

The Strategies Utilized in Achieving the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCS) In Edukasyong Pantahanan at Pangkabuhayan (EPP) In Libmanan South District, Division of Camarines Sur

Czareina B. Baluso¹

¹University of Northeastern Philippines, School of Graduate Studies

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: August 2026 Keywords: EPP MELCS Pedagogical Practice Work Values Teacher Strategies	This study examined Grade 5 teachers' strategies for achieving the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) in Edukasyong Pantahanan at Pangkabuhayan (EPP) in Libmanan South District, Division of Camarines Sur, during School Year 2023–2024. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational survey purposively selected the locale and used total enumeration of eligible teachers; a verified respondent total was not stated in the available results and is not inferred. Weighted means and ranks summarized strategy, challenge, and solution ratings; Kendall's W and chi-square assessed concordance across school categories. Strategies were Much Utilized overall (M=4.07), led by pedagogical practice (M=4.15) and development of work values (M=4.14), followed by mastery of skills (M=4.06), entrepreneurial concepts (M=4.05), and knowledge and content (M=3.96). Concordance was significant for pedagogical practice (W=.760, $\chi^2=20.53$) and work values (W=.723, $\chi^2=19.53$), but not for the other domains. Challenges were Much Challenging (M=4.14), headed by complex curriculum requirements (M=4.31), student engagement (M=4.24), and diverse learner needs and effective technology use (both M=4.18). Solutions were Much Urgent (M=4.11), especially differentiated instruction (M=4.24), diverse assessment (M=4.21), and resource partnerships/open educational resources (M=4.18). Challenge rankings were not significantly concordant (W=.525, $\chi^2=14.16$), whereas solution rankings were (W=.723, $\chi^2=19.53$). The results support task-based, locally relevant, resource-conscious EPP implementation with explicit skill assessment and work-value evidence. Self-report ratings do not establish MELC mastery.

1. Introduction

Edukasyong Pantahanan at Pangkabuhayan connects knowledge with productive action. Learners are expected to plan, use tools and materials safely, complete practical procedures, solve everyday problems, collaborate, reflect on quality, and develop initiative and responsibility. The MELCs were introduced to prioritize essential curriculum expectations under constrained learning conditions. Their practical value depends on how teachers unpack them into teachable sequences, select authentic tasks, allocate time, and assess observable performance. Coverage alone cannot demonstrate mastery.

EPP instruction requires a balanced knowledge–skill–value architecture. Conceptual knowledge explains why a procedure works; demonstration and guided practice develop accuracy and safety; authentic projects support transfer; entrepreneurial concepts connect products and services with need, value, cost, and innovation; and work values shape reliability and ethical participation.

Pedagogical practice is especially consequential in a performance-oriented subject. Modeling, think-alouds, worked examples, gradual release, project-based learning, formative feedback, and reflection can make invisible decisions explicit. Differentiation is necessary when learners differ in prior experience, language, access to tools, confidence, and support.

Resource limitations can narrow EPP into verbal description, yet costly facilities are not the only solution. Teachers can use locally available materials, simulations, rotating practice stations, community expertise, open educational resources, and carefully designed group tasks—provided safety, equity, and curriculum alignment are protected.

Work values should not be assessed only through general impressions. Responsibility, punctuality, cooperation, care for tools, persistence, quality control, honesty, and environmental stewardship can be made observable through rubrics, learner reflection, peer feedback, and product or process evidence.

The present survey brings together strategy ratings, implementation challenges, proposed solutions, and concordance across school categories. It provides a useful planning baseline but does not directly measure whether learners achieved a MELC. The article therefore distinguishes reported use from demonstrated mastery.

1.1 Research Purpose and Analytical Focus

The study aimed to assess strategies in knowledge and content, pedagogical practice, skill mastery, entrepreneurial concepts, and work values; test concordance in their rankings; identify challenges and solutions; test concordance in challenge and solution rankings; and derive policy priorities.

The journal analysis translates these descriptive results into a task-based EPP implementation framework centered on curriculum mapping, demonstration, guided practice, differentiated access, authentic assessment, and observable learner evidence.

