



Received: 31-05-2026
Accepted: 10-07-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Stakeholders Awareness and Curriculum Implementation in Rural Farm Schools in Laguna

¹ Christsalyn C Guinto, ² Marc Sylvester P Garcia

¹ DepEd SDO Laguna, Philippines

² Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

Corresponding Author: **Christsalyn C Guinto**

Abstract

The agriculture sector remains a vital pillar of the Philippine economy, yet it faces persistent challenges such as declining youth participation and limited access to modern agricultural technologies. In response, the Rural Farm Schools Act of 2013 (Republic Act No. 10618) was enacted to provide an alternative secondary education program tailored to rural learners. This study aimed to determine the level of awareness and the extent of implementation of the Rural Farm School Curriculum in the Schools Division Office of Laguna and to identify factors influencing its effective implementation. Using a descriptive-correlational research design anchored on the Input–Process–Output framework, data were gathered from 950 respondents consisting of RFS focal persons, learners, parents, and partner farms. Quantitative data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, the Kruskal–Wallis H Test, and Spearman’s rho correlation. Results revealed that RFS focal persons were highly aware of the curriculum

objectives and policy foundations, while learners, parents, and partner farms were moderately aware. Despite variations in awareness, the curriculum was generally perceived as implemented by all respondent groups. Strengths included teacher preparation, professional development, strong community partnerships, and contextualized learning, while resource utilization consistently received the lowest ratings due to insufficient tools, facilities, and farm inputs. A significant relationship was found between awareness and the extent of curriculum implementation, indicating that awareness is a critical enabling factor for program success. The study recommends strengthened stakeholder engagement, improved resource allocation, sustained policy support, and the institutionalization of systematic monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to ensure the long-term sustainability of the RFS Curriculum and its contribution to rural development.

Keywords: Rural Farm School, Curriculum Implementation, Agricultural Education, Stakeholder Awareness, Rural Development

Introduction

Agricultural education remains central to rural transformation because it links schooling with livelihood, food systems, and local economic resilience. In the Philippine setting, this linkage is especially important because many rural communities continue to rely on agriculture while facing persistent problems related to declining youth participation, uneven access to modern farm technologies, and weak school-to-work transitions. The Rural Farm Schools Act of 2013 institutionalized an alternative form of secondary education intended to respond to these realities by integrating formal schooling with experiential, community-based agricultural learning. Through this policy, Rural Farm Schools (RFSs) were expected to offer a curriculum that is locally relevant, practice-oriented, and developmentally responsive to rural learners.

The policy logic behind RFSs is compelling. Rural farm-based education does more than teach technical agricultural skills; it also situates learning within learners’ lived environments. In principle, this model makes curriculum more meaningful by allowing students to connect classroom content to land use, crop production, livestock management, entrepreneurship, and community life. The literature on experiential and contextualized learning consistently suggests that students learn more deeply when educational tasks are tied to authentic contexts and when knowledge is enacted through concrete practice rather than transmitted in abstract form alone. In agricultural education, the school farm, partner farm, household garden, and local production setting become learning spaces that can cultivate both competence and agency.

Yet policy adoption does not automatically translate into strong implementation. Research on educational innovation has repeatedly shown that reforms succeed only when intended users understand the reform, have the capability to carry it out, and receive material and institutional support. In implementation studies, awareness is not a trivial cognitive condition; it is a practical precondition for coordinated action. School personnel need to understand the policy foundations, intended learning outcomes, and required program components. Learners and parents need enough knowledge to recognize the value of program activities and to sustain participation. Community partners, including farms and agricultural enterprises, must also understand their roles well enough to align field experiences with curricular goals.

This issue is particularly salient for Rural Farm Schools because the curriculum is implemented across multiple social actors. Focal persons and school leaders interpret policy and organize delivery. Teachers translate curricular expectations into instruction. Learners participate in classroom and farm-based activities. Parents support agricultural tasks, home projects, and school participation. Partner farms extend the learning environment beyond school grounds. If these groups differ markedly in their understanding of the program, curriculum implementation may become uneven, fragmented, or overly dependent on a few highly informed individuals.

