



NAVIGATING RECALIBRATED FRAMEWORKS: INSTRUCTIONAL READINESS AND RESOURCE ADAPTATION AMONG GRADE 11 SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATORS

Jackielyn G. Magno, Edsam C. Gura, Estelita A. Madriaga

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra29143>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra29143

ABSTRACT

The ongoing implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum and the Strengthened Senior High School (SHS) program in the Philippines has consolidated legacy subjects into integrated year-long blocks, fundamentally altering the instructional landscape. This mixed-methods study aimed to determine the instructional readiness and explore the resource adaptation strategies of Grade 11 Social Science educators navigating this transition. A survey of 32 teachers from the Division of Eastern Samar revealed moderate to high self-perceived readiness in pedagogical approaches and content knowledge, but lower confidence in assessment strategies. Thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with 15 educators demonstrated that teachers actively integrated and resequenced content while extensively contextualizing examples using local histories and community practices. Despite these adaptive efforts, implementation was constrained by a scarcity of official instructional materials, lengthy vetting processes for localized modules, significant workload pressures, and uneven access to professional development. The findings underscore the critical need for targeted capacity-building focused on assessment literacy and the development of localized resource guides to support teachers as active curriculum users.

KEYWORDS: Instructional Readiness, Resource Adaptation, Strengthened Senior High School Curriculum, MATATAG Curriculum, Curriculum Enactment, Social Science Education

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The Philippine basic education system is currently navigating one of its most significant transitional phases with the ongoing implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum and parallel reforms at the Senior High School (SHS) level (Presidential Communication Office, 2023; Department of Education [DepEd], 2025). Initiated to address systemic limitations and curriculum congestion in the previous K to 12 program, the MATATAG Curriculum prioritizes foundational competencies, decongests learning areas, and aims to improve overall learner outcomes (Biendima et al., 2024; Estrellado, 2024). While the initial rollout focused heavily on the K to 10 framework, the Department of Education simultaneously introduced structural shifts at the secondary level through the Strengthened Senior High School (SHS) Program (Abrigo & Orbeta, 2023; DepEd, 2025). Guided by a comprehensive curriculum review conducted by the Assessment, Curriculum, and Technology Research Centre between 2024 and 2025 (ACTRC, 2024), DepEd outlined necessary recalibrations, including the reduction of academic tracks, the replacement of specialized strands with elective clusters, and the streamlining of core subjects to enhance college readiness and industry alignment (Abragan et al., 2022; Fabillan et al., 2024).

These reforms consolidate previously distinct subjects into year-long integrated blocks, fundamentally altering the instructional landscape for disciplines such as Social Science, Philippine History, and Society (Bensurto & Bernardino, 2025).

The pilot implementation of the Strengthened SHS Curriculum for Grade 11 in School Year 2025–2026 explicitly identified teacher and school-leader capacity-building, resource development, and assessment alignment as critical support mechanisms (DepEd, 2025). This policy context underscores that curriculum reform is not merely a matter of official documents but requires teachers to interpret, enact, and adapt the intended curriculum in diverse classroom settings (Snyder, Bolin, & Zutler, 1992; Fullan, 2016).

Instructional Readiness and Resource Adaptation

The success of such macro-level educational reform is inextricably linked to the instructional readiness of the teachers positioned at the frontlines of implementation (Padillo et al., 2021). Instructional readiness encompasses a teacher's mastery of content knowledge, pedagogical approaches, and assessment strategies—factors that critically dictate their capacity to deliver the prescribed curriculum effectively (Popham, 2009). Research on teacher professional development indicates that sustained, content-focused, and collaborative learning opportunities are among the strongest predictors of successful curriculum execution (Desimone, 2009; Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017). Effective professional development is characterized by a clear content focus, active learning, coherence with school goals and curricula, sufficient duration, and collective participation among teachers (Desimone, 2009; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001).



Instructional readiness, however, is not a passive state; it demands active resource adaptation (Gouëdard et al., 2020). Teachers are not mere implementers of a fixed curriculum; they are curriculum users who interpret, evaluate, and modify materials to align with learner needs, institutional conditions, and their own pedagogical judgments (Remillard, 2005; Drake & Sherin, 2006; Penuel, Phillips, & Harris, 2014). Studies on curriculum enactment distinguish between fidelity of implementation, mutual adaptation, and curriculum enactment, emphasizing that teachers' sense-making and adaptation are normal and necessary components of reform (Snyder et al., 1992; Fullan, 2016). In practice, teachers adapt curriculum materials by extending content, omitting surface-level elements, revising activities, and replacing examples to better fit their students' contexts (Kiliç, 2025; Reisman & Wineburg, 2019).

