



Received: 28-05-2026
Accepted: 07-07-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Awareness and Implementation of Joint Delivery Voucher Program (JDVP) for Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) Specialization in Laguna, Philippines

¹ Sheila P Catalan, ² Marc Sylvester P Garcia

¹ DepEd SDO Laguna, Philippines

² Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

Corresponding Author: Sheila P Catalan

Abstract

The Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) track under the Philippine K to 12 program plays a crucial role in preparing Senior High School learners for employment, entrepreneurship and lifelong learning. However, many public schools face challenges such as limited facilities, inadequate equipment, and shortage of qualified teachers particularly in the Agriculture and Fisheries Arts (AFA) strand. In response the Department of Education implemented the Joint Delivery Voucher Program (JDVP) under DepEd Order No. 68, s. 2017 to provide learners with access to industry-aligned training through partner institutions. This study aimed to determine the level of awareness and the extent of implementation of the JDVP in the 4th Congressional District of Laguna and to examine the relationship between these variables. Using a descriptive-correlational research design data were gathered from 234 respondents composed of learners, school coordinators, and Technical-Vocational Institution (TVI) partners. Quantitative data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, t-test, and Pearson r correlation.

Results revealed that all groups of respondents demonstrated a very high level of awareness of the JDVP. The program was also perceived to be implemented to a very high extent across key areas including program management and coordination, availability of facilities and resources, compliance with standards and delivery of training and assessment. No significant difference was found in the level of awareness among the groups of respondents. However, a significant positive relationship was identified between awareness and program management and coordination while no significant relationships were observed in other areas of implementation. The findings indicate that while awareness of the JDVP is consistently high among stakeholders it primarily influences organizational aspects of program implementation rather than resource based or procedural components. The study recommends strengthening stakeholder engagement expanding access to program slots improving resource allocation and enhancing monitoring and evaluation systems to ensure the sustainability and effectiveness of the JDVP.

Keywords: Joint Delivery Voucher Program (JDVP), Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL), Program Awareness, Program Implementation

Introduction

The Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) track in Philippine senior high school was designed to prepare learners for employment, entrepreneurship, middle-level skills work, and lifelong learning. Within this track, Agriculture and Fishery Arts (AFA) occupies a particularly important place because it connects technical training with food systems, rural livelihoods, and local economic development. However, many public schools that offer TVL specializations continue to face constraints related to workshop space, training laboratories, tools, equipment, consumable materials, and qualified trainers. These limitations create a structural gap between curriculum intentions and actual delivery conditions.

The Joint Delivery Voucher Program (JDVP) was developed precisely to address this gap. Through the program, learners enrolled in public senior high schools may take TVL specialization subjects in partnership with accredited Technical-Vocational Institutions (TVIs), private schools, higher education institutions, or other qualified training providers. In principle, JDVP allows schools to expand access to quality technical-vocational learning without requiring every public school to

independently build full specialization infrastructure. For learners, this arrangement is intended to provide industry-aligned training, better access to equipment and expertise, and stronger preparation for certification and employment. Although the policy rationale for JDVP is clear, effective implementation depends on more than policy issuance. Educational and program implementation literature consistently shows that stakeholder awareness is an enabling condition for successful delivery. Programs tend to function better when implementers understand policy objectives, role expectations, and operational procedures; when learners recognize the purpose and benefits of participation; and when partner institutions are fully aware of standards, compliance requirements, and training responsibilities. Awareness helps reduce ambiguity, supports coordination, and strengthens commitment across multiple actors.

This issue is highly relevant in JDVP because implementation is distributed across schools and partner institutions. School coordinators organize learner participation, communication, scheduling, reporting, and linkages with TVIs. Learners participate in training and assessment activities that often occur outside regular school spaces. TVIs deliver the technical training itself and must align training with Department of Education and TESDA requirements. When awareness varies across these groups, implementation may become inconsistent even if the program is formally in place.