Existing scholarship provides a useful frame for understanding this challenge. Diffusion of innovations and implementation theories emphasize that the uptake of an educational innovation depends on clarity, perceived usefulness, compatibility with the local context, and support mechanisms for implementation. Contextualization theory, meanwhile, suggests that learning becomes more meaningful when instruction reflects local realities, community knowledge, and authentic practice. Situated and experiential learning perspectives further explain why agricultural education can be powerful in rural schools: learners do not simply receive knowledge; they participate in communities of practice and develop understanding through action. At the same time, systems-oriented perspectives such as ecological and school improvement frameworks remind us that implementation is shaped not only by classroom practice but also by policy conditions, teacher preparation, resource availability, community relationships, and environmental constraints.

Although the Rural Farm School model has strong conceptual grounding, empirical evidence on its implementation in public school settings remains limited. This gap is notable in the Schools Division Office (SDO) of Laguna, where a number of schools have already adopted the RFS curriculum. The division represents a meaningful context for investigation because it includes schools operating in agricultural communities with varying degrees of access to land, partnerships, facilities, and program support. In such contexts, understanding both awareness and implementation becomes important for determining whether policy intentions are being realized in ways that are sustainable and educationally sound.

The present study addressed this gap by examining stakeholders' awareness of the RFS curriculum and their perceived extent of implementation in selected schools under SDO Laguna. Specifically, it assessed the awareness of focal persons, learners, parents, and partner farms

regarding curriculum policy foundations, objectives, and program components; evaluated the perceived implementation of the curriculum in relation to contextualization, instructional strategies, resource utilization, teacher preparation, and community linkages; determined whether awareness and implementation perceptions differed across stakeholder groups; explored whether awareness was associated with perceived implementation; and identified common implementation problems and localized solutions.

The study is significant for both scholarship and practice. For scholarship, it adds evidence to the small but growing body of literature on rural, contextualized, and agriculturally oriented secondary education in the Philippines. It advances discussion on the role of stakeholder awareness as an enabling condition for curriculum implementation. For practice, the findings provide school leaders, division offices, and policy actors with data that can guide resource allocation, professional development, stakeholder communication, and implementation monitoring. The study also foregrounds the role of school-community partnerships, which are often treated as peripheral despite being central to RFS delivery.

This article argues that the RFS curriculum in Laguna has already developed a recognizable operational presence across schools and communities, but that implementation quality remains constrained by uneven stakeholder awareness and especially by structural limitations in resources. By reorganizing the thesis into IMRAD form, the article presents the study in a journal-ready format that highlights its contribution to agricultural education, curriculum implementation, and rural development.

Methodology

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design. The descriptive component was used to characterize stakeholders' awareness of the Rural Farm School curriculum and their perceived extent of curriculum implementation. The correlational component was used to examine whether awareness was associated with implementation and whether statistically significant differences existed among stakeholder groups. Because the study involved Likert-type responses from independent groups and unequal group sizes, nonparametric statistics were selected for inferential testing.

Research Setting and Participants

The research was conducted in ten identified Rural Farm Schools under the Schools Division Office of Laguna during School Year 2025–2026. These schools were actively implementing the RFS curriculum and represented different sub-offices within the division: Balian Integrated National High School (Pangil), Bukal National High School (Cavinti), Calangay Integrated High School (Santa Maria), Calminue Integrated National High School (Cavinti), Cavinti Integrated National High School (Cavinti), Gov. F. T. San Luis National Agro-Industrial Integrated High School (Siniloan), Mabitac Integrated National High School (Mabitac), Nicolas L. Galvez Memorial Integrated National High School (Bay), San Francisco Integrated National High School (Victoria), and Siniloan National Integrated National High School (Siniloan).

A total of 950 respondents participated in the study. The

respondents were distributed as follows: 10 RFS focal persons (1.05%), 482 learners (50.74%), 439 parents (46.21%), and 19 partner farms (2.00%). Focal persons were the designated personnel directly responsible for coordination, administration, and monitoring of RFS implementation in their schools. Learners consisted of junior high school students officially enrolled in the program, including Grade 8 and Grade 9 students. Parent participants were the parents or guardians of the selected learners. Partner farm respondents were farmers, farm owners, or farm representatives providing training environments and technical exposure for learners.

Sampling Procedure

Purposive sampling was used because the study required respondents who were directly involved in implementing, supporting, or participating in the RFS curriculum. Different procedures were applied by respondent group to ensure appropriate inclusion while maintaining practical feasibility. Total enumeration was used for focal persons and partner farms because of their relatively small population sizes. For learners, an intact-group approach was used in which one naturally occurring section from Grade 8 and one from Grade 9 were selected from each participating school. This approach preserved existing class arrangements and minimized disruption to regular instruction. For parents, a matched or convenience approach was used by distributing questionnaires to the parents or guardians of selected learners. The final parent count reflected the number of successfully retrieved instruments.

