevailing Problem
5. Parents and Indigenous Peoples (IP) leaders are passive in the education of their learners.	2.33	Prevailing Problem	2.22	Prevailing Problem	2.28	Prevailing Problem
6. Teachers treat their Indigenous Peoples (IP) learners differently and with prejudice.	1.17	Less Prevailing Problem	1.76	Prevailing Problem	1.47	Less Prevailing Problem
7. Teachers use derogatory/discriminatory remarks towards the Indigenous Peoples (IP) learners.	1.17	Less Prevailing Problem	1.48	Less Prevailing Problem	1.33	Less Prevailing Problem
8. Lack of cooperation and supervision from the DepEd personnel.	2.00	Prevailing Problem	1.76	Prevailing Problem	1.88	Prevailing Problem
9. Lack of support from government officials.	1.83	Prevailing Problem	1.86	Prevailing Problem	1.85	Prevailing Problem
10. Lack of budget.	2.33	Prevailing Problem	2.54	More Prevailing Problem	2.44	Prevailing Problem
11. Teachers are not culture-sensitive.	2.00	Prevailing Problem	1.58	Less Prevailing Problem	1.79	Prevailing Problem

12. Peace and order situation	2.17	Prevailing Problem	1.74	Less Prevailing Problem	1.96	Prevailing Problem
13. Calamities/disaster affects the area	2.33	Prevailing Problem	2.46	Prevailing Problem	2.40	Prevailing Problem
14. Tribal conflict regarding who will represent in the IPed Program.	2.00	Prevailing Problem	2.18	Prevailing Problem	2.09	Prevailing Problem
15. Liquidation reports utilization are not community-based.	1.50	Less Prevailing Problem	2.06	Prevailing Problem	1.78	Prevailing Problem
16. Lack of advocacy on the part of the community	1.67	Less Prevailing Problem	2.10	Prevailing Problem	1.89	Prevailing Problem
17. Less attendance of learners	2.00	Prevailing Problem	2.32	Prevailing Problem	2.16	Prevailing Problem
Overall Weighted Mean	2.08	Prevailing Problem	2.14	Prevailing Problem	2.11	Prevailing Problem

Aligned with the result of the findings, based on the profile of the implementers in Table 1, only a few implementers came from Higaonon and Manobo ethnicity. It explains why teachers have no expertise in the indigenous content of the topics to be discussed. However, teachers can use some approaches to learn about their learners' Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices.

Mentoring non-IP teachers can be a good way of helping them to understand the IP learners. In the study by Santoro et al., (2011), they found out that teaching indigenous children through listening and learning from indigenous teachers are found out to be effective. Mentoring provides pedagogical support and advice about indigenous cultures and ways of knowing. In addition, the less prevailing problems encountered by the implementers are teachers treating the Indigenous Peoples (IP) learners differently and with prejudice with an overall mean value of 1.47 and teachers using derogatory/discriminatory remarks towards the Indigenous Peoples (IP) learners with a general weighted mean value of 1.33.

Other Problems Encountered

Based on their answers in the survey questionnaire, the other problems encountered by the implementers share different experiences related to implementing the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPed) Program in their division.

On the side of the indirect implementers, one of the problems they encountered was that the Division IPed Focal Person had no alternative to support in the different IPed Program activities. Other problems were the overlapping of activities that could bar on quality assurance of existing indigenized learning resources. In addition, the sensitivity of the Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs) on the illustration of stories and Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT) Administrator and Indigenous Peoples Organizations (IPOs) has not reflected their IP education plan in their Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Protection Plan (ADSDPP).

One of the indirect implementers stressed that the issues and concerns about IP education in their division were the following: the IP teachers are tasked to take pictures of where the school is to be constructed and look for the children; some of them were assigned not to IP schools; only in the year 2016 that Agusan del Sur was given several items for IP education teachers; and no IP curriculum is used in the field; it is still an ongoing process.

The same with the indirect implementers, direct implementers have different problems encountered in the field. One of these was the tribal conflicts on distinct domain boundaries that affected the peace and order of the area. People used their bolo and knife in times of conflict. Their culture was also on the brink of being forgotten due to the influence of the lowlanders. Farms were not productive because of climate change which may disrupt the focus of IP children to attend school religiously. Since they were dependent on the resources of the forest, this is why most of the learners had no food to eat.

