



Received: 11-07-2026
Accepted: 21-08-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Impact of Strengthened Curriculum on Senior High School Students at Young Achievers' School of Caloocan

¹ Cornelio S Doloque Jr, ² Joaquin Benedict O Imperial, ³ Amor Mia C Teves, ⁴ Jairuz D Ambrosio, ⁵ Sofia Penelope S Yadao, ⁶ Szaina Gail Peñalosa

¹ Vice Principal, Young Achievers School of Caloocan Inc., Philippines

^{2, 3, 4, 5, 6} Student, Young Achievers School of Caloocan Inc., Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2026.6.5.6819>

Corresponding Author: **Cornelio S Doloque Jr**

Abstract

This study examined the perceived impact of the strengthened curriculum on the academic performance of Senior High School students at Young Achievers School of Caloocan. The study aimed to show how students perceive the effects of the strengthened curriculum on their academic performance, learning experiences, and motivation to study. It also found whether there was a significant difference in students' perceptions when they were grouped according to their academic strand. The study used quantitative research design. Data was collected through a researcher-made survey questionnaire distributed through Google Forms. The respondents were 30 Grade 12 students from the ABM, STEM, HUMSS, ICT, and HE strands who were selected using purposive sampling. The collected data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The findings showed that students perceived the strengthened curriculum as often affecting their academic performance, with an overall weighted mean of 4.17. They also reported that the curriculum increased the difficulty of

subjects and affected their motivation to study. At the same time, students believed that the curriculum helped improve their knowledge and skills. They rated their teachers highly for explaining lessons clearly and providing effective learning activities.

However, students gave the lowest rating to the curriculum's preparation for college and future employment, showing that this area still needs improvement. The results also showed only slight differences in the perceptions of students from different strands. The ANOVA result showed no significant difference in the perceived impact of the strengthened curriculum when respondents were grouped according to strand. The study concluded that the strengthened curriculum supports students' learning and skill development but also brings greater academic challenges. The findings may help students, teachers, parents, and school administrators improve curriculum implementation and provide better academic support for Senior High School students.

Keywords: Perceived Impact, Strengthened Curriculum, Academic Performance

1. Introduction

Quantitative research had been considered a suitable approach for examining measurable phenomena, finding patterns and relationships among variables, and generating evidence that could be generalized within defined contexts. In educational research in particular, quantitative methods had enabled scholars to evaluate interventions systematically by using structured instruments, standardized indicators, and statistical analyses. This study had been anchored on the premise that curriculum quality and instructional emphasis could significantly influence students' academic performance and learning outcomes, especially during the senior high school stage when learners joined foundational competencies and prepared for higher-level academic demands.

This research, titled "IMPACT OF STRENGTHEND CURRICULUM ON SENIOR HIGHSCHOOL STUDENTS AT YOUNG ACHIEVERS' SCHOOL OF CALOOCAN," had sought to investigate the extent to which an enhanced or strengthened curriculum could contribute to the academic outcomes of senior high school students enrolled at Young Achievers School of Caloocan.

In alignment with contemporary discussions on curriculum effectiveness, curriculum strengthening had been conceptualized in terms of improved content alignment, enhanced instructional structure, and the systematic reinforcement of learning expectations across relevant academic competencies. Accordingly, the study had focused on naming measurable outcomes associated with curriculum strengthening, thereby providing empirical insight into its potential value as a school-based academic improvement strategy.

In addition, this study had aimed to generate evidence that would help school administrators, curriculum planners, and instructional leaders in understanding whether curriculum strengthening was associated with improved student achievement. By employing quantitative techniques to collect and analyze data, the investigation had tried to produce findings that were objective, replicable, and statistically supported. The results of this study were expected to contribute to the broader body of knowledge on curriculum implementation and student performance in senior high school education settings, and to inform future program planning and instructional decision-making within the institutional context of Young Achievers School of Caloocan.

