

Analysis of Factors Affecting the Changes in the Philippine Elementary Art Education Curriculum (EAEC) in 1982 Through 2013

Romina Beltran-Almazan

The Elementary Art Education Curriculum (EAEC) has developed from being focused on the value of aesthetics, art form, and techniques to one that is geared towards cultural and social relevance, and holistic development of children. This qualitative study utilizes desk review and key informant interviews (KII) to examine significant transformations of the EAEC from 1982 to 2013 and the factors that influenced such changes. The said period is important with the re-establishment of the democratic government, and shows how the national aims of education have been translated into the three curricula used during the period. Documenting how EAEC has evolved would serve as guide posts to future developments of the art education discipline and practice. Findings show that the changes in the EAEC have been primarily driven politically and legally by Constitutional policies and other mandates. Underlying these policies are socio-economic and cultural factors that have continuously shaped the views and appreciation of Philippine society and identity as Filipino students and citizens. Moreover, innovations in approaches and strategies, and the presentation and contextualization of content are driven by factors resulting from changing socio-cultural perspectives, educational breakthroughs in the discipline of art education, technological discoveries, and studies on the teaching-learning process in general.

Keywords: *Art Education, Art Curriculum, Curriculum, Philippine Art Education Curriculum, Philippine Elementary Art Education*

Introduction

This paper explores influences on the Philippine EAEC after Martial Law, or between 1982 to 2013, when the democratic form of government was reclaimed. This period is particularly important due to Constitutional changes driven by sociopolitical factors and democratic ideologies. Thus, the curricula within this timeframe are expected to deliver the tenets of democracy and hone nationalistic and patriotic citizens as mandated by the 1987 Constitution. This period ushered as well major revisions in the curriculum. In the case of art education, the effort to localize and appreciate indigenous and local contemporary art began at this time (Duka, 1997). Documenting and knowing the transformation that led to the kind of art education at present could perhaps provide more innovative ideas and other directions towards the growth of the discipline. Describing and analyzing the changes in the EAEC within time periods seek to answer the questions: 1) How did art education curriculum evolve? and 2) Which factors prompted the major changes in the EAEC?

The significance of studying the factors influencing changes in said curriculum from 1982 through 2013 can be further viewed from several perspectives that can be classified according to general themes (Foshay, 1966; Maclure, 1968; Marcs & Willis, 2007; Marsh & Morris, 1991; Murray 1968). These are political factors, which pertain to changes in government and leadership, including legislation and laws affecting education; socioeconomic factors, which include the development of skills necessary for economic growth and other socioeconomic indicators deemed important by communities and the nation as a whole; cultural factors, or the traditions, beliefs, values and ideologies of the Filipinos, and other principles as applied in the Philippine context including religion; research and development factors, or new information, knowledge, theories, discoveries, and inventions affecting education, curriculum and learning (e.g., the best practices in other countries that can be adapted to Philippine education; and finally, educational factors such as peculiarities of education and curriculum as

discipline, and other aspects like competence of teachers and availability of teaching materials and facilities. The nuances and unique developments in the subject area fall under this last category. These various factors play a significant role in the teaching of art as they facilitate how art education is understood, written, interpreted, and mediated in the teaching-learning process (Kraehe, Hood, & Travis, 2015).

Political factors in the Philippine setting are brought about by the mandates of the 1987 Constitution which support Arts and Culture, and direct the aims of education by virtue of *Batasang Pam-bansa Bilang 232* (BP 232). These likewise carry socioeconomic, cultural and educational significance in terms of envisioning Filipinos as productive and versatile citizens, workers and leaders, in the process improving the quality of their life and responding effectively to changing needs and conditions of the nation (Ministry of Education Culture and Sports, 1982, p.14).

The foregoing BP 232 mandates have been implemented in the entire Philippine educational system with the instruction of art in the elementary, secondary, tertiary, and post graduate levels. The teaching and learning of art and culture specifically in the elementary levels are based on the art curriculum developed and prescribed by the Department of Education for both public and private schools. Such curriculum, ideally, would direct how educational programs related to art are to be planned, implemented, and evaluated.

The development and application of art curricula has further been greatly affected by research and development factors, especially in information technology (IT). IT influences global changes in ideas, values and tools of instruction and creation. Freedman and Stuhr (2004) explain that these exemplify the transformation of art from industrial drawings and handicrafts to visual propaganda to pop culture and mass media technologies. The most recent EAEC includes the development of visual literacy, focused on preparing students in decoding visual information, increased media literacy and an understanding of a

global visual culture. Reviewing the changes in the country's EAEC in this area can open discourse regarding IT impact on, and implications for, the betterment of Filipino students' values and aesthetic knowledge and art teachers' capacities or training, and the transfer of the same into practical economic usage, supporting government's poverty alleviation and income generating efforts. A case in point is the levelling up of discussion and skills in old practical arts and new version of applied arts as ceramics, industrial design, fashion design, martial arts, and other art concepts and skills that could be brought into the realm of art stewardship and creative industries.

Studying changes in EAEC from 1982 to 2013 necessarily touches on historical and sociocultural factors in education itself, reflecting upheavals and other milestones in the historico-socio-cultural fabric of the nation. These could show how the national educational and art programs in general, and curricula in particular, have been affected by such upheavals or milestones.

Educational programs and curricula continuously evolve with society, and just as the needs of society transform with trends in politics, socioeconomic concerns, value systems, and growing body of human knowledge, decisions made on different curriculum elements also essentially change (Smith, 2009). Such changes are reflected in the varying foci of the curriculum especially for art education where the developments in the use of art and media must consider new technologies, new techniques, and sociocultural issues and milieu. In this regard, it is important to identify art forms, and other art concepts that have been withdrawn or added from past and present curricula within the period studied and understand the reasons as to why such actions have been made. Identifying these elements could allow for inclusion of new and traditional concepts that should be reintroduced as sanctioned in EAEC.

Methodology

This article focused on examining the factors

and changes in the EAEC from 1982 to 2013. As the methodology came from qualitative research, descriptive data were gathered from existing primary and secondary sources which included government prescribed course studies and curricular guides, and textbooks. Desk review, historical review through analysis of historical manuscripts, and key informant interview (KII) sessions were utilized to validate information gathered from documents.