At an early age, parents bring their children to farms in times of crisis, which may result in frequent absences of the child. The family's socioeconomic status was meager, making it a hindrance to education. Some learners also are far from the school; it takes them many hours of hiking before they can reach the school. Not only may that, because of different rivers within Agusan but successive floods were also encountered during the rainy season. To reach the place or schools, teachers must transport using a pump boat and raft. The school's location was also dangerous in areas where a landslide was a constant problem, especially in mountainous places. Roads were also muddy and slippery, making the travel challenging and complex.

On the part of the parents, they lack guidance with their children regarding learners' activities/homework's/projects. Lack of availability of birth certificates and permanent addresses also prevailed as a problem.

On the part of the teachers, IP education was not fully implemented due to the insufficiency of learning materials. The language barrier between the teacher and learners was also apparent since hired teachers cannot speak the mother tongue of their learners. Even though the teacher was an IP, they were assigned to a school where the learners had different languages and prevailing cultural practices; they could still not relate with their learners. Cultural activities for the teachers and learners were also less evident.

Significant difference between the problems encountered as perceived by the implementers

Table 5 shows the computation of the significant difference between the problems encountered as perceived by the indirect and direct implementers during the implementation of the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program.

Table 5: t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	<i>Indirect Implementers</i>	<i>Direct Implementers</i>
Mean	2.078235294	2.144705882
Variance	0.266490441	0.214576471
Observations	17	17
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	32	
t Stat	-0.395140222	
p-value	0.695361187	
t Critical two-tail	2.036933343	

The computed *P*-value is 0.695, greater than 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant difference between the problems encountered as perceived by the two

implementers (indirect & direct). The study suggests that both implementers are at the same level regarding their problems.

Proposed Intervention Program

Based on the result of the study, the researcher has come up with an intervention program. The program was designed to address recurring problems in implementing the Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program in DepEd Esperanza Districts. The Program covers the training/seminar of the implementers to improve their knowledge in contextualizing the lesson, learning materials development, orthography development, demonstration teaching, and other related activities. It also covers the monitoring and evaluation of teachers, the role of the implementers in the IPEd implementation, supervision of the sustainability of the Program through school visits, continuous collaboration with the culture bearers, and other IPEd-related activities. The format of this design was adapted from the study of Coro (2016) about the Project UGMAD (Unahon Gayud ang Magtutudlo sa Ato Dakbayan).

Symbols of the Logo

The researcher makes a logo for the **PRE**servation of **C**ultural **I**ntity **T**hrough **E**ducation (PRECITE) Program. The logo is aligned with the IPEd Program of the Department of Education. The following are the symbols used and their meaning.

Gear. The gear or cogwheel symbolizes the skill of keeping going until the goals are reached. It is the essential element of a person. Just like the machine, it can move because of the gear, putting all specific values and goals into action.

Gold. The color gold is the color of success, achievement, and triumph. It can be represented in the Filipino culture because gold was considered a person's social status in the very early years. It means that a person who has jewelry and gold is successful. It represents the Filipino culture because they are unique and is a fundamental identity of Filipino here in the Philippines.

Green. The color green symbolizes growth and development, and the community's growth is in the learners' future.

Teacher. To be a teacher means acknowledging that teaching is a transformative process for students and teachers. Teachers have an essential role in the life of the learners since they are a source of knowledge inside the classroom.

Datu. It is a title that means rulers. At present, datu is used by the indigenous peoples across the Philippine archipelago.

Handshake. The image of two hands holding each other symbolizes a firm commitment. It represents a form of greeting, generally between men, or as a sign of agreement, for instance, a deal or plan agreed upon by both sides. It symbolizes both the side of teachers and datu to agree upon teaching learners of their prior knowledge and to collaborate.

Learner. A learner is learning about a particular subject or how to do something.

Torch. The meaning of the torch is both enlightenment and hope that serves as a guiding light toward the path. It was placed in the center to guide the learner, teacher, and datu in their values.