Implementation quality also depends on concrete organizational and instructional conditions. Program management and coordination, facilities and resources, compliance with standards, and delivery of training and assessment are all crucial dimensions of JDVP implementation. A program may be judged positively at one level because it runs on schedule or produces certification results, yet still encounter hidden weaknesses related to resource adequacy, communication practices, or learner support. For this reason, awareness and implementation need to be examined together rather than in isolation.

The need for such examination is particularly strong in the context of AFA specialization in Laguna. Agricultural and fishery-related training requires tools, materials, facilities, safety equipment, and authentic practical exposure. These demands are difficult for many public schools to meet on their own. The schools included in this study therefore represent an important implementation setting for JDVP, not only because they rely on partnerships but also because they illustrate how policy works in practice under real educational and logistical constraints.

This study investigated awareness and implementation of the JDVP among learners, school coordinators, and a partner TVI in selected schools in the Fourth Congressional District of Laguna. Specifically, it examined respondent profile; measured awareness of JDVP; assessed implementation in terms of program management and coordination, facilities and learning resources, compliance with program guidelines, and delivery of training and assessment; identified challenges encountered during implementation; described selected post-graduation outcomes of JDVP beneficiaries; tested whether awareness differed between learners and school coordinators; and determined whether learner awareness was associated with perceptions of program implementation.

The study contributes to the literature on TVL

implementation, school-industry partnership, and educational access in resource-constrained contexts. It also provides practical evidence for Department of Education units, school heads, JDVP focal persons, and partner institutions seeking to improve implementation quality and program sustainability. The article argues that JDVP in Laguna has achieved a generally high level of implementation and awareness, yet continued strengthening is needed in learner support, coordination systems, and post-graduation transition mechanisms.

Methods

Research Design

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational design. The descriptive component was intended to determine the level of awareness of the JDVP and the extent of its implementation as perceived by the respondents. The correlational component was used to examine the relationship between learner awareness and implementation dimensions. Because the study also compared awareness between learners and school coordinators, an independent-samples test of difference was applied.

Research Setting and Participants

The study was conducted in five public schools implementing JDVP for the Agriculture and Fishery Arts strand in the Schools Division of Laguna: Calangay Integrated High School (Sta. Maria), Gov. F.T. Integrated High School (Siniloan), Galalan Integrated National High School (Pangil), Stand-Alone Senior High School No. 21–Papatahan (Paete), and Siniloan Integrated High School (Siniloan). The partner Technical-Vocational Institution was Laguna Sweet Nature Technology and Livelihood Training Center in Sta. Maria, Laguna. The participating TVI was selected because of its active JDVP partnership and accreditation for relevant specialization areas.

A total of 234 respondents participated. These included 228 JDVP graduates in the AFA strand, five school coordinators or focal persons, and one TVI representative. Total enumeration was used for school coordinators and the TVI representative because of their small population size. Total enumeration was also used for JDVP graduate-respondents at the site level to capture all available qualified graduates exposed to the program during the identified implementation period.

Instrumentation

Data were collected using a researcher-made questionnaire. The instrument was divided into several parts: respondent profile; level of awareness of JDVP; extent of implementation of JDVP; challenges encountered in implementation; and post-graduation status of JDVP beneficiaries in the AFA strand. The awareness scale used five descriptive categories: 4.21–5.00 = very much aware, 3.41–4.20 = aware, 2.61–3.40 = moderately aware, 1.81–2.60 = slightly aware, and 1.00–1.80 = not aware. The implementation scale used: 4.21–5.00 = very well implemented, 3.41–4.20 = well implemented, 2.61–3.40 = implemented, 1.81–2.60 = fairly implemented, and 1.00–1.80 = poorly implemented. A separate scale was used for challenges encountered, ranging from not a problem to highly a problem.

The questionnaire underwent content validation by a panel

of experts and pilot testing to support clarity, content adequacy, and internal consistency prior to full administration.