Document analysis was used to review the different primary historical documents and secondary sources (i.e. textbooks), which focused on tracking changes and relating them with the different significant events and identified factors during each period.

Primary considerations in analyzing the documents were the relevant changes in any of the four curricular elements aside from the significant events during each period that shaped the EAEC. These four components which were affected by the changes done to the curriculum were the learning intent, learning content, approach and evaluation. The learning intent comprised of aims, goals, and objectives that guided the selection of learning content, approach and evaluation method. Learning content dealt with the knowledge, skills and values that should be taught to the students. Approach referred to how the learning content should be taught, and from where the instructional methods and strategies were derived. Evaluation was concerned with measuring the extent to which the curriculum had achieved the learning intent (Tyler, 1949; Print, 1993). Print (1993) explained that these four components comprise the curriculum, which he defines as all the learning opportunities and experiences presented by institutions and implemented by teachers.

Six respondents participated in the KII based on the scope and quality of their involvement with art education. All key informants (KIs) went through different art instruction in basic education, participated in various art education-related trainings, has contributed to the development of the EAEC at the national or school level, and have

implemented the curriculum either as teachers or administrators. The KII was analyzed using Concept-Construct-Theme (CCT) which entailed the listing of all utterances as individual concepts. Similar concepts then regrouped to form constructs. The constructs were again analyzed and re-classified to draw coherent themes.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the summary of changes in, and the factors that brought about transformations in the EAEC. It likewise includes a brief background on art education to contextualize the curricula under study, followed by the discussion of the last three curricula under the period studied.

The review of literature yielded five elementary art education curricula that have been implemented between 1946 to 2012 since the establishment of the Philippine Republic. These were the Revised Philippine Educational Program (RPEP) (1957), Revised Elementary Education Program (REEP) (1970), New Elementary School Curriculum (NESC) (1982), Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) (2002), and K-12 Curriculum (2012). The period in the study (1982 – 2012) covers the last three curricula. The NESC was the most immediate curriculum adopted after the Martial Law. The Revised Elementary Education Program Curriculum (REEP) in 1970 was used until it was slowly phased out in the school year 1988-1989 while the NESC in 1982 was being gradually introduced (Fajardo, 1998). The document used in this study is the curricular guide in 1990, after the REEP has been completely phased out.

The NESC centered on mastery learning and valued Art as a venue for creative expression and appreciation, and aimed to develop awareness and appreciation for the country's indigenous and contemporary arts (Duka, 1997; Ulit et al., 1995); the BEC focused on lifelong learning and saw Art as a way to address societal needs through the application of practical knowledge and life skills, and the demonstration of a deeper appreciation for the

Filipino culture (Tanodra, 2003). The most recent K-12 curriculum shows changes in terms of developing specializations culminating in the different tracks in senior high school thereby strengthening global competitiveness of graduates (SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2012), with emphasis on the student-centered approach to teaching, and regards Art as a means to address real world problems through creative and innovative solutions.

Brief Background on Philippine Art Education Before 1982

Art education in the country was primarily influenced by the American educational system, and initially mirrored America's inclusion of drawing in the curriculum, with an emphasis on industrial work (Burog, 1995; De Vera, 1996; Fresnoza, 1950). Freehand drawing was introduced in 1918 with the aim to connect drawing with industrial work, and "provide work in freehand drawing that naturally follows the primary course and correlates with school and home activities" (Victoria, 1972, p.10). Art Education as a subject was only officially included in the basic education curriculum in the 1940s. Through the efforts of Mr. Sancho Enriquez, *Course Study in Art Education in Elementary Schools* was published in 1941, which listed practical activities that may be taught during art lessons. In 1947, Mr. Enriquez prepared the outline of the Bureau of Public Schools' *Course Study in Art Education for the Elementary Grades*, which was released in 1950 under the guidance of then Director of Education Esteban Abada. This course study explained that art education, as compared to drawing, had the goals of honing appreciation and self-expression among students (Cruz et al., 1976; Victoria, 1972). Despite this change, art education shared the time period with music, physical, and work education. Activities included appreciation, costume and poster making, illustrating activities, and other crafts that were informally taught (Fresnoza & Casim, 1964; Victoria 1972).

In 1960, the Third World General Assembly of the International Council for Education through Art

(INSEA) was held in Manila, making a significant impact to the teaching of art as art experts and specialists shared their expertise and introduced new ideas, strategies and trends in art education (Cruz et. al. 1976; Victoria, 1972). Those who attended the INSEA consequently organized themselves with the purpose of practicing what they learned to improve their teaching (Fajardo, 2012). This group, which later became the Philippine Art Educators Association (PAEA), aimed to equip art teachers with the skills and competencies to contextualize art lessons through workshops and seminars using local materials, and inviting local artists to give lectures about Philippine art and culture (Fajardo, 2012). However, this was not the case for public schools. The public school art program was only given focus in 1965, when the Public Schools Art Education Association tried to define the role of the teacher in art education and guidelines for each level, such as specific objectives of art education, materials, techniques, motivational themes, and possible topics for each grade. The activities and topics reflected Lowenfeld's ideas on the stages for creative and mental growth, which became the basis for determining appropriateness of topics and activities for each level (Burog, 1995; Pariña, 1980; Soria, 1986).

In the 1970s, the concept of art education further changed with the renewed interest in the growth of the child, especially addressing children's needs and improving their welfare (Pañares, 1980). Thus, art education followed by shifting to something that relates to daily life, and became available for all regardless of skill, disabilities, or even socio-economic status (Cruz et al.,1976). Its

goals reflected the development of the students' physical, psychosocial, and emotional growth, which was also heavily influenced by Viktor Lowenfeld's stages of artistic development (Cruz et. al., 1976; Soria, 1986; Victoria, 1972) From the activity-based curriculum, the new curriculum also featured the presence of specific objectives, topics and skills required for the listed activities. Different approaches such as the directing method, free expression method, eclectic method, and meaningful art instruction. Direction method, as the name suggests, involved the teacher giving instructions, while free expression method allowed the child to choose the subject, materials and methods for their art work. Eclectic method combined both direction and free expression methods. Last but not least was the meaningful art education approach that related art making with a sense of purpose (Bernardino & Casim, 1971; Cruz et al.,1976; Victoria, 1972). However, despite these shifts, art education was still marginalized and poorly taught (De Vera, 1996; Soria, 1986).