(PREservation of Cultural Identity Through Education)

PROGRAM DESIGN

I. GENERAL TRAINING INFORMATION	
TRAINING TITLE:	PRECITE – PREservation of Cultural Identity Through Education
TRAINING DESCRIPTION:	A program inspired by the Learning Action Cell (LAC) and Community of Practice (CoP)
PRE-REQUISITE PROGRAM:	Pedagogical Consultancy
DURATION:	Annual
MANAGEMENT LEVEL OF PROGRAM:	District-based – School Administrators, School INSET/IPed Coordinators monitored by District Supervisors, IPed Focal Person, Chief-Curriculum Implementation Division (CID), Schools Division Superintendent (SDS), and IP Community Elders of Manobo and Higaonon of Esperanza as Resource Speakers/Consultants
DELIVERY MODE:	Conduct of Training Workshop on the Implementation of Program PRECITE (to be scheduled) Conduct of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC)/Community of Practice (CoP)
TARGET PERSONNEL:	Esperanza Districts IPed School Administrators and Teachers
BUDGET REQUIREMENTS:	a. Supplies and Materials – Php10,000.00 (estimated) b. Venue – Php 3,000.00 (estimated) c. Food – Php50,000.00 Charged to School MOOE, Division IPed Program Support Fund, and other sources
RATIONALE: <p>Implementing the IPed Program paves the way for making education relevant to the needs of the indigenous peoples' learners, aligned with the principles of a rights-based approach to inclusion, empowerment, and participation. To address Education for All, IPed Program was realized to give a culture-based education to each IP community to preserve their cultural identity that is different from the mainstream education.</p> <p>Since part of this realization are the IPed implementers, it is essential to know their roles in making this IPed Program well implemented in their respected districts and schools. It will happen only with the collaboration of different stakeholders to develop a collaborative effort for the IP learners. They need to immerse themselves in their community's culture and traditions to understand their learners' Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs). Teachers in the field should be equipped with the contextualization of the lessons, especially in indigenizing the lesson plans with the help of the culture bearers through intermarriages of K to 12 competencies with the competencies of the community, learning materials development, orthography development, and immersion to learner's ancestral domain as part of their learning experiences that may be emphasized for the sustainability of the Program.</p>	

The elders also have a significant role in realizing the IPed Program since they are the culture bearers of their community. They may disclose their IKSPs to DepEd to preserve them for the next generation. However, there must be a continuous dialogue between the DepEd and elders since many cultures and traditions need to be written to document it.

Since in every Program, there are still some problems encountered that should be given proper attention to strengthening its implementation. The Learning Action Cell (LAC) and Community of Practice (CoP) conduct are essential for the district and school's activities. With this, the teachers, school administrators, district supervisors, and culture bearers will collaborate to enrich the IPed Program at their level, helping learners to identify themselves through education. Hence, this Esperanza Districts Project PRECITE is conceptualized.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To improve the teaching-learning process between the teacher and the IP learners to help them understand the lessons in their pacing and worldview.
2. To enhance the District Supervisors, School Heads, and Teachers with the K to 12 competencies and intermarry it with the IP community competencies to align the lesson based on the learner's understanding.
3. To ensure the participation of elders in the teaching-learning process as consultants/resource persons/speakers in the school with IP learners.

END OF TRAINING OUTPUTS:

A. Training-Workshops

- a. Improve teacher's teaching-learning process aligned with the IKSPs of their learners
- b. Make indigenized lesson plans with the help of the culture bearers (Produce one indigenized lesson plan in each subject area with a minimum of three objectives).
- c. Enhance the understanding of the Districts Supervisors, Schools Heads, and Teachers about the IPed Program implementation

B. School Learning Action Cell (SLAC)/Community of Practice (CoP)

- a. Empower the implementers in making indigenized lesson plans, learning materials, orthography development, demonstration teaching, and other related activities for the learner's development
- b. Enhance the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values of the implementers
- c. Intensify the collaboration among IPed Focal Person, District Supervisors, School Heads/Teacher-in-Charge, Teachers, and Culture Bearers in implementing the Program.

EXPECTED FINAL OUTCOMES/ SUCCESS INDICATORS:

A well-implemented Indigenous Peoples Education (IPed) Program with the intensive collaboration of the implementers and culture bearers of Manobo and Higaonon communities.