Data Collection Procedure

Before data collection, the researcher sought permission from the Schools Division Office and coordinated with participating schools and program personnel. Following the approved procedures, the validated questionnaires were administered to learners, school coordinators, and the TVI partner. Respondents completed the instruments, after which the data were retrieved, checked, and prepared for encoding and analysis. The implementation of the data-gathering procedure followed the basic research management requirements of the Department of Education and observed confidentiality of respondents.

Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage were used to describe respondent profile and post-graduation outcomes. Mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of awareness, extent of implementation, and challenges encountered. A t-test for two independent samples assuming unequal variances was used to determine whether awareness differed significantly between learners and school coordinators. The TVI respondent was excluded from inferential testing because a sample size of one does not satisfy the assumptions required for statistical comparison. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test the relationship between learner awareness and the four implementation dimensions.

Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary. The study assured respondents that their answers would be treated confidentially and reported only in aggregate form. The research process followed standard academic procedures for consent, anonymity, and responsible handling of data.

Results

Profile of Respondents and JDVP Implementation Sites

The data set consisted of 234 respondents drawn from five participating schools and one accredited TVI partner. Learners made up the majority of respondents ($n = 228$), while school coordinators ($n = 5$) and the TVI representative ($n = 1$) provided the administrative and partnership perspectives. The use of multiple stakeholder groups allowed the study to capture learner experience, school-side coordination, and institutional partner implementation.

The schools involved in the study were Calangay Integrated High School, Gov. F.T. Integrated High School, Galalan Integrated National High School, Stand-Alone Senior High School No. 21–Papatahan, and Siniloan Integrated High School. These schools implemented JDVP in partnership with Laguna Sweet Nature Technology and Livelihood Training Center, which offered AFA specialization training and functioned as the accredited TESDA-linked training institution for the program.

Level of Awareness of the JDVP

The findings show that awareness of JDVP was consistently high across all respondent groups. School coordinators obtained a weighted mean of 4.65 ($SD = 0.55$), interpreted as **very high**. Their strongest indicators were

knowledge of training programs, eligibility criteria, school roles in implementation, benefits of the program, and the importance of JDVP in strengthening technical and practical skills. Even the relatively lower items, such as awareness of partner agencies and school-to-career connections, remained at the fully aware level.

Learners also demonstrated a **very high** level of awareness, with a weighted mean of 4.34 ($SD = 0.75$). The highest mean score was recorded for awareness that JDVP provides training opportunities for technical-vocational courses ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 0.66$), followed by awareness of the program's purpose in supporting skill development ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 0.70$). Learners were slightly less aware of the specific training programs offered under JDVP ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.98$) and of the agencies or partners involved in implementation ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.79$). Nevertheless, the overall profile indicates strong learner familiarity with JDVP and its perceived benefits.

The TVI representative obtained a perfect weighted mean of 5.00 ($SD = 0.00$), interpreted as **very high** or complete awareness. Every awareness statement—from program objectives, institutional roles, policies, voucher mechanisms, and training requirements to reporting, monitoring, and learner protection—was rated fully aware. While this result cannot be generalized because it reflects only one respondent, it indicates that the partner institution involved in the study possessed complete knowledge of program requirements.

Overall, the findings indicate that JDVP awareness was not weak or fragmented. Instead, the program appears to have been clearly communicated to both school-level implementers and learner beneficiaries, with the greatest depth of awareness observed among formal implementers and the TVI partner.

Extent of JDVP Implementation

Implementation was rated **very high** across all four major dimensions.

In **program management and coordination**, the weighted mean was 4.27 ($SD = 0.77$). Respondents perceived JDVP as well organized, with effective school-partner coordination, timely communication, administrative support, and generally positive learner experiences. The highest rated items were the organization of the program and the contribution of overall management to positive learning experiences. Slightly lower, but still positive, ratings were observed for learner feedback in management, collaborative participation, and the regularity of management meetings.