The transition of art education from the 1970s to the 1980s began with reforms to education after the EDSA Revolution. The three curricula after this historic event will be discussed in the succeeding section.

Major Transformations and Factors in the NES, BEC, and K-12 EAEC

The information gleaned from both document analysis and KII identifies the following factors for the transformations in each curriculum per period as presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Major Transformations and Factors in the NES, BEC, and K-12 EAEC from 1982 to 2013

Curriculum/ Period	Factors		Major Transformations in Art Education Curriculum
	Classification	Significant Actions	
NESC (1982 period of expression, inquiry and competency building)	Political/ Socioeconomic/ Research and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Martial Law was lifted in January 17, 1981, bringing back a democratic form of government and climate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Art education was equated to creative expression and appreciation, especially for indigenous and local contemporary art.

Table 1

Major Transformations and Factors in the NESC, BEC, and K–12 EAEC from 1982 to 2013 (continued from previous page)

NESC (1982 period of expression, inquiry and competency building)	Political/ Socioeconomic/ Research and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus was on social justice and socio-economic development, as well as emphasis on scientific and cultural development. • Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education (PCSPE) (1970), and the Survey of Outcomes of Elementary Education (SOUTELE) (1976) were conducted. The results of these became the basis for developing NESC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Aim: “to assist in the intellectual, emotional, and social growth of the learners according to their needs and capacities” (The previous goal merely focused on development of physical, psychosocial and emotional growth).
	Educational Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curricular emphasis on mastery learning • Influenced by art Education theories: Discipline Based Art Education Approach (DBAE) (1992), John Dewey’s art as experience (1934), and Lowenfeld’s Artistic Development Theory (1947) • Art combined with Music and taught alongside Physical Education (P.E.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum Learning Competencies (MLCs) written using the national language, which lists the skills and knowledge to be developed for each grade level were created. • Content topics have been classified into four learning areas: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Kaalaman sa Disenyo at Biswal na Pagdama</i> <i>b. Malikhaing Pagpapahayag</i> <i>c. Midya, Kagamitan, Pamamaraan</i> <i>d. Pagpapahalaga sa Kagandahan</i> • Various methods of teaching art (copy method, creative expression, assigned topics to interpret, core teaching, correlated teaching, integrative teaching, the art of questioning, group processes, and sequential method were revised.
Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) (2002-period of integration and emphasis of patriotic, nationalistic and environmental values)	Political Cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of Report on the Presidential Commission on Educational Reform (PCER) (2000) • Promulgation of RA No. 8371, “<i>The Indigenous People’s Rights Act of 1997</i>” • Implementation of DepEd Order No. 25 s. 2002 • Emphasis on the core values of <i>makabayan, makatao, makakalikasan</i> at <i>maka-Diyos</i> (Tanodra, 2003) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art was viewed as a vehicle for change especially in developing higher appreciation for the Filipino culture including indigenous culture. • Art (<i>Sining</i>) is integrated in the Makabayan subject, which also includes <i>Sibika at Kultura</i> (Social Studies), <i>Musika</i> (Music) and <i>Edukasyong Pangkalusugan</i> (Physical Education)

Table 1

Major Transformations and Factors in the NESC, BEC, and K–12 EAEC from 1982 to 2013 (continued from previous page)

Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) (2002-period of integration and emphasis of patriotic, nationalistic and environmental values)	Research and Development Educational Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on life-long learning, integration of topics, and the use of various creative and critical teaching strategies • Influenced by Discipline Based Art Education Approach (DBAE) (1992), John Dewey’s art as experience (1934), and Lowenfeld’s Artistic Development Theory (1947) • Art taught alongside Music and P.E. (MSEP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives per grade level are more defined as expressed in the specific art competencies • Content topics were reclassified into the following themes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>pandama sa kagandahan</i> (aesthetic perception) b. <i>malikhaing pagpapahayag</i> (creative expression) c. <i>pamana ng sining</i> (art heritage) d. <i>pagpapahalaga sa kapaligiran</i> (environment appreciation) • Study of art elements and principles are explicitly stated. • Topics on Philippine art, design, artists and national heritage were added. • Art as a means to national identity and unity was included as a subtopic.
K-12 Curriculum (2012–beginnings of standardization and global competitiveness; era of specialization, cultural heritage, and child centered learning)	Socioeconomic Political Sociocultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Philippine Medium-Term Development Plan (MTPDP) from 2011 to 2016 “aims to strengthen education for global competitiveness” • Education for All (EFA) (2015) and Basic Education Reform Agenda (BESRA) (2010) framework promotes “global comparability and better-prepared graduates for higher levels of learning.” • Critical Task No. 5 of the Philippine EFA Plan of Action 2015 necessitates the lengthening of basic education from ten (10) years to twelve (12) years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art education was as an essential tool for communication and self-expression, and could increase a person’s ability to apply creative and new solutions, for new problems in our world. • In addition to competencies, progression of concepts and skills were expressed through specified standards for the learning area (Art), and for each grade level. • Content (elements, principles, most activities and topics) are relatively the same as in previous curriculum. However, content explicitly includes art elements and principles, art processes and techniques. • Content focuses on Philippine art, culture and heritage

Table 1
 Major Transformations and Factors in the NESC, BEC, and K–12 EAEC from 1982 to 2013 (continued from previous page)