1.1 Research Questions

What was the level of academic performance of senior high school students at Young Achievers School of Caloocan before the curriculum was strengthened?

To what extent was the strengthened curriculum implemented among senior high school students at Young Achievers School of Caloocan?

Was there a significant difference in the academic performance of senior high school students before and after the curriculum was strengthened at Young Achievers School of Caloocan?

Was there a significant relationship between the extent of curriculum strengthening and the academic performance of senior high school students at Young Achievers School of Caloocan?

What academic areas like specific subjects or competencies showed the greatest improvement following the implementation of the strengthened curriculum among senior high school students at Young Achievers School of Caloocan?

2. Literature Review

Curriculum strengthening has been widely discussed in educational research as a deliberate process of improving the content, organization, delivery, and alignment of instructional programs to prove learning standards. In this regard, strengthening is not merely an addition of materials or activities; rather, it involves the refinement of curriculum objectives, the clarification of expected competencies, and the enhancement of instructional coherence to ensure that teaching and learning are systematically directed toward measurable outcomes. Curriculum strengthening had therefore been recognized as a school-based mechanism for improving instructional quality and learner achievement. Studies in curriculum implementation had generally emphasized that effective curriculum reform depends on the congruence among curriculum design, teacher instructional practices, assessment methods, and learning resources. Where curriculum elements were aligned, learners were

more likely to receive consistent guidance across grade levels and subject areas. Conversely, where misalignment existed—such as discrepancies between instructional emphasis and assessment—students had tended to experience learning gaps that could negatively affect performance. A central theme in educational scholarship had been the relationship between curriculum quality and student academic achievement. Curriculum frameworks had been designed to ensure that learners acquire knowledge and skills in progression, enabling them to build mastery over time. When curriculum content was strengthened through clearer learning outcomes, improved sequencing, and better instructional organization, students had shown greater academic engagement and improved mastery of subject matter in senior high school education, curriculum effectiveness had been particularly important because learners were expected to combine foundational competencies and show higher-level learning behaviors such as analytical thinking, application of concepts, and performance in competency-based assessment. Consequently, research had implied that interventions targeting curriculum strengthening in senior high school contexts had the potential to improve students' academic outcomes by enhancing both learning structure and instructional focus. Curriculum strengthening had often been conceptualized as an intervention that influences teaching and learning processes. From a quantitative perspective, strengthened curriculum could be examined through measurable indicators such as the extent of curriculum implementation, the degree of alignment between curriculum content and instruction, and the consistency of assessment practices. When instructional delivery reflected the strengthened curriculum, learners were more likely to receive instruction that matched intended competencies, leading to improved test performance, higher grades, and better overall academic results. Relevant educational literature had also suggested that curriculum interventions could contribute to improved academic outcomes by standardizing instructional expectations across classes and teachers. Standardization, when implemented with flexibility for learner needs, had supported more consistent teaching practices and clearer learning targets. Such consistency had been linked to improved student performance because learners could better understand what was expected and how to prepare for assessments. Assessment had been consistently shown in the literature as a critical part of curriculum effectiveness. When assessments aligned with curriculum objectives and competency standards, they had tended to function as valid measures of intended learning. In contrast, assessments that did not reflect the curriculum had resulted in unreliable evaluation of student learning and could have discouraged students from focusing on the skills that were genuinely needed. Strengthened curriculum practices had therefore been associated with improved assessment alignment using learning competencies as references for test construction, performance tasks, and feedback mechanisms.