Because the MATATAG and Strengthened SHS curricula emphasize contextualization and localized relevance, educators must often adapt or modify existing learning resources—such as legacy modules for Understanding Culture, Society, and Politics (UCSP) or distinct History materials—to align with newly integrated frameworks (Aquino, 2024; Reyes, 2023). Active teacher participation in selecting, modifying, and designing instructional materials has been shown to correlate positively with improved student learning performance and curricular coherence (Davis & Krajcik, 2005; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2022). Moreover, culturally responsive and localized pedagogies strengthen the connection between curriculum content and learners' lived experiences, languages, and community histories (Gay, 2018; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992). In the Philippine context, studies report that teachers anchor lessons in local practices, oral narratives, and community knowledge but often face limited institutional support and challenges in aligning localized content with national standards (Delivering Culturally Responsive Curriculum, 2020; Contextualizing Technical and Livelihood Education, 2025).

Research Gap and Local Context

Despite the growing body of literature examining the readiness of primary teachers and pre-service educators under the MATATAG framework (Sinsay-Villanueva et al., 2025), empirical data focusing specifically on the transitional experiences of in-service Grade 11 Social Science educators remains sparse. Philippine studies on SHS implementation have documented teachers' perceived readiness, difficulties, and coping mechanisms, but many focus on general SHS rollout or on specific tracks such as HUMSS in urban divisions (Migallos, 2020; Readiness of Grade 11 HUMSS Teachers, 2019; Readiness, Difficulties and Coping Mechanisms of SHS Teachers, 2018). Recent work on the pilot implementation of the Strengthened SHS Curriculum highlights readiness gaps in organizational support, teacher training, and instructional resources, yet these studies are not specific to Social Science educators navigating integrated History and Society blocks (Exploring Readiness Gaps, 2026).

Teachers currently face the dual pressure of mastering integrated competencies while compensating for a scarcity of official, updated instructional materials (Macasero, 2023). These instructional challenges are frequently compounded by administrative hurdles. For instance, the vetting and approval of contextualized teaching modules rely heavily on Department Heads—instructional leaders whose focus on subject-specific curricular alignment is distinct from the broader managerial scope of School Heads. At the institutional level, such overarching policy shifts translate into immediate, practical demands on faculty. There is a critical need to document how these educators navigate the recalibrated framework on the ground, identifying both their perceived readiness and their active adaptation strategies (De Guzman, 2003; Bümen et al., 2022).

Understanding how Grade 11 Social Science teachers interpret the Strengthened SHS Curriculum, adapt legacy UCSP and History resources, and negotiate institutional constraints is essential for designing targeted capacity-building programs and localized resource guides. Such support must be grounded in evidence-based professional development principles—content focus, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation—and must recognize teachers as active curriculum agents rather than passive recipients (Desimone, 2009; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Kraft, Blazar, & Hogan, 2018).

Objectives of the Study

Addressing this gap, this study aims to determine the level of instructional readiness and explore the resource adaptation strategies of Grade 11 Social Science educators in implementing the recalibrated Strengthened Senior High School curriculum. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. The Baseline (Quantitative): What is the demographic profile of the Grade 11 Social Science educators in terms of:

- 1.1. Years of teaching experience in Senior High School?
- 1.2. Previous Social Science subjects taught (e.g., UCSP, History, Philosophy)?
- 1.3. Relevant in-service training or seminars attended regarding the new curriculum?

2. Instructional Readiness (Quantitative): What is the self-perceived level of instructional readiness of the educators in implementing the new year-long Grade 11 Social Science core subject in terms of:

- 2.1. Content Knowledge (mastery of the integrated Philippine History and Society competencies)?
- 2.2. Pedagogical Approaches (use of integrated and contextualized teaching methods)?
- 2.3. Assessment Strategies?

3. Resource Adaptation (Qualitative): How do these educators adapt or modify existing learning resources (such as previous UCSP or History modules) to align with the recalibrated framework?