In **facilities, equipment, and learning resources**, the weighted mean was 4.23 ($SD = 0.78$), also interpreted as very high. Respondents agreed that facilities and resources generally supported effective learning and skill development. Adequate training spaces, learning resources, safety equipment, and material availability were rated positively. However, access to technology for JDVP learning activities ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.94$) emerged as a comparatively weaker area, together with concerns related to functional tools and adequacy of space for practical exercises.

In **compliance with program guidelines and standards**, the weighted mean was 4.29 ($SD = 0.70$), the highest among the four implementation dimensions. JDVP activities were perceived to follow official guidelines, safety and health standards, required procedures, and assessment

expectations. Ratings related to adherence to program timelines, learner monitoring, fairness in assessment, and prompt response to deviations from standards were all very positive. Relatively lower, though still high, scores were seen in the communication of updated guidelines and the reinforcement of professional and ethical standards.

In **delivery of training and assessment**, the weighted mean was 4.26 (SD = 0.72), again interpreted as very high. Training sessions were perceived as regular, clearly delivered, and supportive of practical skill development. Learners were actively engaged, trainers were seen as professional and effective, and assessments were generally viewed as fair and aligned with program objectives. The comparatively lower items concerned the degree to which overall training met learner needs, the clarity of assessment criteria before evaluation, and the extent to which training strengthened learner confidence.

Taken together, these findings indicate that JDVP implementation in Laguna was not simply functional but strongly institutionalized in the eyes of respondents. The ratings suggest a program that is stable, coordinated, compliant, and instructionally active, although with room for targeted enhancement in feedback processes, technology access, and learner support.

Challenges Encountered in JDVP Implementation

Despite the generally strong implementation profile, respondents also identified persistent challenges.

For **learners**, the most salient problems were scheduling conflicts with regular classes or other commitments ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 1.16$), transportation difficulties or costs to training sites ($M = 2.41$, $SD = 1.29$), difficulty understanding some training instructions without sufficient guidance ($M = 2.25$, $SD = 1.18$), insufficient funds for implementation-related needs ($M = 2.24$, $SD = 1.07$), and personal financial constraints involving transportation and meals ($M = 2.22$, $SD = 1.16$). Limited hands-on practice due to insufficient equipment or materials ($M = 2.22$, $SD = 1.19$) was also noted. These scores fell in the “a problem” range, indicating moderate but meaningful barriers to full participation.

For the **TVI**, most challenges were rated as not a problem, although two items—limited training slots due to high learner demand and financial/logistical constraints affecting sustainability—received means of 2.00 and were interpreted as minor but existing concerns. These findings suggest that the TVI partner was generally capable of delivering training but remained sensitive to capacity and resource sustainability.

For **school coordinators**, challenges were generally minimal, yet a few areas stood out: insufficient or outdated equipment and training materials ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 0.84$), difficulty monitoring learner progress according to JDVP standards because of limited tools or capacity ($M = 1.80$, $SD = 0.84$), and limited classrooms or laboratory space affecting delivery ($M = 1.75$, $SD = 0.96$). Other concerns related to documentation, compliance attention, attendance consistency, and the smoothness of implementation were present but not highly severe.

These findings show that while JDVP was broadly well implemented, learner participation was still constrained by logistical and resource issues, and schools and partners were not entirely free from operational pressure.

Post-Graduation Outcomes of JDVP Beneficiaries

The study also examined selected post-graduation outcomes among JDVP learners in the AFA strand. Of the 228 respondents, 118 (51.75%) were enrolled in college, 23 (10.09%) were enrolled in technical-vocational courses, 29 (12.72%) were employed full-time, 9 (3.95%) were employed part-time, 12 (5.26%) were self-employed or engaged in entrepreneurship, and 37 (16.23%) were neither employed nor enrolled.