Quantitative studies examining curriculum strengthening had often focused on students' academic performance as an outcome variable, using grades, standardized scores, and teacher-made test results as measurable indicators. Accordingly, assessment alignment had been expected to mediate the relationship between curriculum strengthening and academic improvement. Even when curriculum

improvements were well-designed, outcomes had depended on implementation fidelity—the degree to which curriculum plans were carried out in classroom settings. Educational research had shown that variations in implementation could lead to different learning outcomes among schools or classes. Factors such as teacher readiness, availability of learning materials, and administrative support had influenced how fully curriculum strengthening strategies were enacted. Implementation fidelity had therefore been treated as a key variable in curriculum studies. In quantitative terms, researchers had often used implementation checklists, implementation ratings, or documentation-based measures to figure out how extensively curriculum changes were applied. This perspective supported the idea that curriculum strengthening's impact on student performance could be partly explained by the level and quality of implementation achieved within the school.

Empirical studies on curriculum reform and instructional improvement had generally reported positive associations between curriculum-related interventions and student achievement. However, the strength and consistency of these effects had varied depending on context, implementation quality, and instructional conditions. Some studies had reported that students improved most when curriculum strengthening was accompanied by effective teaching strategies and appropriate assessment methods. Other studies had shown that without adequate teacher training and resources, curriculum reforms could fail to produce significant improvements. In senior high school settings, academic outcomes had been influenced by multiple factors, including learners' prior achievement, motivation, and instructional support. Nevertheless, literature had suggested that curriculum strengthening still offered a structured pathway for improving educational delivery, particularly when the intervention was clearly defined, supported by school leadership, and monitored through measurable performance indicators. The review of literature had showed that curriculum strengthening was connected to improved academic outcomes through mechanisms such as instructional alignment, assessment validity, and implementation fidelity. It had also revealed that the impact of curriculum reforms often depended on how consistently and accurately the curriculum changes were implemented in actual classroom practices. Despite the established discussions, there remained a need for school-specific quantitative evidence to figure out whether curriculum strengthening had produced measurable academic improvements among senior high school students in particular institutional settings. Thus, the present study had been positioned to address this gap by investigating the impact of strengthened curriculum on senior high school students at Young Achievers School of Caloocan, using quantitative measures of curriculum strengthening and student academic performance.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study had employed a quantitative research design to figure out the impact of a strengthened curriculum on the academic performance of senior high school students. Specifically, it had used a quasi-experimental approach, like on how curriculum strengthening had been assessed and

whether pre- and post-implementation academic data was available.

The pre- and post-data were available the study had used a quasi-experimental design which is one-group pretest–posttest. Only single-time assessment of curriculum strengthening and academic performance was available the study had used a correlational design to examine the relationship between variables.

3.2 Research Locale

The research had been conducted at Young Achievers School of Caloocan, where the strengthened curriculum was implemented and where the target senior high school students were enrolled.

3.3 Population and Sampling Procedure

The study had included senior high school students from Young Achievers School of Caloocan. A sampling procedure had been applied to select participants for data collection.

Population: all senior high school students enrolled during the period school year 2026-2027.

Sampling technique: the study had used simple random sampling, and it was by strand and specific grade level.

Sample size: had been determined using Slovin's Formula required with number based on the available student population.

3.4 Respondents of the Study

The primary respondents had been the senior high school students.

3.5 Research Instruments

The study had utilized instruments to measure both variables of interest:

Curriculum Strengthening Instrument and structured questionnaire/checklist had been used to assess the extent of curriculum strengthening implementation.

The instrument instrument had cover indicator such as:

Alignment of lessons with learning competencies, clarity of learning objectives, organization of instructional objectives materials, Effectiveness of learning activities, assessment alignment, and feedback practices.

3.6 Academic Performance Measure

Students' academic performance had been determined using documented grades and test scores teacher-made tests, quarterly assessments, or final grades, depending on what data were accessible and consistent with school records. The study had treated academic performance as the dependent variable and ensured that the same grading basis and time frame were used.

3.7 Instrument Validity and Reliability

Content validity had been established through expert review Reliability had been figured out through a pilot test, and internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha and had been computed for questionnaire items.

3.8 Data Gathering Procedure

Data collection had followed a systematic process:

Permission had been requested from school authorities to conduct the study.

The questionnaire/checklist had been administered to the selected student.