II. PROGRAM CONTENT FOCUS

CONTENT MATRIX

Specific Objectives	Content	Suggested Activity	Duration	Expected Output
Training Workshop				
KNOWLEDGE: 1. To improve the teaching-learning process between the teacher and the IP learners to help them understand the lessons in their pacing and worldview.	IPed Program Information Drive Contextualization of the Lesson	PRECITE Session	Five days – as needed	Improved knowledge and understanding in the teaching-learning process
SKILLS: 1. To enhance the District Supervisors, School Heads/Teacher-in-Charge, and Teachers with the K	IPed Program Information Drive	Coaching, Mentoring, &		Enhance the knowledge, skills, attitude, and values of

to 12 competencies and intermarry it with the IP community competencies to align the lesson based on the learner's understanding.	Contextualization of the Lesson	Collaboration with the Culture Bearers	Five days – as needed	District Supervisors, School Heads, and Teachers
ATTITUDES: 1. Participation of community elders in the teaching-learning process as consultants/ resource persons/ speakers in the schools with IP learners.	IPed Program Information Drive Contextualization of the Lesson	Coaching, Mentoring, & Collaboration with the Culture Bearers	Five days – as needed	Outcome-based portfolio for indigenized lesson plan, strategies, and innovations
School Learning Action Cell (SLAC)/Community of Practice (CoP)				
Specific Objectives	Content	Suggested Activity	Duration	Expected Output
KNOWLEDGE: 1. Enhanced knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values of the implementers	Indigenized Lesson Plans, Learning Materials Development, Orthography Development, Demonstration Teaching, and Assessment of the Learning Outputs	PRECITE Session	One day, once a month Year-round	Compilation of Validated Indigenized Lesson Plan, Big books Stories of Higaonon and Manobo, Communication with the Higaonon and Manobo languages to the IP learners, Observation of Teachers, and Assessment of Learners Using the IP lens
SKILLS: 1. Empowered implementers in making indigenized lesson plans, learning materials, orthography development, demonstration teaching, and other related activities for the learner's development	Indigenized Lesson Plans, Learning Materials Development, Orthography Development, Demonstration Teaching, and Assessment of the Learning Outputs	Coaching, Mentoring, & Collaboration with the Culture Bearers	One day, once a month Year-round	Compilation of Validated Indigenized Lesson Plan, Bigbook Stories of Higaonon and Manobo, Communication with the Higaonon and Manobo languages to the IP learners, Observation of Teachers, and Assessment of Learners Using the IP lens
ATTITUDES: 1. Intensified collaboration among IPed Focal Person, District Supervisors, School Heads/Teacher-in-Charge, Teachers, and Culture Bearers	Indigenized Lesson Plans, Learning Materials Development, Orthography Development, Demonstration Teaching, and Assessment of the Learning Outputs	Coaching, Mentoring, & Collaboration with the Culture Bearers	One day, once a month Year-round	Creation of Consultative and Advisory Bodies (CABs) Reflective Journal

in implementing the Program				
ACTIVITY SCHEDULE:				
A. TRAINING WORKSHOPS				
PHASE I – PLANNING				
DATE	ACTIVITY	PERSONS INVOLVED	MOVs	
April	District meeting about the conduct of Mass Training of Teachers Assigned in the School with IP Learners	IPed Focal Person District Supervisors School Heads	Masterlist of Teachers and Culture Bearers Who Will Attend the Training	
PHASE II - IMPLEMENTATION				
May	PRECITE Orientation/ Training	Schools Division Superintendent IPed Focal Person District Supervisors Schools Heads IPed Coordinators	LAC/CoP Policies and Guidelines (DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016)	
May	District-based Teacher's Orientation/ Training	Schools Division Superintendent IPed Focal Person District Supervisors Schools Heads IPed Coordinators	Training Matrix Training Design	
PHASE III – MONITORING AND EVALUATION				
June – March	Supervise PRECITE sessions in different schools	IPed Focal Person District Supervisors School Heads IPed Coordinators Teachers	Monitoring Report	
October	PRECITE sessions Midyear Performance Review	IPed Focal Person District Supervisors Schools Heads IPed Coordinators Teachers	PRECITE Evaluation Report	
March	Individual Performance Review of teachers	District Supervisors School Heads IPed Coordinators	Compilation of Indigenized Lesson Plan with strategies and innovations	
PHASE IV – FEEDBACK				
April	Enhancement of PRECITE strategic plans	Schools Division Superintendent IPed Focal Person District Supervisors School Heads	Improved PRECITE Strategic Plans	
May	Conduct information drive to PRECITE activities to stakeholders	IPed Focal Person District Supervisors School Heads Teachers Culture Bearers	Report on the result of the conducted activities	
B. SCHOOL LEARNING ACTION CELL (SLAC)/COMMUNITY of PRACTICE (CoP)				
DATE	ACTIVITY	PERSONS INVOLVED	MOVs	
June and July	Indigenized Lesson Plan Making	IPed Focal Person District Supervisors School Heads IPed Coordinators Culture Bearers	Attendance Sheets Reflection Journal Pictorials One Indigenized Lesson Plan with Three	