1.2 Conceptual and Empirical Synthesis

The framework begins with an unpacked competency and ends with a demonstrable performance. Teachers identify prerequisite

knowledge and safety requirements, model the procedure, provide scaffolded practice, assess process and product, give feedback, and require reflection or transfer.

Strategy domains are complementary. Content without practice remains inert; practice without conceptual explanation may not transfer; entrepreneurship without ethical work values is incomplete; and values without authentic responsibility can become rhetorical. Concordance identifies shared priorities across school categories. High concordance can guide common district supports, whereas non-significant concordance signals the need to understand contextual differences in learners, facilities, tools, and teacher expertise.

2. Methodology

A descriptive-evaluative-correlational survey was conducted in Libmanan South District during School Year 2023–2024. The locale was purposively chosen and total enumeration was reported for eligible Grade 5 EPP teachers.

A researcher-made, five-point questionnaire measured five strategy domains, ten reported challenges, and ten proposed solutions. The available preliminaries and Chapter 4 did not state a verified respondent total; no number is inferred.

Weighted means and rank order summarized the domains and items. Kendall's W and corresponding chi-square tested concordance in rankings across big, medium, and small school categories at the source's stated .05 level.

The source's detailed statistical table was preferred over rounded abstract values. The work-values result is reported as significant because the table gives $W=.723$, $\chi^2=19.53$, rejection of the null, and significance at .025.

Table 1. Research Design, Participants, Measures, and Analysis

Component	Specification
Design and locale	Descriptive-evaluative-correlational survey; Libmanan South District; SY 2023–2024
Sampling	Purposive locale; total enumeration of eligible Grade 5 EPP teachers; verified N not stated
Measure	Researcher-made five-point strategy, challenge, and solution questionnaire
Comparisons	Big, medium, and small school categories
Analysis	Weighted mean, rank, Kendall's W, chi-square; $\alpha=.05$ as reported

2.1 Analytical Rigor and Boundaries

Separate strategy, challenge, and solution profiles create a logical needs-assessment structure. The detailed tables also allow abstract-level rounding and decision inconsistencies to be checked.

The report did not provide a verified sample size, response rate, reliability coefficients, item-level missing-data procedures, objective skill assessments, observation, or learner products. Favorable ratings therefore describe teacher perceptions rather than verified MELC achievement.

A stronger study should use competency-aligned performance tasks, analytic rubrics, moderated scoring, curriculum-coverage logs, resource and safety audits, classroom observation, validated scales, effect sizes, and qualitative investigation of school-context differences.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Strategies Used to Address EPP MELCs

All five strategy domains were Much Utilized.

Table 2. Summary of EPP Strategy Domains

Strategy Domain	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Pedagogical practice	4.15	Much Utilized	1
Development of work values	4.14	Much Utilized	2
Mastery of skills development	4.06	Much Utilized	3
Entrepreneurial concepts	4.05	Much Utilized	4
Knowledge and content	3.96	Much Utilized	5
Overall	4.07	Much Utilized	—

Pedagogical practice ranked first, indicating strong perceived use of instructional methods. In EPP, this should mean visible demonstration, guided rehearsal, authentic problems, structured collaboration, and feedback on both process and product. Observation is needed to determine the depth of enactment.

Work values ranked a close second. Reflection sessions and teacher modeling were prominent in the source. These practices become more valid when values are attached to observable behaviors and authentic responsibility for time, tools, quality, teamwork, safety, and environmental care.

Knowledge and content ranked last but remained Much Utilized. This relative position matters because procedural competence depends on accurate concepts, terminology, reasons for steps, and safety knowledge. Content updating and subject-specific coaching should accompany practical pedagogy.

3.2 Concordance in Strategy Rankings

Pedagogical practice and work values showed significant concordance.

Table 3. Kendall Concordance for EPP Strategy Domains

Strategy Domain	W	χ^2	Reported Decision
Knowledge and content	.525	14.16	Not significant
Pedagogical practice	.760	20.53	Significant
Mastery of skills	.312	8.42	Not significant
Entrepreneurial concepts	.619	16.71	Not significant
Development of work values	.723	19.53	Significant

Strong concordance for pedagogy and work values indicates shared ordering of specific practices across school categories. These domains can anchor district exemplars, common rubrics, and professional-learning priorities.