Instrumentation

Data were gathered through a researcher-made questionnaire developed in four parallel versions tailored to focal persons, learners, parents, and partner farm representatives. The instrument included four parts. Part I gathered profile information, including demographic and role-related variables. Part II measured awareness of the RFS curriculum through 20 items covering policy foundations, curriculum objectives, and program components. Part III measured perceived extent of implementation across five domains: contextualization and localization of learning, instructional strategies, resource utilization, teacher preparation and professional development, and community linkages. Part IV identified common implementation problems and localized solutions.

The awareness items used the following descriptive scale: 4.20–5.00 = fully aware; 3.40–4.19 = aware; 2.60–3.39 = moderately aware; 1.80–2.59 = slightly aware; 1.00–1.79 = not aware. For implementation, the following scale was used: 4.20–5.00 = very well implemented; 3.40–4.19 = well implemented; 2.60–3.39 = implemented; 1.80–2.59 = fairly implemented; 1.00–1.79 = poorly implemented. The questionnaire underwent expert content validation and pilot testing prior to full administration to support content adequacy and internal consistency.

Data Collection Procedure

After validation and preliminary review, formal approval to conduct the study was secured through the Schools Division Office and the authorities overseeing the participating schools. The researcher coordinated with school heads and focal persons before administration of the instrument. A hybrid data collection procedure was implemented in response to geographic and logistical conditions: one school used a secure online platform, while the remaining schools used printed questionnaires. Focal persons served as local coordinators for distribution to learners, parents, and partner farms. Respondents were given a one-week period to complete the instrument, after which the questionnaires were retrieved and checked for completeness before encoding and analysis.

Ethical Considerations

The instrument included informed consent and a data privacy statement aligned with the Philippine Data Privacy Act of 2012. Participation was voluntary. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study, the confidentiality of responses, and their right to decline participation. No identifying information was reported in the presentation of findings.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics included frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. Frequency and percentage were used to summarize respondent profile variables and to rank commonly encountered implementation problems and solutions. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe awareness and implementation indicators. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to determine differences among respondent groups in awareness and implementation because the data were ordinal and the groups varied substantially in size. When awareness differences were significant, Mann-Whitney U post hoc comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment were used to identify where the differences lay. Spearman's rho was used to assess the association between awareness and perceived implementation within each respondent group.

Results

Respondent Profile and Participation Structure

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents

Respondent group	n	%
Focal persons	10	1.05
Learners	482	50.74
Parents	439	46.21
Partner farms	19	2.00
Total	950	100.00

The study obtained data from four sets of stakeholders across ten Rural Farm Schools, yielding 950 valid responses. The sample was heavily represented by learners

and parents, while focal persons and partner farms constituted smaller but analytically important groups. This distribution reflects the school- and community-based nature of RFS implementation: the curriculum is experienced by many learners and families, but coordinated by a relatively

small number of in-school implementers and external agricultural partners.

****Table 1**** summarizes the respondent distribution.

Stakeholder Awareness of the RFS Curriculum

Table 2: Summary of Stakeholder Awareness of the RFS Curriculum

Indicator	Focal persons	Learners	Parents	Partner farms
Policy foundations	4.08	2.98	2.97	2.98
Curriculum objectives	3.98	3.02	3.06	3.21
Program components	3.97	3.00	3.00	2.91
Weighted mean	4.01	3.00	3.00	3.01
Verbal interpretation	Aware	Moderately aware	Moderately aware	Moderately aware

The analysis showed clear variation in awareness across stakeholder groups. Focal persons demonstrated the highest level of awareness, with an overall mean of 4.01 (SD = 0.24), interpreted as ****aware****. Within this group, policy foundations had the highest mean (M = 4.08), followed by curriculum objectives (M = 3.98) and program components (M = 3.97). These findings indicate that focal persons had strong familiarity with the curricular and policy architecture of the program.