Academic performance data had been obtained from official school records for the corresponding grading period.

Data had been checked for completeness and organized for statistical analysis.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

To ensure ethical compliance, the study had applied the following:

Informed consent had been secured from proper parties (students and/or guardians as required by school policy).

Respondents' identities had been protected through confidentiality and anonymity.

Participation had been voluntary, and respondents had been informed that they could withdraw if they chose to do so.

3.10 Data Analysis

The study had used appropriate quantitative statistical tools to answer the research questions:

Descriptive statistics such as mean, frequency, percentage, standard deviation had been used to describe: The extent/level of curriculum strengthening, and the level of students' academic performance.

Inferential statistics to test relationships and differences t-test. Significance level had been set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Presentation of Results

This chapter presented the findings of the study on the impact of strengthened curriculum on senior high school students at Young Achievers School of Caloocan. The results were organized according to the study's research questions, using the appropriate quantitative statistics based on the collected data.

Overall descriptive findings showed the level of curriculum strengthening as reported by the respondents, and the corresponding academic performance of senior high school students based on school records (e.g., quarterly/final grades and/or test scores).

Table 1: Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
16 years old	23	23%
17 years old	77	77%
Total:	100	100%

Table 1 presents the age distribution of the 30 respondents included in the study. The data show that 77 respondents (77%) are 17 years old, while 23 respondents (23%) are 16 years old. This shows that the majority of the participants are 17 years old, representing more than three-fourths of the total respondents. In contrast, only a small proportion of the respondents are 16 years old. The findings suggest that the respondents are within the typical age range of senior high students. Since most participants are 17 years old, their responses are reflective of the experiences, perceptions, and behaviors common to students at this stage of adolescence. This relatively narrow age range suggests the respondents share a similar developmental stage, Which may be relevant when interpreting their perceptions of the strengthened curriculum.

Table 2: Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	56	56%
Female	44	44%
Total	100	100%

Table 2 presented the sex distribution of the 30 respondents who took part in the study. The data reveal that 56 respondents (56%) are male, while 44 respondents (44%) are female. This shows that male respondents are most of the participants, although the difference between the number of male and female respondents is small. The findings suggest that the study includes respondents from both sexes, providing a balanced representation of the target population. With males slightly outnumbering females, the responses gathered are expected to reflect the perspectives of both groups, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the research topic.

Table 3: Strand

Strand	F	%
ABM	30	30%
STEM	13	13%
HUMSS	17	17%
ICT	17	17%
HE	23	23%
Total	100	100%

Table 3 shows the distribution of the 100 respondents based on their academic strand. Out of 100 respondents, ABM or Accountancy, Business, and Management had the highest number of participants with 30 respondents or 30.0%. This means ABM represents the largest group in the study. This is followed by HE or Home Economics with 23 respondents or 23%. Both HUMSS or Humanities and Social Sciences and ICT or Information and Communications Technology had the same number of participants, with 17 respondents or 17% each. Meanwhile, STEM or Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics had the smallest representation with only 13 respondents or 13%.

Table 4:

Indicator	Weighted mean	SD	Interpretation
Affected academic performance	4.20	0.83	Often
Increased difficulty of subjects	4.23	0.92	Always
Affected motivation to study	4.23	0.99	Always
More challenging than before	4.00	1.03	Often
Overall Weighted mean	4.17	—	—

Students perceive that the strengthened curriculum often affects their academic performance and creates challenges in their studies. The results show that increased difficulty of subjects and affected motivation to study received the highest ratings, which means these are the challenges students experience the most. Meanwhile, affected academic performance and more challenging than before were also rated high, showing that students feel the curriculum has a noticeable effect on their learning and school experience. Overall, the findings suggest that the strengthened curriculum often has a positive and challenging impact on students' academic life.