Skill mastery had the lowest concordance. Schools may differ in facilities, tools, time, teacher specialization, and opportunities for repeated practice. A minimum-equipment and performance-task map should identify what every learner must be able to demonstrate and how low-resource alternatives preserve the same competency.

Non-significant agreement for content and entrepreneurship does not make these domains unimportant. It signals variable priorities that should be investigated through curriculum mapping, resource review, and analysis of learner products.

3.3 Challenges in Achieving the MELCs

Teachers rated the challenge profile Much Challenging overall.

Table 4. Highest-Rated EPP Implementation Challenges

Challenge	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Complex curriculum requirements	4.31	Much Challenging	1
Engaging students	4.24	Much Challenging	2
Diverse student needs	4.18	Much Challenging	3.5
Effective use of technology	4.18	Much Challenging	3.5
Accurate and fair assessment	4.17	Much Challenging	5
Overall challenge profile	4.14	Much Challenging	—

Curriculum complexity ranked first. Teachers need a usable competency map showing prerequisites, essential concepts, performance evidence, safety requirements, time, resources, and links across EPP components. Such mapping can reduce fragmentation without lowering expectations.

Engagement and diverse needs point to task design. Authentic local problems can improve relevance, but participation also depends on accessible instructions, flexible grouping, roles, scaffolded challenge, and sufficient opportunity to handle materials and make decisions. Technology and fair assessment were also prominent. Digital demonstrations can expand access but cannot replace practical performance where a hands-on skill is the target. Assessment should use transparent criteria, multiple evidence sources, and accommodations that preserve the construct.

3.4 Urgency of Proposed Solutions

Differentiation, varied assessment, and resource partnerships were the leading responses.

Table 5. Highest-Rated Solutions

Proposed Solution	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Use differentiated instruction	4.24	Much Urgent	1
Employ diverse assessment methods	4.21	Much Urgent	2
Build resource partnerships and use OER	4.18	Much Urgent	3
Provide technology training/cost-effective tools	4.15	Much Urgent	4
Use curriculum mapping and smaller units	4.13	Much Urgent	5
Overall solution profile	4.11	Much Urgent	—

The solution rankings align closely with the challenge profile. Differentiation responds to diverse needs and engagement; varied assessment addresses fairness; curriculum mapping responds to complexity; and partnerships or OER address resource constraints. Differentiation should vary support, representation, grouping, time, and task pathway while maintaining the intended competency. Lowering the performance expectation for some learners can conceal inequity rather than solve it.

Partnerships and OER require governance. Materials should be safe, accurate, curriculum-aligned, accessible, licensed appropriately, and sustainable after initial donation. Community expertise should complement—not substitute for—teacher responsibility and learner protection.

3.5 Concordance in Challenges and Solutions

Challenge rankings were not significantly concordant, while solution rankings were.

Table 6. Kendall Concordance for Challenges and Solutions

Profile	W	χ^2	Reported Decision
Challenges encountered	.525	14.16	Not significant
Solutions offered	.723	19.53	Significant

Schools did not order challenges consistently, which is plausible given differences in resources, learner composition, teacher experience, and local opportunity. Needs assessment should therefore remain school-specific.

Solution rankings showed strong, significant concordance, indicating a shared district response agenda despite different challenge ordering. Common support for differentiation, assessment, mapping, technology, and resource development can be implemented with local adaptation.

The combination argues for a tiered policy: district-wide minimum supports and tools, school-level diagnosis and targets, and periodic review of whether the solution addressed the locally documented barrier.

3.6 Integrated Interpretation of the Findings

Teachers reported strong use of pedagogical practice and work-value development, but content knowledge and skill mastery require careful attention because EPP learning must be both accurate and demonstrable.

The challenge profile centers on curriculum complexity, engagement, diversity, technology, and assessment. The solution profile responds coherently through differentiation, varied assessment, mapping, professional learning, and resource partnerships.