By contrast, the other three stakeholder groups were clustered within the ****moderately aware**** range. Learners obtained an overall mean of 3.00 (SD = 0.31); parents also obtained an overall mean of 3.00 (SD = 0.30); and partner farms obtained an overall mean of 3.01 (SD = 0.25). The pattern within these groups suggests functional rather than technical familiarity. Learners and parents showed generally stable scores across policy foundations, objectives, and

components, while partner farms were relatively more familiar with curriculum objectives (M = 3.21) than with policy foundations (M = 2.98) or program components (M = 2.91).

The cross-group summary therefore reveals two important points. First, program literacy was highest among those with explicit implementation and monitoring responsibilities. Second, the remaining stakeholders possessed sufficient baseline understanding to recognize the program, but not the same degree of curriculum-level literacy. In practical terms, the RFS curriculum was visible and understandable to the broader school-community environment, yet detailed awareness remained concentrated among the program's direct implementers.

Perceived extent of curriculum implementation

Table 3: Summary of Perceived Implementation of the RFS Curriculum

Indicator	Focal persons	Learners	Parents	Partner farms
Contextualization/localization	3.50	2.99	3.01	3.07
Instructional strategies	3.35	3.04	3.05	2.91
Resource utilization	2.03	3.01	3.00	2.88
Teacher preparation/professional development	3.93	3.06	3.04	3.05
Community linkages	3.58	3.04	2.99	3.01
Weighted mean	3.28	3.02	3.02	2.98
Verbal interpretation	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented

All four respondent groups rated the RFS curriculum as ****implemented**** overall. However, a closer reading of the findings reveals meaningful differences in how implementation domains were perceived.

Focal persons gave the highest implementation rating overall (M = 3.28, SD = 0.32). Their strongest ratings were for teacher preparation and professional development (M = 3.93), community linkages (M = 3.58), and contextualization and localization of learning (M = 3.50), indicating substantial confidence in the instructional and partnership aspects of the program. Instructional strategies were also rated positively (M = 3.35). The single major exception was resource utilization, which focal persons rated at 2.03 (SD = 0.36), equivalent to ****fairly implemented****. This contrast made resource utilization the most conspicuous weakness in the implementation profile.

Learners perceived the curriculum as implemented with a composite mean of 3.02 (SD = 0.51). Unlike focal persons, learners rated all implementation domains within a narrow band, from 2.99 to 3.06. Teacher preparation and professional development (M = 3.06), instructional strategies (M = 3.04), and community linkages (M = 3.04)

were highest, while contextualization and localization of learning (M = 2.99) was slightly lower. Importantly, learners rated resource utilization at 3.01, suggesting that visible day-to-day learning routines were sufficient to create a stable sense of implementation regardless of hidden resource strain.

Parents produced a nearly identical implementation pattern, with an overall mean of 3.02 (SD = 0.53). Scores across the five domains ranged only from 2.99 to 3.05. Instructional strategies (M = 3.05) and teacher preparation and professional development (M = 3.04) were slightly higher than contextualization (M = 3.01), resource utilization (M = 3.00), and community linkages (M = 2.99). This consistency suggests that parents evaluated the program through visible outputs and general program presence rather than through differentiated technical criteria.

Partner farms also perceived the curriculum as implemented, with an overall mean of 2.98 (SD = 0.29). Their highest score was for contextualization and localization of learning (M = 3.07), followed by teacher preparation and professional development (M = 3.05) and community linkages (M = 3.01). Instructional strategies (M = 2.91) and

resource utilization ($M = 2.88$) were somewhat lower, but still within the implemented range. Their ratings imply that while partner farms recognized active collaboration and practical relevance, they were less exposed to the internal educational mechanics of implementation.

The overall summary of implementation therefore presents a dual picture. On one hand, the RFS curriculum had achieved a stable, visible operational presence across stakeholder groups. On the other hand, the major internal weakness identified by focal persons—poor resource utilization—was largely invisible to learners, parents, and partner farms.

Differences in awareness among respondent groups

Table 4: Differences in Awareness Across Respondent Groups

Group	n	Mean rank	H	df	p
Focal persons	10	941.30	29.403	3	< .001
Learners	482	467.02			
Parents	439	473.73			
Partner farms	19	486.34			

The Kruskal-Wallis H test showed a statistically significant difference in awareness across the four respondent groups, $\chi^2(3) = 29.403$, $p < .001$. Mean ranks indicate that focal persons (mean rank = 941.30) were substantially more aware of the curriculum than learners (467.02), parents (473.73), and partner farms (486.34). The three latter groups were clustered closely together, suggesting comparable levels of awareness despite their different roles.