			Objectives in Selected Subject
August and September	Demonstration Teaching	IPed Focal Person District Supervisors School Heads IPed Coordinators Culture Bearers	Attendance Sheets Reflection Journal Pictorials One teacher demonstrator per month
October and November	Higaonon/ Manobo Language Literacy	IPed Focal Person District Supervisors School Heads IPed Coordinators Culture Bearers	Attendance Sheets Reflection Journal Pictorials
December and January	Bigbook Making	IPed Focal Person District Supervisors School Heads IPed Coordinators Culture Bearers	Attendance Sheets Reflection Journal Pictorials One story per month
February and March	Evaluation	IPed Focal Person District Supervisors Schools Heads	Monitoring Tool and Pictorials
MATERIALS: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> Training Matrix Training Design LCD Manila Papers Bond papers (Short, Long, A3) Pentel Pen Pencil Crayons </div> <div> Sound System Laptops Extension Wire Sign Pens Instructional Materials Illustration Boards Curriculum Guide Masking Tape </div> </div> MONITORING AND EVALUATION: The conduct of the activity will be monitored monthly by the District Supervisors, School Heads/Teacher-in-Charge, IPed Coordinator, and the Consultative and Advisory Bodies (CABs). School IPed Coordinator and CABs will gather the journal and identify common problems in the implementation to be used as the basis for future plans. School IPed Coordinators will be required to submit a report to the Division IPed Focal Person. Each subject teacher will closely monitor MPS per grading. There will be an informal gathering of school heads, teachers, and CABs to allow them to share their thoughts and learnings from their LAC sessions/CoPs. Final monitoring will be done at the end of the year.			

4. Conclusion

Based on the result of the study, the following conclusions were formulated. Ethnicity and relevant training attended by the implementers affect the program's implementation. There is a minimal number of teachers who knows the IP learners' culture and traditions where they are assigned. Added to the problem is the few trainings attended by the implementers that affect the readiness of the implementation. The socioeconomic status of the IP family hampers the education of the learners. Their dependence on the resources of the environment affects their economic status. The implementing schools need additional facilities to sustain the increasing number of learners enrolled. A supplementary budget for the school's operation is necessary. Lack of culture-based learning materials like textbooks and references is the more prevailing problem in the implementation. Another problem they face is that teachers have no expertise in indigenizing the lesson to be discussed.

5. Recommendations

The researcher wishes to offer the following recommendations based on the conclusions drawn. IP teachers who belong to the same IP community as the learners may be prioritized for giving an item since they have prior knowledge about the culture and tradition of the learners. Implementers may enhance their understanding of culture-based instruction by attending relevant training to improve their knowledge, skills, and competence in implementing the IPED Program. Indigenous peoples' learners may grab the opportunity of enrolling in the implementing schools in their respective barangays so that they can finish schooling, land a job, and augment the economic condition of their families.

The Department of Education may give more facilities to the implementing schools to cater to their learners' needs and acquire quality education apt for them. Schools may have a more vital link to the different stakeholders to help them implement, especially on financial matters. The Department of Education may give culture-based learning materials just like textbooks and references and extensive training for teachers since this is their primary concern during the implementation of the IPED Program. They may consider the proposed intervention program for the IPED implementers and other stakeholders for the extensive implementation of the IPED Program.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank all the participants of the study, especially the Department of Education – Division of Agusan del Sur. Special thanks to Miss Kissygen A. Auditor for making the design logo.