Table 5:

Indicator	Weighted mean	SD	Interpretation
Helps improve knowledge/skills	4.27	1.13	Always
Prepares for college/future employment	3.67	1.11	Often
Relevant to chosen strand	4.17	0.90	Often
Learning activities are effective	4.33	0.94	Always
Teachers explain clearly	4.37	0.75	Always
Materials/resources sufficient	4.20	0.90	Often
Overall Weighted mean	4.17	—	—

Table 5 shows that students perceive that the curriculum is often to always effective in helping them learn and prepare for their future. The highest-rated indicator was teachers explain clearly, followed by learning activities are effective and helps improve knowledge and skills, showing that students are satisfied with the way lessons are taught. The indicator prepares for college/future employment received the lowest rating, although it was still interpreted as often, suggesting that students see room for improvement in this area. Overall, the findings show that the curriculum often provides a good learning experience and supports students in developing the knowledge and skills they need.

Table 6: Perceived Impact of the Strengthened Curriculum by Strand

Strand	n	Weighted mean	Interpretation
ABM	30	4.30	Always
STEM	13	4.24	Always
HUMSS	17	4.20	Often
ICT	17	3.98	Often
HE	23	3.95	Often

ABM and HE students reported the highest perceived impact of the curriculum, with both groups receiving an interpretation of "Always." On the other hand, STEM students had the lowest rating with an interpretation of "Often." Even though there are differences in the ratings of each strand, the overall scores are still close to one another, ranging only from 3.95 to 4.30. This shows that students from all strands share similar views about the impact of the curriculum. Overall, the findings suggest that the curriculum has a noticeable effect on students across all strands, with only slight differences in how strongly each group experiences its impact.

Table 7:

Indicator	Significance Level	P-Value	F-Statistics
Impact of Strengthened Curriculum on Senior High School students Academic Performance	0.05	4.168	2.21

This table presents the one-way ANOVA results, showing an F-statistic of 2.36 and a p-value of 0.92 at a significance level of 0.05. Since the p-value is greater than the significance level, the results are not statistically significant. This shows that there is no significant difference in students' perceived impact of the strengthened curriculum when grouped according to strand. Therefore, the study does not accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1) and does not reject the null hypothesis (H_0), showing that students from different strands have similar perceptions of the impact of the

strengthened curriculum at Young Achievers School of Caloocan.

4.2 Level of Curriculum Strengthening

Tables presented the level of curriculum strengthening among senior high school students at Young Achievers School of Caloocan. The results showed that the respondents perceived the strengthened curriculum as Very High/High/Moderate/Low, with a mean of and a standard deviation.

The highest rated indicator was Indicator/Dimension 1, suggesting that the curriculum strengthening efforts were most effectively observed in brief interpretation such as alignment of lessons with competencies/clarity of learning objectives.

Meanwhile, the lowest rated indicator was Indicator/Dimension 2, implying that brief explanation like assessment alignment, learning resource adequacy, or instructional coherence required further strengthening.

4.3 Level of Academic Performance

Table presented the academic performance of senior high school students in Young Achievers School of Caloocan. The overall academic performance level was Very Satisfactory/Satisfactory/Needs Improvement, with a mean. Such results suggested that students had strong/adequate/limited academic outcomes during the covered grading period(s). The findings also implied that students were able to show learning progress consistent with the curriculum delivery and assessment practices used in the school.

4.4 Difference in Academic Performance

If the study used a pretest–posttest design, Table Z showed the difference in academic performance before and after the curriculum strengthening implementation. The results revealed that the posttest mean score lower than the pretest mean score.

The paired samples test yielded a t-value of $t = _$ with a p-value of $p = _$. Since $p < 0.05$ / $p \geq 0.05$, the study concluded that there was a significant/not significant difference in the academic performance of senior high school students after the curriculum was strengthened.

Discussion: This outcome supported the argument that curriculum strengthening could contribute to improved student achievement by enhancing instructional alignment, clarifying learning targets, and ensuring that assessments measured the intended competencies.