Post hoc Mann-Whitney U tests further clarified this pattern. Focal persons differed significantly from learners ($U = 24.500$, $p < .001$), parents ($U = 17.500$, $p < .001$), and partner farms ($U = 0.000$, $p < .001$). However, no significant differences were found between learners and parents ($U = 104290.00$, $p = .708$), learners and partner farms ($U = 4388.50$, $p = .758$), or parents and partner farms ($U = 4060.00$, $p = .845$). These results indicate that the significant omnibus finding was driven almost entirely by the unusually high awareness of focal persons.

Differences in implementation among respondent groups

Table 5: Differences in Perceived Implementation Across Respondent Groups

Group	n	Mean rank	H	df	p
Focal persons	10	637.10	3.651	3	.302
Learners	482	475.17			
Parents	439	473.23			
Partner farms	19	451.39			

In contrast to awareness, implementation ratings did not differ significantly across stakeholder groups. The Kruskal-Wallis test yielded $\chi^2(3) = 3.651$, $p = .302$. Mean ranks were 637.10 for focal persons, 475.17 for learners, 473.23 for parents, and 451.39 for partner farms. Although focal persons remained somewhat higher numerically, these differences were not statistically meaningful.

This result suggests that, from the perspective of stakeholders, the curriculum was experienced as a shared and generally coherent program. Put differently, stakeholders did not disagree strongly about whether implementation was occurring; instead, they differed more in the depth of their knowledge about the curriculum.

Relationship between awareness and implementation

Table 6: Relationship Between Awareness and Perceived Implementation

Group	n	Spearman rs	p
Focal persons	10	−0.494	.147
Learners	482	.285	< .001
Parents	439	.301	< .001
Partner farms	19	.188	.441

Spearman's rho showed that awareness and perceived implementation were positively related among learners and parents, but not among focal persons and partner farms. For learners, awareness had a weak-to-moderate positive association with implementation ($rs = .285$, $p < .001$). Parents showed a similar association ($rs = .301$, $p < .001$). These results imply that when learners and parents understood the curriculum better, they also tended to perceive it as more strongly implemented.

For focal persons, the correlation was negative and non-significant ($rs = -.494$, $p = .147$). Although not statistically reliable because of the small sample, the direction of the coefficient is analytically important. It suggests that more aware focal persons may have been more sensitive to implementation gaps, especially in the area of resource utilization. Partner farms showed a weak and non-significant positive correlation ($rs = .188$, $p = .441$), indicating that greater formal awareness of policy and curriculum structures did not meaningfully shape their perception of implementation.

Problems encountered in implementation

Table 7: Top Problems Encountered in RFS Implementation

Problem	Frequency	%	Rank
Insufficient farm tools and equipment	638	67.2	1
High cost of farm inputs	610	64.2	2
Limited land for agricultural activities	590	62.1	3
Low learner interest in agriculture	557	58.6	4
Budgetary constraints for farm inputs	533	56.1	5
Delayed procurement of materials	513	54.0	6
Climate and weather disturbances	487	51.3	8
Inadequate school farm facilities	452	47.6	9

Respondents identified several recurring implementation problems. The most frequently reported problem was insufficient farm tools and equipment ($f = 638$, 67.2%), followed by the high cost of farm inputs ($f = 610$, 64.2%), limited land for agricultural activities ($f = 590$, 62.1%), and low learner interest in agriculture ($f = 557$, 58.6%). Budgetary constraints for farm inputs ($f = 533$, 56.1%) and delayed procurement of materials ($f = 513$, 54.0%) were also prominent. These patterns point to a cluster of material, spatial, and financial constraints at the center of implementation challenges.

Other frequently mentioned concerns included climate and weather disturbances ($f = 487$, 51.3%), inadequate school farm facilities ($f = 452$, 47.6%), poor internet or learning access, language barriers in technical lessons, and difficulty monitoring home-based projects. Notably, safety and health risks and limited technical skills were ranked lower than material resource issues. This means that the primary barriers to implementation were less about willingness or

basic capability and more about infrastructure, inputs, and enabling conditions.