Among reported employment categories, agriculture-related work accounted for 60.00% of employed graduates, while 40.00% were in non-agriculture-related work. Government employment accounted for the largest identified sector (33.76%), followed by private, family enterprise, and cooperative settings. Most reported work fell into the skilled or semi-skilled categories. Notably, all respondents were reported to have passed TESDA National Certification, and most indicated that they were applying JDVP-acquired skills in further studies, entrepreneurship, employment, or household use. These results suggest that JDVP had relevant post-school utility, although the group of graduates not in employment or further study also points to the need for stronger transition support.

Test of Significant Difference in Awareness

Because the number of respondents differed substantially across groups, inferential comparison was limited to learners and school coordinators. The independent-samples t-test assuming unequal variances showed no statistically significant difference in awareness between learners and school coordinators, $t = -1.39$, $p = .238$. Learners had a mean awareness score of 4.34, while school coordinators had a slightly higher mean of 4.65, but the difference was not statistically meaningful. This indicates that both groups shared generally high awareness of the JDVP despite the school coordinators' numerically higher score.

Relationship between Learner Awareness and Implementation

Pearson product-moment correlation showed that learner awareness was **strongly and positively** related to perceptions of **program management and coordination** ($r = .797$, $p < .001$). This means that learners who were more aware of the JDVP also tended to view the organizational and coordination aspects of implementation more positively. By contrast, awareness had **no significant relationship** with the other implementation dimensions: facilities, equipment, and learning resources ($r = -.039$, $p = .555$); compliance with program guidelines and standards ($r = .016$, $p = .806$); and delivery of training and assessment ($r = .022$, $p = .740$). These non-significant associations suggest that learner awareness primarily shaped perceptions of how the program was organized and communicated, rather than how resources, standards compliance, or instructional delivery were experienced.

Conclusion

The Joint Delivery Voucher Program for TVL specialization in Laguna was found to be highly visible, well understood, and generally very well implemented. School coordinators, learners, and the partner TVI all demonstrated high levels of awareness of the program. Across implementation domains, respondents perceived JDVP as strongly managed, resource-

supported, compliant with standards, and effective in the delivery of training and assessment.

Despite these favorable findings, the study also shows that implementation quality is not free from operational and contextual constraints. Learners continued to face barriers related to scheduling, transportation, funding, and access to hands-on resources. Schools and the partner TVI also faced issues involving equipment sufficiency, training capacity, and sustainability. These constraints did not negate the overall success of the program, but they do indicate that continued support and refinement are necessary.

The study further concludes that learner awareness matters most in relation to perceptions of program management and coordination. Awareness strengthened attention to how the program was organized and communicated, but it did not significantly shape perceptions of facilities, compliance, or training delivery. This suggests that awareness-building is important but not sufficient by itself; improvements in implementation practice must accompany continued communication efforts.

Finally, the post-graduation data indicate that JDVP contributed positively to further study, certification, employability, entrepreneurship, and skill application. Nevertheless, the presence of graduates who were neither employed nor enrolled highlights the need for stronger transition support, industry linkages, and graduate monitoring. JDVP in Laguna is therefore best understood as a strong but still evolving partnership-based program that requires ongoing enhancement to maximize learner benefit and long-term sustainability.

Recommendations

1. Strengthen division-level program support:

Department of Education and Schools Division Office units may continue and expand division-wide orientation, capacity-building, and policy updating for JDVP implementers to maintain strong program awareness and responsive coordination.

2. Improve communication and feedback systems:

Participating schools may institutionalize regular coordination meetings, learner feedback mechanisms, and clearer communication of updated guidelines, schedules, and assessment expectations.

3. Address learner participation barriers: Schools and partner institutions may develop practical support strategies for scheduling conflicts, transportation difficulties, and learner costs related to meals and travel, especially for those attending partner-site training.

4. Enhance facilities and resource adequacy: Although implementation was rated highly, targeted improvement is still needed in technology access, equipment functionality, and space for practical exercises. Resource-sharing and partnership expansion may help address these gaps.