K-12 Curriculum (2012 – beginnings of standardization and global competitiveness; era of specialization, cultural heritage, and child centered learning)	Research and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Problems in education were congested curriculum and lack of classrooms, materials and qualified teachers, low student participation rates, unequal access to education, low student scores in the National Achievement Test (NAT), and the poor performance of the Philippines in the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) ● Students are considered too young to enter the labor force ● Influenced by Art Education theories: Discipline Based Art Education Approach (DBAE) (1992), and Lowenfeld’s Artistic Development Theory (1947) ● Influenced by major educational theories: Howard Gardner’s multiple Intelligences (1982), Child-centered approach to learning ● Art taught alongside Music, P.E. and Health (MAPEH) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Introduction of digital arts in the higher elementary levels ● Use of student-centered, Experiential, Developmentally appropriate, Culture-Based strategies to teaching ● Use of Mother Tongue as medium of instruction ● Integrative and contextualized
--	--------------------------	--	---

The Ministry of Education mandated the implementation of the NESC in 1982 with the issuance of MEC Order No. 6 (Duka, 1997). The New Elementary School Curriculum (NESC) was initially conceived to address the problems presented by the different surveys done for REEP, namely, Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education (PCSPE) and the Survey of Outcomes of Elementary Education (SOUTELE). The EAEC under NESC was heavily influenced by democratic ideals, as specified in the 1987 Constitution. The political, socio-economic, and cultural factors were immediately felt as the general curriculum strived to develop democratic citizens who will contribute to nation-building. It included more defined minimum competencies that outline the necessary knowledge and skills to be achieved by students per grade level. Policies also dictate that Art include Visual Arts and Music, which are taught alongside P.E. These three share a

weekly time slot of 30 minutes per day in grade 3, and 40 minutes in higher levels (Aquino, 1971).

Cultural and educational factors, however were more evident in the EAEC, as seen in the topics, teacher competencies, and teaching methods, especially in the inclusion of appreciation for indigenous art and contemporary Philippine Art. The content *Kaalaman sa Disenyo at Biswal na Pagdama* (Design and Visual Perception); *Malikhaing Pagpapahayag* (Creative Expression); *Midya, Kagamitan, Pamamaraan* (Media, Tools, and Techniques); and, *Pagpapahalaga sa Kagandahan* (Aesthetics, or literally, Appreciation of Beauty) also reflect the influences of Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE), an approach to teaching art which focuses on teaching the four (4) fundamental disciplines in art, namely, art production, art history, art criticism and aesthetics (Smith, 2000). Research and development factors

also enhanced the arsenal of teaching art in the classroom such as John Dewey's *Art as Experience* published in 1934, which proposed that art is proof that human beings can make life according to how they understand the world, according to their beliefs about themselves, their identity, and culture (Wartenberg, 2001). Dewey suggested that art education should be implemented with the purpose of developing a critical eye, where the individual can appreciate worth and value in different forms, to resurface emotions, memories, and ideas enabling individuals to a heightened sense of awareness that cannot be achieved through ordinary experiences. This so-called aesthetic experience and appreciative development transformation ultimately lead to both the refinement of one's character and a deeper understanding of culture (Nakamura, 2009). Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth* in 1947 also introduced the importance of tracking developmental stages in art and using developmentally appropriate evaluation of art works. Lowenfeld also believed that the creative process in art was just as important as the final product, and therefore the process should also be assessed (Gruber & Hobbs, 2002). These ideals espoused by John Dewey, Victor Lowenfeld, and DBAE have affected the perception of Philippine art education towards achieve aesthetic experience, creative expression, appreciation, and cognitive process. This is in contrast to the previous curricula's view that art education is a means to improve manual training for factory workers (Elfland, 1990). Thus, teaching strategies have evolved from merely copying and drawing, to a gamut of techniques, such as creative expression, assigned topics to interpret, core teaching, correlated teaching, integrative teaching, the art of questioning, group processes, and sequential method. However, despite the proliferation of strategies, this era also used the copy method, a technique used in manual training.

Other technological advancements in new media and tools (i.e. different kinds of paints) are also influential in enhancing art processes. However, activities from the old curriculum (i.e. vegetable printing) have been recycled to fit the

new EAEC. On the other hand, cultural factors, inclusion of indigenous culture and the need to establish the Filipino identity as mandated in the Constitution are expressed under the theme *Pagpapahalaga sa Kagandahan*, where sub-topics focus on the appreciation of the environment. This is the theme where local art of the immediate community, folk and traditional arts in the different regions, famous Philippine artists, indigenous art and artifacts are presented and discussed according to the EAEC.

BEC, on the other hand was a product of restructuring the curriculum based on the report of the Presidential Commission on Educational Reform (PCER), which reiterated that the students' reading abilities "plateau at the intermediate level, or approximately Grade 4 capacity" due to the congested curriculum (Tanodra, 2003). PCER further reported that the curriculum is overcrowded which affected students' focus on basic critical foundation skills needed to succeed in higher grade levels. Emphasis was also given on reading, communication skills, and basic mathematical and scientific concepts (Tanodra, 2003). Additionally, the impetus to implement the new curriculum was politically-driven through the implementation of DepEd Order No. 25 s. 2002, or the Implementation of the 2002 Basic Education Curriculum. This development also accentuated core values such as *makabayan* (nationalistic and patriotic), *makatao* (humanitarian), *makakalikasan* (steward of the environment) *at maka-Diyos* (pious) (Tanodra, 2003). Policies dictated that specific art skills are taught from grade 4 onwards. Similarly, the promulgation of RA No. 8371, otherwise known as "The Indigenous Act of 1997" (Republic Act No. 8371, n.d.), allowed the education sector to be more aware and explicit in teaching cultural diversity, as well as the traditions and histories of indigenous people (IP). Likewise, this also surfaced the need to emphasize the national identity as Filipinos. This was evident in the Art curriculum, where Art Appreciation towards national unity and identity was included as a the first topic in Art Heritage. Art Heritage also gave attention to the discussion of the art forms / materials of the different IPs, particularly wood and

clay; and carving, pottery, jewelry, and ethnic design. Another subtopic in *Pagpapahalaga sa Kapaligiran* or Environment Appreciation tackles the different celebrations, which included IP rituals and festivities. Art was still taught with Music (*Musika*) and P.E. (*Edukasyon sa Pagpapalakas ng Katawan Pantao*) (MSEP) with a daily time allotment of 20 mins for Grade 4, and 40 mins for Grades 5 and 6 (Tanodra, 2003).