4.5 Relationship Between Curriculum Strengthening and Academic Performance

To address whether curriculum strengthening was associated with academic performance, Table W presented the correlation analysis between the extent/level of curriculum strengthening and students' academic performance.

The results showed a positive/negative relationship between the variables, with a correlation coefficient of r and a corresponding p-value with $p < 0.05$ / $p \geq 0.05$, the study concluded that the relationship was significant/not significant.

Discussion: A positive and long-term relationship would indicate that stronger curriculum implementation was linked to better academic outcomes. This would imply that when

curriculum elements were strengthened—such as lesson competencies, instructional activities, and assessment alignment—students had clearer learning pathways and improved readiness for performance tasks and examinations.

4.6 Academic Areas With the Greatest Improvement

Table V summarized the academic areas subjects/competencies that showed the greatest improvement following the curriculum strengthening implementation. The subject area with the highest improvement was Subject/Area, while the subject area with the least improvement was Subject/Area.

This finding suggested that brief interpretation the strongest instructional emphasis, better alignment of materials to competencies, or stronger assessment practices contributed to greater gains in subject. Conversely, limited gains in subject could be attributed to possible factors difficulty level, time constraints, resource limitations, or student preparedness.

4.7 Summary of Findings

In summary, the study found that state key results based on your actual data: level of curriculum strengthening, level of academic performance, whether there was significant difference, relationship strength, and top improved area. Overall, the findings provided evidence on how strengthened curriculum practices were connected to students' academic outcomes in the context of Young Achievers School of Caloocan.

5. Conclusion

The strengthened curriculum is perceived to have a considerable impact on students' academic performance, primarily through increased subject difficulty and reduced motivation to study. Students view the strengthened curriculum as effective in improving their knowledge and skills, attributing this to their teachers' clarity in instruction and the effectiveness of learning activities.

Career and college readiness is the area where students feel least supported by the curriculum, suggesting a gap between its academic demands and its perceived real-world applicability. Perceived impact is consistent across strands, with HE and ABM students reporting slightly higher perceived impact than HUMSS, ICT, and STEM students, though the difference is not large.

While the strengthened curriculum is perceived as beneficial to students' knowledge and skill development, it also introduces academic challenges that may require additional support, particularly in preparing students for life beyond senior high school.

6. References

1. Gul R, Khilji G. Exploring the need for a responsive school curriculum to cope with the Covid-19 pandemic in Pakistan. *Prospects*. 2021; 51(1):503-522.
2. Buckley E, Monaco JD, Schultz KM, Chalmers R, Hadzic A, Zhang K, *et al*. An interdisciplinary approach to high school curriculum development: *Swarming Powered by Neuroscience*, 2021.
3. Arold BW, Shakeel MD. The unintended effects of the Common Core State Standards on non-targeted subjects. *Economics of Education Review*, 2026.
4. Aini Q. Implementation of an independent curriculum in supporting students' freedom to create and learn.

Journal of Scientific Research, Education, and Technology (JSRET), 2023.

5. Nasir M. Curriculum development and accreditation standards in the traditional Islamic schools in Indonesia. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*. 2021; 3(2):37-56.
6. Liu H. Application of Curriculum Implementation Monitoring Outcomes in General Senior High Schools from the School Improvement Perspective. In *Future-Oriented Teacher Education: Shanghai Teacher Insights 2025*, 2025.
7. Rintaningrum R, Fahmi A, Nuswantara K, Trisyanti U, Yusuf K, Zahrok S. Strengthening English language learning through an independent curriculum approach. *International Journal of Science and Society*. 2023; 5(5):161-171.
8. Aya-ay RM, Bantasa AKT, Cajés GA, Cajés JH. Exploring Readiness Gaps in the Pilot Implementation of the Strengthened Senior High School Curriculum in the Philippines, 2026.
9. Barrot JS. K to 12 curriculum reform in the Philippines: Towards making students future ready. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 2023.