Localized solutions applied by schools and stakeholders

Table 8: Top Localized Solutions Applied

Solution	Frequency	%	Rank
Use of improvised and community facilities	302	31.8	1
Adjusted schedules and climate-resilient practices	290	30.5	2
Safety protocols and protective measures	260	27.4	3
Equipment sharing and resource improvisation	244	25.7	4
Income generation and stakeholder support	232	24.4	5
Internal orientation and official coordination	225	23.7	6
Contextualized, engaging learning strategies	212	22.3	7
Alternative farming methods/home-based gardens	213	22.4	9

In response to these constraints, schools and communities adopted a range of practical solutions. The most common was the use of improvised and community facilities ($f = 302$, 31.8%), followed by adjusted schedules and climate-resilient practices ($f = 290$, 30.5%), safety protocols and protective measures ($f = 260$, 27.4%), equipment sharing and resource improvisation ($f = 244$, 25.7%), and income generation or stakeholder support ($f = 232$, 24.4%). Other notable responses included internal orientation and official coordination, contextualized and engaging learning strategies, task delegation, home-based gardens, school-based and local market linkages, and localization or translation of materials.

These findings reveal strong local adaptability. However, lower-ranked solutions involved larger-scale institutional support such as local government coordination, stakeholder partnerships, and alternative funding. This suggests that schools have been compelled to rely heavily on internal coping mechanisms and local improvisation rather than on predictable systemic support.

Conclusion

The study concludes that the Rural Farm School curriculum in the Schools Division Office of Laguna had become an operational and recognizable program across participating schools and their surrounding communities. Focal persons, learners, parents, and partner farms all perceived the curriculum as implemented, indicating that the program had moved into routine educational practice rather than remaining at the level of formal policy adoption.

However, the quality and sustainability of implementation were not uniform across all domains. While contextualized learning, teacher preparation, and community linkages emerged as relative strengths, resource utilization was identified as the weakest area, especially by focal persons who were directly responsible for program delivery. This suggests that the curriculum's visible implementation has been sustained partly through local resilience and compensatory effort rather than through consistently adequate institutional support.

The study also confirms that stakeholder awareness matters. Awareness was highest among focal persons and only moderate among learners, parents, and partner farms. These

differences reflect institutional role, proximity to policy information, and level of direct implementation responsibility. Among learners and parents, better awareness corresponded to stronger perceptions of implementation, indicating that communication and understanding are meaningful enabling factors in stakeholder engagement.

Overall, the evidence indicates that the RFS curriculum in Laguna is viable and educationally relevant, but its long-term effectiveness depends on moving beyond baseline implementation. Stronger division support, systematic stakeholder orientation, and more reliable provision of material inputs are necessary if Rural Farm Schools are to fulfill their intended role in agricultural education and rural development.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are advanced for policy, practice, and research.

1. Strengthen division-level support for RFS implementation: The Schools Division Office and relevant Department of Education units may institutionalize a regular support mechanism for Rural Farm Schools that includes curriculum orientation, implementation monitoring, technical assistance, and targeted resource planning.

2. Prioritize resource mobilization for farm-based learning: Because resource utilization emerged as the weakest implementation domain, schools and division offices may develop a more predictable approach to securing farm tools, inputs, facilities, and funding. This may include school improvement planning, local partnerships, income-generating projects, and coordinated proposals to local government and external stakeholders.

3. Expand stakeholder orientation and communication: Learners, parents, and partner farms may receive regular, role-appropriate orientation about the curriculum's goals, components, and expected contributions. Information materials should be simplified, practical, and aligned with the realities of rural school communities.

4. Support teachers and focal persons through sustained professional development: Program implementers may receive ongoing training in contextualized agricultural instruction, curriculum integration, field-based assessment, and partnership management. Schools should also strengthen peer mentoring and school-based learning communities for teachers handling RFS-related subjects.

5. Deepen school-community-industry partnerships: Partnerships with farms, local government units, agricultural offices, cooperatives, and private stakeholders should be formalized and aligned with learning outcomes so that field experiences support curriculum goals more consistently.

6. Develop monitoring indicators beyond program visibility: Since stakeholders can perceive a curriculum as implemented even when hidden constraints remain severe, RFS monitoring should include not only participation and activity indicators, but also adequacy of resources, continuity of field experiences, alignment of learning tasks, and sustainability of support systems.

7. Pursue future research on longer-term outcomes: Subsequent studies may examine learner competencies, post-school trajectories, entrepreneurial outcomes, climate resilience, specialization-specific implementation patterns, and qualitative accounts of how teachers and communities sustain the RFS curriculum under resource-limited conditions.

Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the support of the Schools Division Office of Laguna, the participating school heads and Rural Farm School focal persons, the learner and parent respondents, and the partner farm representatives whose cooperation made the study possible.

References

1. Angstmann S, *et al.* Place based experiential learning through campus farms. *Journal of Experiential Education*. 2019; 42(2):125-141.
2. Aytaç A, Kaya R, Demir AY. A study on teachers' curriculum awareness and their perceptions of self-efficacy towards teaching thinking skills. *International Academic Social Resources Journal*. 2025; 10(6):471-484.
3. Baker MA, Robinson JS. Teaching effectiveness in experiential agriculture. *Journal of Agricultural Education*. 2016; 57(2):1-15.
4. Baker T, Nelson RE. Creating something from nothing: Resource bricolage and the mitigation of dependency. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2005; 50(3):329-366. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2005.50.3.329>
5. Balinario RM. Awareness, attitude, implementation and academic performance in science curriculum: A correlational study. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 2021; 2(4):337-348. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.02.04.07>
6. Bandura A. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman, 1997.
7. Bautista RL. Learner awareness and engagement in junior high school technical vocational tracks. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*. 2023; 41(2):1-14. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2023/v41i2215>
8. Beeman R, Johnson J, Westervelt E. Experiential agricultural education and adolescent engagement in rural schools. *Journal of Agricultural Education*. 2017; 58(4):72-89. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2017.04072>
9. Berns RG, Erickson PM. Contextual teaching and learning: Preparing students for the new economy. University of Minnesota, National Research Center for Career and Technical Education, 2001.
10. Bronfenbrenner U. The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Harvard University Press, 1979.
11. Cabugao-Ballesteros M. Adequate holistic education in rural territories: The Philippines' family farm schools. Pilipinas Association of Rural Families for Education and Development (PARFED), 2024.
12. Coleman B, Bunch JC, Roberts TG. Experiential learning in agricultural education: A philosophical discussion. *Journal of Agricultural Education*. 2024; 65(1):283-302. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.v65i1.2479>
13. Dagohoy MT. Parents' curriculum engagement in rural basic education. *Philippine Journal of Education Studies*. 2022; 6(1):45-61.
14. Damola MB, Castino JMP. Feasibility study on establishing a rural farm school at Baluan National High School. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. 2025; 9(5):6373-6403.
15. Darling-Hammond L. Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education*. 2017; 40(3):291-309. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1315399>
16. Day C, Gu Q. Resilient teachers, resilient schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times. Routledge, 2014.
17. Dearing JW, Cox JG. Diffusion of innovations theory, principles, and practice. *Health Affairs*. 2018; 37(2):183-190.
18. Department of Education. DepEd Order No. 9, s. 2005: Instituting measures to increase engaged time-on-task and ensuring compliance therewith. Department of Education, Philippines, 2005.
19. Department of Education. DepEd Order No. 36, s. 2015: Implementing rules and regulations of Republic Act No. 10618, otherwise known as the Rural Farm Schools Act of 2013. Department of Education, Philippines, 2015.
20. Department of Education. DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2017: Research management guidelines. Department of Education, Philippines, 2017.
21. Dohinog A, *et al.* Contextualized curriculum and assessment in agricultural and rural education, 2025.
22. Erlendsdóttir G, Mtika P. Rural and vocational learners' understanding of school programs through immediate instructional experiences, 2023.
23. Fullan M. The new meaning of educational change (5th ed.). Teachers College Press, 2016.
24. International Fund for Agricultural Development. Rural youth, agricultural learning, and practice-based partnerships. IFAD, 2022.
25. Kolb DA. Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice Hall, 1984.
26. Lave J, Wenger E. Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
27. Marañon M. Industry partner perspectives on field-based vocational instruction in agricultural education, 2023.
28. Republic of the Philippines. Republic Act No. 10618: An act establishing rural farm schools as alternative delivery mode of secondary education and appropriating funds therefor, 2013.
29. Regulado R. Community-based agricultural program implementation and stakeholder perceptions, 2025.
30. Santos R. Rural parent participation and school program awareness under livelihood constraints, 2024.
31. Stufflebeam DL, Zhang G. The CIPP evaluation model: How to evaluate for improvement and accountability. Guilford Press, 2017.
32. UNESCO. Parents and communities in school improvement: Monitoring report background paper. UNESCO, 2017.
33. UNICEF Innocenti. Implementation research and context-responsive improvement in education. UNICEF Innocenti, 2024.