Cultural and educational factors further drove the EAEC to go beyond expression and be an instrument in developing higher appreciation for the Filipino culture. Unlike NESC where topics were contextualized in the last major theme *Pagpapahalaga sa Kagandahan*, the topics in BEC provided more opportunities to discuss Filipino visual arts, as they were also more aligned with the four disciplines of DBAE (art history, art production, aesthetics, criticism). The BEC EAEC topics were further classified into four themes, namely, *pandama sa kagandahan* (aesthetic perception), *malikhaing pagpapahayag* (creative expression), *pamana ng sining* (art heritage), and *pagpapahalaga sa kapaligiran* (environment appreciation). It should be noted that *pagpapahalaga sa kapaligiran* did not involve the study of the environment per se, rather, it developed appreciation for natural scenic spots, architecture, and other elements found in the surroundings. *Pamana ng sining* explored Philippine art history by studying local art, design, artists, and national heritage. The study of the basic art elements and principles were explicitly stated and are introduced together with aesthetic beliefs in *pandama sa kagandahan*, and further reinforced in the other themes. BEC EAEC provided more opportunities to discuss aesthetics and art history but is still heavy on art production. Art criticism was not overtly defined.

Another educational factor was the use of Lowenfeld's stages of graphic development. The BEC EAEC espoused developmental appropriateness, as seen in the list of pre-requisite skills and hierarchy of specific competencies for each grade level.

One thing that the framers of BEC EAEC overlooked was that Art was one of five subjects in *Makabayan* (the others being Music, P.E., Health, and Social Studies) and still shared time allotment with Music and P.E. Although the art competencies were higher and wider in scope, the time to cover all of these remained almost the same as in the previous curriculum (Grade 4 – 40 minutes for NESC, 20 minutes for BEC; Grades 5 to 6 - 40 minutes/day for both NESC and BEC) (Department of Education, 2012c). The time allotment begged the question whether quality Art education was given importance because competencies, especially those inculcating love for Filipino culture through art, required more time to develop.

Research and development and political and socio-economic factors played significant roles in the transition to the K-12 curriculum. To note, the effect of research and development factors persisted as the problems encountered by previous surveys and studies about Philippine Education such as congested curriculum, lack of classrooms and materials, and the inadequate number of qualified teachers continued even with the implementation of BEC. Socio-economic factors were also present as low student participation rates, unequal access to education, low National Achievement Test (NAT) scores, and the poor performance of the Philippines in the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) confirmed the country's low quality of education. Aside from decongesting the curriculum and complying with global standards, the K-12 was also crafted to prepare students for higher education and/or the labor force. On the global front, the Philippines was the only country in Asia during the time of curriculum transition, and one of the last three countries in the world, with a 10-year education cycle (Policy Brief Senate Economic Planning Office, 2011).

These pressing educational concerns and an international commitment to fulfill Education for All (EFA) dictated the Aquino administration to make necessary educational reforms through the Philippine Medium-Term Development Plan from 2011 to 2016, which "aims to strengthen education

for global competitiveness” and promote “global comparability and better-prepared graduates for higher levels of learning” (SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2012, p.1). Moreover, Critical Task No. 5 of the Philippine EFA Plan of Action 2015 necessitates the lengthening of basic education from ten years to twelve (SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2012). Thus, the K-12 curriculum was mandated through RA 10533, or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Congress of the Philippines, 2012). The K-12 system aimed to reform the previous educational system by adding two more years to the required number of years in basic education. The new curriculum emphasized the need for specialized or preparatory courses prior to entering the university or work force in the hope of providing students better work and academic opportunities right after graduating from high school. The additional two years of basic education allowed students to pursue any of these four tracks: Academic, Technical-Vocational-Livelihood, Sports, and Arts and Design (SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2012).

Another innovation this curriculum introduced was the use of Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) from kindergarten to Grade 3, which was then replaced by Filipino and English by Grade 4. The use of the mother tongue as the medium of instruction aimed to support the learning of students by serving as the foundation in learning the national languages of the country. Further contextualization of concepts to the students’ local environment through MTB-MLE also ensured that students could identify the relevance of their learning to their daily lives. Another change was the statement of knowledge and skills as general content and performance standards per level, in addition to the specific grade-level competencies.

Similar to previous curricula, the K-12 EAEC envisioned art as a tool for communication and self-expression. However, this time, Art was given more significance in recognition of its ability to increase a person’s ability to solve problems creatively. This perception of art as a means to cognitive and creative development was influenced by educational factors, particularly by studies and

theories that affect Art instruction, such as, Howard Gardner’s Project Zero and multiple intelligences, and Lowenfeld’s Graphic Development Theory (De Vera, 1996; Soria, 1986). Moreover, the approach to teaching was given more clarity as the learner was seen as an innovator and an active participant in the learning process compared to previous curricula. Nevertheless, Art is still taught with Music P.E., and Health, all of which share daily time allotment of 40 minutes.

Research and Development factors, specifically the use of DBAE approach to teaching Art and the addition of digital media in the higher grade levels, affected how the EAEC should be delivered. From relying too much on activities and art production, art instruction should also give equal significance to other art disciplines namely, aesthetics, art history, and art criticism.

Aside from DBAE, the K-12 EAEC advocated the child-centered approach which took into account the holistic learning of students through activities that are experiential, developmentally-appropriate, and considerate of students’ needs and interests (Department of Education, 2012b).

Sociocultural factors affect the EAEC through integration and contextualization of learning. Co-curricular activities in the community were encouraged to provide opportunities for learners to apply their knowledge and skills to their immediate environment or within the Philippine context (Department of Education, 2012b). Particularly, content focused more on Philippine art, culture, and heritage thereby strengthening the students’ sense of Filipino identity.