School categories differed in their ordering of challenges, yet agreed strongly on proposed solutions. This supports a common district implementation toolkit with school-specific diagnosis and resource plans.

A publishable theory of action is to unpack each MELC into knowledge, safety, process, product, and value criteria; provide authentic, accessible practice; assess with moderated rubrics; and use learner evidence to revise teaching and resource allocation.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

EPP strategies were Much Utilized overall ($M=4.07$), led by pedagogical practice and work values. Knowledge and content ranked last within a favorable profile.

Concordance was significant for pedagogical practice and work values, but not for knowledge, skill mastery, or entrepreneurial concepts. Challenges were Much Challenging overall ($M=4.14$); solutions were Much Urgent ($M=4.11$). Curriculum complexity and engagement were prominent challenges, while differentiation and varied assessment were leading solutions.

Solution rankings were significantly concordant, whereas challenge rankings were not. The findings guide implementation support but do not demonstrate learner mastery of the MELCs.

4.2 Study Limitations

The cross-sectional design describes conditions during the stated school year and cannot establish temporal or causal effects. Ratings of effectiveness, competence, or implementation are therefore interpreted as respondent perceptions rather than independently verified improvements in learner performance.

The principal measures were researcher-made, self-report scales. Social desirability, recall, common-method variance, and differences in interpretation of the response anchors may have influenced the estimates. Classroom observation, document review, learning-resource audits, and learner-level outcome data were not incorporated into the principal analyses.

Kendall's W evaluates concordance in the ordering of indicators. It does not test a respondent-level causal relationship between program implementation and competence, nor does it show that a higher-rated practice produced a learner outcome.

A verified respondent total, scale-reliability evidence, classroom observation, resource and safety audits, and learner performance-task results were not reported in the available materials.

4.3 Implications for Practice and Policy

Develop a district EPP competency map specifying concepts, skills, safety, work values, evidence, time, and minimum resources. Use demonstration, guided practice, authentic local tasks, feedback, and repeated performance opportunities rather than coverage-focused instruction.

Apply analytic rubrics to process, product, safety, explanation, collaboration, and work values; moderate samples across schools. Provide differentiated pathways and accessible alternatives that preserve the intended performance standard.

Govern resource partnerships and OER through accuracy, safety, licensing, accessibility, maintenance, and sustainability criteria.

5. Policy and Implementation Priorities

Table 7. EPP MELC Implementation Framework

Priority Area	Recommended Direction	Expected Evidence
Curriculum mapping	Unpack competencies into knowledge, skill, safety, value, and evidence sequences.	Competency map; pacing and prerequisite guide
Task design	Use authentic, locally relevant projects with explicit modeling and guided practice.	Task brief; lesson artifact; learner product
Differentiation	Vary scaffolds, grouping, materials, time, and pathways without lowering the construct.	Access plan; participation and growth evidence
Assessment	Use analytic rubrics and moderated performance samples.	Rubric; scored sample; moderation record
Resources	Map minimum tools and safe low-cost alternatives; govern partnerships and OER.	Inventory; safety and quality review
Professional learning	Provide content-specific coaching and review of learner work.	Coaching log; revised task; outcome evidence

6. Directions for Future Research

Measure MELC achievement with valid performance tasks and examine relationships with observed strategy use and resource access. Investigate school-category differences in skill-mastery and challenge rankings through mixed-methods case studies. Test differentiated, project-based, and contextualized EPP units through quasi-experimental or cluster-randomized designs. Develop and validate rubrics for EPP process, product, safety, entrepreneurship, and work values, including inter-rater reliability.

References

- [1] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- [2] Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers-2/>
- [3] Department of Education. (2022). *Basic Education Development Plan 2030*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
- [4] Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). *Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- [5] Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J., Jr. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [6] Bell, S. (2010). Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future. *The Clearing House*, 83(2), 39–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098650903505415>
- [7] Department of Education. (2024). *MATATAG Curriculum: EPP/TLE Grades 4–10*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/matatagcurriculumk147/>
- [8] Gulikers, J. T. M., Bastiaens, T. J., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). A five-dimensional framework for authentic assessment. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 52, 67–86.
- [9] Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- [10] Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). ASCD.