5. Sustain TVI capacity and partnership alignment:

Partner institutions may continue upgrading training capacity, scheduling systems, facilities, and coordination channels to accommodate learner demand without reducing quality.

6. Strengthen learner-centered training: Trainers and teachers may more clearly communicate assessment criteria, align training more closely with learner needs, and provide additional opportunities that strengthen confidence and applied competence.

7. Expand transition and post-graduation support:

Schools, TVIs, and external partners may strengthen career guidance, employment linkage, entrepreneurship support, and graduate tracking to improve outcomes for JDVP completers after graduation.

8. Support future research: Future studies may examine larger samples of TVI partners, conduct longitudinal tracking of graduates, and explore the role of digital and blended approaches in JDVP delivery and sustainability.

Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the participating schools, JDVP focal persons, learner-respondents, and the Technical-Vocational Institution partner whose cooperation made the study possible.

References

1. Afeti G. Technical and vocational education and training for industrialization. UNESCO-UNEVOC International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education and Training, 2018.
2. Baffsky R, Kemp L, Jolly B, Williams K. Stakeholder awareness and implementation fidelity in educational interventions. *Prevention Science*. 2022; 23(6):1021-1034.
3. Becker GS. Human capital theory and education investment. University of Chicago Press, 2020.
4. Billett S. Vocational education: Purposes, traditions and prospects. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
5. Blancaflor J. Policy constraints affecting the implementation of the Joint Delivery Voucher Program in the Philippines. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 2026.
6. Buenafe EP, Mahistrado AML. Challenges encountered by teachers in the implementation of the Joint Delivery Voucher Program. *International Journal of Science and Advanced Technology*, 2025.
7. Burstein VR, Cahill J, Griffiths K. Awareness interventions and educational program effectiveness: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health*. 2019; 19(1):7258.
8. Campbell M, Fitzpatrick R, Haines A, Kinmonth AL, Sandercock P, Spiegelhalter D, *et al.* Framework for design and evaluation of complex interventions to improve health. *British Medical Journal*. 2000; 321(7262):694-696.
9. Canlas DB. Investing in human capital for inclusive growth: Focus on higher education. Philippine Institute for Development Studies, 2016.
10. CEDEFOP. Vocational education and training and the future of work. European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training, 2020.
11. Chukwuedo SO, Omofonmwan GO. Challenges of funding and industry collaboration in TVET implementation. *Education Sciences*. 2022; 12(8):551.
12. Declaro-Ruedas MYA. Evaluation of Joint Delivery Voucher Program implementation in selected public schools in Occidental Mindoro. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 2022.
13. Department of Education. Guidelines on the implementation of the Joint Delivery Voucher Program for Senior High School Technical-Vocational-Livelihood specializations for School Year 2017-2018

- (DepEd Order No. 68, s. 2017). Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines, 2017.
14. Department of Education. K to 12 curriculum guide for Technical-Vocational-Livelihood track. Department of Education, 2017.
 15. Department of Education. Research management guidelines (DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2017). Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines, 2017.
 16. Department of Education. Joint Delivery Voucher Program for Senior High School Technical-Vocational-Livelihood specializations (DepEd Order No. 006, s. 2023). Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines, 2023.
 17. Department of Education. Department Memorandum No. 003, s. 2024. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines, 2024.
 18. Magno C, Pizarro M. Program awareness in public schools and effective implementation, 2016.
 19. Mendoza PR, Lim SA. Learner satisfaction in TVL programs and the role of awareness, facilities, and trainer expertise, 2020.
 20. Ramos EL. Awareness of voucher-supported programs, learner motivation, and engagement in technical-vocational education, 2021.
 21. TESDA. Training regulations for Agriculture and Fishery Arts specializations. Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, n.d.
 22. UNESCO-UNEVOC. TVET and workforce preparation in developing contexts. UNESCO-UNEVOC, 2018.