While the K-12 EAEC identified underlying theories, it failed to include recent art education theories that could have been more relevant and responsive to the goals of contemporary art education. As a case in point, there had been studies that challenged and went beyond Lowenfeld’s linear stage theory ending in the achievement of realism or mimesis in drawing. One such study was that of Dennie Wolf and Martha Perry’s theory (Elfland, 2002) which posited that

drawing development did not adhere to only one type of drawing but is rather a “multiple repertoire” where each type served a different purpose (i.e. drawing of a map to show location *vis-à-vis* merely drawing a house). Similarly, Kindler and Darras (1997) proposed the Map of Artistic Development, where drawing and other art skills did not end at a certain stage but rather continued to branch out in different forms pictorial representation and levels of proficiency depending on the cultural influences, need/s, and purpose/s of one’s drawings. Other approaches to art teaching, such as Design Thinking and Cross-Cultural Approaches, were also developed aside from DBAE, which could have been more relevant to how art education is perceived and taught today.

Summary of Findings

This study examined the influences on the Philippine EAEC, and the ensuing changes in the goals, content, approaches, and evaluation. Below are the key findings based on the results of the study:

1. **On changes in the EAEC (1982 through 2012).** Findings showed that there was gradual yet progressive change in the perception and goals of art education. Initially, was used as training ground for the workforce of industries (Victoria, 1972). As the national curriculum changed, the value of art education evolves in accordance with the national curriculum. The original perception of art education during the 1950s was that of a work-oriented subject designed for manual training (Victoria, 1972). The EAEC gradually changed to become a vehicle for creative expression and appreciation used to fulfill the new educational aim to foster nationalism by developing an appreciation for the Filipino culture. The NESAC and BEC both valued Art as an agent in instilling nationalism and cultural appreciation in addition to creative expression and appreciation. The K-12 EAEC was more progressive in its view of art education as it rationalized art as an integral part

of the development of both individual and society.

As art education shifted to a more humanistic perspective, the intent, approaches and content emphasized the creative development of the child. All children regardless of age, sex, religion, and socio-economic background, were taught to observe, to critique, to appreciate and to interact with each other, and their environment. At the same time, they learned how to express their observations, ideas, feelings and aspirations using different methods in art (such as drawing and painting). The goal was to develop children’s sensitivity and imagination, and to encourage them to create, experiment, and appreciate their work. The intent and content were incorporated in learning competencies and arranged into meaningful themes as art education’s role began to widen, encompassing the development nationalism and cultural literacy. As countries including the Philippines opened to the international community, these themes and competencies gave way to standards to allow students and graduates to be globally competent.

The approaches followed the lead of the changes in the intent. Child-centered approaches progressively replaced teacher-centered strategies as the goals of art education curriculum evolved to encompass different aspects of an individual’s development (cognitive, affective, psychomotor, social, cultural) through the use of developmentally appropriate materials and activities, experiential and discovery learning, integration, and localization. The latest research and advancements in technology, learning, human development, and art as a discipline also affected the availability of strategies, materials, and media that may be used to effectively implement the curriculum.

Notably, all three curricula expressed the need for contextualization of lessons in the Philippine setting, which was a commendable move in fostering nationalism and cultural pride. The NESCS began with a general appreciation for indigenous and Philippine contemporary art, BEC pushed for integration and deeper the appreciation for Filipino culture, which culminated in the K to 12 curriculum's drive to contextualize art lessons through the use of materials and exploration of community arts. However, upon scrutinizing, the listed student competencies in the K-12 curriculum would seem to have fallen short on deepening the art concepts (i.e. drawing the outline of a jeepney and using art elements and principles to paint the drawing in Grade 2, or enumerating unique characteristics of popular Philippine landscapes in Grade 5) (Department of Education, 2012b). Teachers would have to exert effort in consciously using the recommended approaches and foundational principles (i.e. DBAE) in teaching art since the curriculum presents more art production activities. Aside from this, there was a lack of topics on the standards of indigenous art. Addition of such standards would provide an appropriate lens with which to view and appreciate indigenous art, and prevent the use of western principles to evaluate local and indigenous art.

Art as a subject had always been taught with Music, and P.E., with the addition of Health. Not much had been written if this practice was adopted by virtue of habit in time allotment or to provide holistic learning. However, it would seem that more of the former has been accepted rather than the latter, as no other evidence or explanation was offered in the curricular guides regarding the chunking of these subjects, save for the evident adoption of time allotment from previous curricula. However, BEC tried to answer this through the subject *Makabayan*, which featured teaching subjects that reinforced nationalism and

patriotism such as Art, Music, P.E., Health and Social Studies. Despite this purpose to instill said values by teaching *Makabayan* in an integrated manner, the curricular guides for the different subjects remained separated and distinct from each other.

The content had minimal changes since the foundation skills and concepts of art education remained unchanged. Most of the revisions were limited to the presentation, contextualization, and inclusion of new concepts and processes that the technological era has brought. The presentation of content saw the use of activities, themes, and a gradual progression of difficulty, while new concepts, processes, and art forms, such as photography and digital art, were necessary inclusions to keep abreast with the changing society.

Nevertheless, despite the documented changes in the goals and approaches, the actual instruction was a different matter. The lack of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms, as stated in the documents and attested by the KIIs, meant that there was no standard and established process of assessing the faithful, efficient and effective implementation of the EAEC *vis-à-vis* the curricular guide. These M&E procedures were necessary because these would show the problems encountered in the delivery and translation of the EAEC and served as basis for future changes and/or improvements in the program.

2. **On Factors affecting changes in EAEC.** All factors (political, socio-economic, cultural, educational, and research and development) contributed to transformations in each curriculum but at varying degrees. Political and socio-economic factors were foremost in initiating the planning and implementation of a new curriculum. The change of government, as well as educational surveys and evaluation initiated by the government, and agreements mandated

by the international community resulted to the different reforms and transformations to the national curriculum. These changes were also translated to the art program, required learning competencies, the corresponding approaches, and the structure and sequence of content.

On the other hand, educational, and research and development directly affected changes in approaches, strategies, and available materials. The availability of different studies on art theories, processes, and levels of application aid in discerning and choosing suitable strategies and media for the effective implementation of the program, technological advancements and emerging media had direct impact on the pedagogy and arrangement of content in the EAEC.

Moreover, cultural factors affected the learning intent, content, and approach due to emphasis in developing cultural appreciation, integration of local practices and processes, and the contextualization and localization of the curriculum during actual instruction.