References

- Alcober, N. (2016, August 30). DepEd moves to bolster IP education. *The Manila Times*.
<https://www.manilatimes.net/2016/08/30/news/regions/dep-ed-moves-to-bolster-ip-education/283027>
- Coro, E. C. (2016). *Quality work life of public school teachers* [Unpublished doctoral's dissertation]. Surigao del Sur State University.
- De Leon, H. S. (2005). *Textbook on the Philippine Constitution*. Rex Printing Company, Inc.
- Department of Education. (2011). DepEd order no. 62 s, 2011: "Adopting the national indigenous peoples (IP) education policy framework."
<http://www.deped.gov.ph/orders/do-62-s-2011>
- Department of Education. (2016). DepEd order no. 35, s. 2016: "The learning action cell as a k to 12 basic education program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning." https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/DO_s2016_035.pdf
- Department of Education. (2016). DepEd order no. 50, s. 2016: "Hiring guidelines for teacher I positions in schools implementing indigenous peoples' education effective school year 2016-2017." <http://www.deped.gov.ph/orders/do-50-s-2016>
- Directorate of Primary Education. (2010). Indigenous peoples' framework primary education sector development program 3 (PEDP III): ADB TA NO. 7169-BAN. Ministry of Primary & Mass Education, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.
<https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/project-document/62218/4212201-ban-ippf.pdf>

- Drummond, K. E. & Reyes, A.M. (2018). Nutrition Research: Concepts & Applications [E-book]. In *Quantitative Research Designs: Experimental, Quasi-Experimental, and Descriptive* (pp. 155–183). Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Eduardo, J. P., & Gabriel, A. G. (2021). Indigenous Peoples and the Right to Education: The Dumagat Experience in the Provinces of Nueva Ecija and Aurora, in the Philippines. *SAGE Open*, 11(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211009491>
- Flor, A. G. (2013). Exploring the downside of open knowledge resources: The case of indigenous knowledge systems and practices in the Philippines. *Open Praxis*, 5(1), 75-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.5.1.15>
- Great Schools Partnership. (2013). Multicultural Education. In *Glossary of Education Reform*. <http://edglossary.org/multicultural-education/>
- Korff, J. (2012). *Barriers to aboriginal education*. <https://www.creativespirits.info/aboriginalculture/education/barriers-to-aboriginal-education>
- Maeda, K., & Okano, K. H. (2013). Connecting indigenous Ainu, university and local industry in Japan: The Urespa Project. *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 12(1), 45-60. ISSN 1413-1475
- National Government Portal. (1997). *Republic Act No. 8371, also known as "The Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act of 1997."* Retrieved from <http://www.gov.ph/1997/10/29/republic-act-no-8371/>
- National Government Portal. (2013). *Republic Act No. 10533, also known as the "Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013."* <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/downloads/2013/05may/20130515-RA-10533-BSA.pdf>
- National Government Portal. (2016). Education comes to the indigenous peoples of Mindanao. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2016/08/24/education-comes-to-the-indigenous-peoples-of-mindanao/>
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (n.d.) *Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989*. Retrieved from <http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx>
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2009). *Quality education for indigenous peoples*. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/QualityEducationForIndigenousPeoples.aspx>
- Oxtero, I. A. (2018). *Implementation of Indigenous Peoples Education (IPEd) Program in DepEd Esperanza, Agusan del Sur* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Surigao del Sur State University.
- Plant, R. & Chakma, K. N. (2011). *Regional: Targeted capacity building for mainstreaming indigenous peoples' concerns in development*. Asian Development Bank. <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/project-document/79232/39356-012-reg-tacr-01.pdf>
- Pondar, M.J. G. (2013). *The implementation of mother tongue in basic education* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Surigao del Sur State University.
- Santoro, N., Reid, J. A., Crawford, L., & Simpson, L. (2011). Teaching Indigenous Children: Listening To And Learning From Indigenous Teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(10), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n10.2>
- United Nations. (2008). *United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples*. www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

- United Nations Department of Public Information. (2014). *Indigenous peoples in the Asian region: Thirteenth session of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues*.
<https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/2014/press/asia.pdf>
- United Nations Development Programme. (n.d.). *Sustainable Development Goals*. UNDP.
<https://www.undp.org/sustainable-development-goals>
- United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women & the Secretariat of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. (2010). *Gender and indigenous peoples' education*.
https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/BriefingNote3_GREY.pdf
- Zheng, G. (2014). Establishing Multicultural-Oriented Teacher Education System: An Empirical Research on Cultural Conflicts between Teachers and Students in Tibet. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 02(06), 409–416.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2014.26047>