These factors revealed the considerations of curriculum developers in formulating the art program, especially in using foreign influences rooted in the developments of the discipline based on studies from Western countries, especially USA. This practice of adapting developments in American education to the Philippine curriculum was largely due to the fact that the Philippine educational system was based on the American educational system. However, the factors that shaped American education may not be the same. Thus, difficulties also arose in adapting and localizing American and other foreign curricular innovations because the context and considerations were not the same.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the study:

1. **On Changes in the EAEC (1982 through 2012).** Art education has changed from being a tool used for manual training, to one that allows self-expression and communication, culminating in a process that could initiate personal and social change. The goals of the EAEC have evolved from development of creative expression and appreciation to one that nurtures creative problem-solving. Art is also not limited only to the psycho-motor and affective realm, as previous curricula suggested, but is also significant in developing cognitive processes, where learners use creative means in solving real world problems.

Content changed minimally since the art theories and principles remained the same. Contextualization of content to make learning more relevant is noted. Yet, the current curriculum lacks appropriate local standards would allow a deeper understanding, appreciation and more appropriate interpretation of indigenous art.

Gradual changes were made in the approaches in the EAEC, from teacher-centered approach (i.e. directing method), to student-centered approaches (i.e. creative problem solving). While this is a milestone in teaching Art, most activities involve art production.

Last but not the least, there is also a lack of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms in tracking the transformations and influences in the EAEC.

2. **On Factors affecting changes in EAEC.** Major changes in EAEC are primarily politically and socio-economically driven. Changes in

the landscape of Philippine government as well as socioeconomic policies and concerns direct education and curricular changes. These changes were naturally translated to the EAEC, affecting time allotment, required learning competencies, approaches and the structure and sequence of content. Cultural, R&D, and educational factors, on the other hand, directly influence the EAEC in terms of how the content is presented, which viewpoints must be considered, and what approaches, and strategies to learning should be used. The availability of different studies on learning theories, art instruction, and processes assist in choosing appropriate activities and media in implementing the EAEC successfully.

Recommendations

The recommendations based on the factors and changes in the EAEC are the following:

1. **For art teachers.** Art teachers, or those handling art classes, should take time to thoroughly understand the influences and underlying principles in the present art curriculum to effectively implement the program and achieve the goals of the EAEC in use.

Moreover, approaches to teaching art should give equal importance to aesthetics, art history, art criticism, and art production. Socio-cultural factors necessitate that these art disciplines be utilized to have a deeper understanding and appreciation of one's Filipino identity and heritage. Teachers must therefore make a conscious effort to arm themselves with competencies in teaching the four disciplines and using the prescribed approaches, especially in making learning more relevant to learner's experiences and studying learning /teaching processes that are more integrative and multidisciplinary while remaining focused on the aims, function, and nature of art education. It is important for art teachers to first fully

appreciate art education as a discipline and understand its special place in the curriculum to implement it effectively and efficiently.

2. **For school administrators.** School administrators should hire qualified art teachers, with the proper expertise, skills, and experience. Assigning this subject to one who does not have the required competencies will only jeopardize the efficient and effective implementation of the EAEC.

Administrators must anticipate the training needs of their art teachers, and search for or develop relevant training programs that are aligned with the theories and principles of the EAEC in use. Proper and adequate support must be given to teachers so they can cultivate a deeper understanding and appreciation for art education, and develop other avenues to improve their competencies in implementing the art program.

3. **For curriculum developers.** Curriculum developers should be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the EAEC to ensure the proper conduct of the curriculum development process. They should also come up with appropriate teacher training that are aligned with the competencies required to effectively deliver the EAEC. They should also include the appropriate time allotment in the analysis and evaluation of the EAEC to see the whether the program can indeed be effectively delivered given the time allocated.
4. **For other researchers.** Researchers could conduct a similar study with a wider scope, with representative KIs, and documents from all over the Philippines. This could provide further basis and information on how the EAEC was delivered and contextualized in the different regions.

Moreover, it would also be interesting to study the secondary art education curriculum to see how it has transformed, and which factors served as driving forces that ushered changes and innovations to establish a more cohesive and comprehensive picture of art education in the Philippines.

Comparative studies at the school level on the factors affecting the present and previous EAEC should also be done to determine the relevance, appropriateness, and responsiveness of using the same considerations in the development of EAEC.

Since there is lack of information regarding the practice of offering Art with Music, P.E. and Health, researchers could also look into the rationale behind this custom if this is due to force of habit, a replication of previous time allotment and subject listing, or if there are strong socioeconomic and political reasons underlying this practice. Studies, moreover, may also look into the efficiency of offering (or combining) Art with the other subjects or lengthening its time allotment in the achievement of desired learning outcomes.

5. **For policy makers.** M&E should be in place and done regularly. Similarly, M&E systems, policies, and other programs must be established to set directions, measure performance of art education across levels, and determine if the Constitutional mandates on art, culture and national educational aims are being achieved.

Policies regarding support for art education should also be reviewed and/ or enhanced to address emerging needs in the discipline and the EAEC. For example, policies should examine offering Art as a stand alone subject with its own time allotment, to include service and community-based learning, as well as more contextualized content on national and local culture,

art products, and aesthetics.

References

- Aquino, G.V. (1971). *Curriculum development principles & techniques*. Quezon City: Alemar Phoenix Publishing House.
- Bernardino, V. and Casim, C.P. (1971). *Course study in the elementary grades revised edition*. Manila: Abiva Publishing.
- Burog, J.B. (1995). *Status of teaching music, art and physical education (mape) in grades iii-vi of San Remigio Districts I and III Division of Cebu* (Unpublished thesis). Graduate School of Cebu Roosevelt Memorial Colleges, Bogo, Cebu.
- Congress of the Philippines. (2013, May 15). *Republic act no. 10533*. Retrieved from Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines: <http://www.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/>
- Cruz, P.Z., Villamin A.M, et al. (1976). *Teaching the elementary school subjects*. Manila: Rex Bookstore.
- De Vera, L.L. (1996). *Theoretical guidelines for developing a discipline-based art teacher education program in the Philippines* (Unpublished thesis). College of Education, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Department of Education (2010). *DO 23, s. 2010 - adoption of the besra implementation and accountability plan, 2010-2012: A blueprint for transforming the basic education sub-sector*. Philippines: Government Printing Office.
- Department of Education: (2012a). *K+12 curriculum guide for arts*. Pasig City: Department of Education. Retrieved from Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines: <http://www.gov.ph/k-12/#about>
- Department of Education. (2012b). *The K to 12 basic education program*.
- Department of Education (2012c). *Deped order 31. s. 2012, implementing guidelines of grades 1 to 10 enhanced basic education curriculum*. Philippines: Government Printing Office.
- Department of Education (2012d). *Policy guidelines on the implementation of grades 1 to 10 of the k to 12 basic education curriculum (bec) effective school year 2012-2013*. Philippines: Government Printing Office.
- De Vera, L.L. (1996). *Theoretical guidelines for developing a discipline-based art teacher education program in the philippines* (Unpublished thesis). College of Education,

97 Alipato

- University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Duka, C.D. (1997). *Historical, philosophical, and legal foundations of education*. Quezon Ave., Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House, Inc.
- Elfland, A.D. (1990). *A history of art education: intellectual and social currents in teaching the visual arts*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Elfland, A.D. (2002). *Art and cognition: Integrating the visual arts in the curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Foshay, A.W. (1966). *Shaping curriculum: The decade ahead. Influences in curriculum change*. New York: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Fajardo, A.C. (1998). *Developing prototype community-based elementary school science instructional materials on energy for the Filipino child* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hiroshima University, Japan.
- Fajardo, B.V. (2012). *Keynote for PAEA conference on art education*. GSIS Museum
- Freedman, K. & Stuhr, P. (2004). Curriculum changes for the 21st century: Visual culture in art education. In E. Eisner & M. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of research and policy in art education* (pp. 815-828). Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Fresnoza, F.P. and Casim, C.P. (1964). *Essentials of Philippine educational system (Revised ed.)*. Sta. Cruz, Manila: Abiva Publishing House.
- Gruber, D.D. and Hobbs, J.A. (2002). *Historical analysis of assessment in art education*. *Art Education*. 55. 12. 10.2307/3193974.
- Kindler, A.M. and Darras, B. (1997). Map or artistic development. In Kindler, A.M (Ed.), *Child development in art* (pp. 17 to 44). Virginia, USA: National Art Education Association.
- Kraehe, A. M., Hood, E. J., & Travis, S. (2015). "I'm So Offended!": Curriculum flashpoints and critical arts education. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 16(18).
- Maclure, J.S. (1968). *Curriculum innovation and practice: a report by J. Stuart Maclure of the third international curriculum conference*, Oxford, September 17-22, 1967. London: The Schools Council.
- Marcus, C. J. and Willis, G. (2007). *Curriculum: alternative, approaches, ongoing issues, (fourth edition)*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Marsh, C. and Morris, P. (eds.) (1991). *Curriculum development in East Asia*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sports (1982). *A glimpse on the educational system of the Philippines*. Planning and Programming Division, Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sports: Manila
- Murray, T.R. (1968). *Strategies for curriculum change: Cases from 13 nations*. Scranton, PA: International Textbook.
- Nakamura, K. (2009). The significance of Dewey's aesthetics in art education in the age of globalization. *Educational Theory*, (59)4. ProQuest Education Journals
- Pañares, A.P. (1980). *A model for an introductory seminar-workshop in art education for preschool teachers* (Unpublished thesis). College of Education, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Pariña, G.M. (October-December, 1980). Art education in the Philippines. *Education Quarterly XXVII*, 41-51. UP, Diliman: College of Education.
- Policy Brief Senate Economic Planning Office (2011). *K to 12: The key to quality education*. http://senate.gov.ph/publications/sepo_publications.asp
- Print, M. (1993). *Curriculum development and design (2nd ed.)*. Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Republic Act No. 8371. Retrieved from extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/phi13930.pdf
- SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2012). *K to 12 toolkit: Resource guide for teacher educators, school administrators, and teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.seameo-innotech.org>
- Smith, J. (2009). Art education in New Zealand: Historical antecedents and the contemporary context. *Canadian Review of Art education: Research and Issues*, 3619-36.
- Smith, R. A. (2000). *Readings in discipline-based art education, a literature of educational reform*. Virginia USA: The National Art Education Association
- Soria, R.C. (1986). *Art education in the elementary schools: cues for direction or redirection* (Unpublished thesis). College of Education, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Tanodra, E.Q. (2003). *Philippine educational system*. Quezon City: VERH Educational Enterprise.
- Tanner, D. and Tanner, L. (2007). *Curriculum development: Theory into practice, (4th ed)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Tyler, R.W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ulit, U.V., Salazar, E.S., et al. (1995). *Teaching the elementary school subjects: Content and strategies in teaching the basic elementary school subjects*. Manila: Rex Bookstore.

Victoria, P. J. (1972). *Art in the elementary schools*. Quezon Boulevard, Quezon City: Phoenix Press Inc.

Wartenberg, T.E. (2002). *The nature of art, an anthology*. USA: Wadsworth, Thomas Learning Inc.

About the Author

Romina “Phoebe” P. Beltran-Almazan is presently a faculty of the Art Education Area, College of Education, University of the Philippines, Diliman. She received her Bachelor in Interior Design, Certificate in Professional Education and Master in Education Major in Curriculum Studies from the same institution. In addition, she is a *Monbukagakusho* Japanese Government Scholar under the Teacher Training Program at Okayama University where she conducted research on Art and Museum Education. She has been a basic and adult education art education teacher, private art tutor/ teacher, textbook writer, trainer, and school principal. She is also a practicing artist and holds positions in art groups such as being the treasurer of the Philippine Pastel Artists Inc. (PPA) and founding president of Art Ventures and Advocacy Network (ARTVAN). Her consultancy works include research, training, instructional design, materials development, and curriculum evaluation for art, gender, military, basic, and tertiary education.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Romina “Phoebe” P. Beltran-Almazan at **rbalmazan@up.edu.ph**