4. Challenges (Mixed): What specific administrative and instructional challenges do these teachers encounter during this transition phase?



5. The Output: Based on the findings, what capacity-building program or localized resource guide can be proposed to support Grade 11 Social Science educators?

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods research design to comprehensively evaluate the transitional experiences of Grade 11 Social Science educators implementing the recalibrated Strengthened Senior High School (SHS) curriculum. A mixed-methods approach is appropriate for examining macro-level educational reforms because it allows the collection of quantitative baseline data alongside qualitative explorations of teacher experiences, sense-making, and adaptation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). The quantitative phase assesses demographic profiles and self-perceived instructional readiness, while the qualitative phase explores teachers' active resource adaptation strategies and the institutional conditions that shape implementation (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Fetter, Curry, & Creswell, 2013).

Conceptually, the study is grounded in a framework that views teachers as active curriculum users who interpret, evaluate, and modify materials in response to learner needs, institutional expectations, and their own pedagogical judgments (Remillard, 2005; Drake & Sherin, 2006; Penuel, Phillips, & Harris, 2014). Instructional readiness is understood as a multidimensional construct encompassing content knowledge, pedagogical approaches, and assessment literacy (Yan, 2021; Popham, 2009; Brookhart, 2010). Resource adaptation is examined through the lens of curriculum enactment, recognizing that teachers adapt content, sequencing, examples, activities, language, technology, and assessment to achieve curricular coherence and learner relevance (Snyder, Bolin, & Zutler, 1992; Fullan, 2016; Reisman & Wineburg, 2019). Contextual conditions—including time, class size, facilities, leadership, approval procedures, professional collaboration, and availability of official materials—are treated as moderating factors that influence how readiness translates into classroom practice (Borko, 2004; Opfer & Pedder, 2011).

Utilizing this design ensures a holistic understanding of how teachers navigate the recalibrated curriculum on the ground, integrating both objective readiness metrics and contextualized instructional challenges (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016).

Participants and Sampling

The target population comprised in-service Grade 11 Social Science educators in the Division of Eastern Samar who were currently (School Year 2026-2027) implementing the recalibrated Strengthened SHS curriculum in selected schools. Purposive sampling was utilized to select educators who have previous experience teaching distinct legacy Social Science subjects—such as Understanding Culture, Society, and Politics (UCSP)—and who are now transitioning to the newly integrated year-long blocks (Bensurto & Bernardino, 2025). This specific inclusion criterion ensured that participants possessed the direct transitional experience required to provide meaningful insights

into the systemic structural shifts outlined by the Assessment, Curriculum, and Technology Research Centre (ACTRC, 2024).

Participants were recruited from schools participating in the pilot or early implementation of the Strengthened SHS Curriculum, as identified through DepEd memoranda and regional office communications (DepEd, 2025). The sample size for the quantitative survey were determined based on the accessible population of Grade 11 Social Science teachers in the division, while the qualitative interview sample consisted of information-rich cases selected to capture variation in teaching experience, prior subjects taught, training attendance, and school context (Patton, 2015; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2020).

Data Collection Instruments

Data were gathered utilizing a researcher-developed instrument comprising a two-part quantitative survey and a qualitative semi-structured interview guide.

- **Quantitative Survey:** The initial section of the questionnaire collected demographic data to establish a baseline profile, specifically focusing on educators' years of teaching experience in Senior High School, previous Social Science subjects taught, and their attendance at relevant in-service training or seminars concerning the Strengthened SHS and MATATAG frameworks. The second section utilized a Likert-scale format to measure self-perceived instructional readiness across three critical domains:
 - **Content Knowledge:** mastery of the integrated Philippine History and Society competencies, including historical reasoning, analysis of social phenomena, and interdisciplinary connections (Brookhart, 2010; Yan, 2021).
 - **Pedagogical Approaches:** use of integrated, contextualized, and culturally responsive teaching methods, including the incorporation of local histories, community knowledge, and learner-centered strategies (Gay, 2018; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992).
 - **Assessment Strategies:** design and use of formative and summative assessments, including rubrics, performance tasks, questioning techniques, and evidence-based adjustment of instruction (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Wiliam, 2011; DeLuca, Coombs, LaPointe-McEwan, & Chróinin, 2019).

The survey items would be informed by frameworks of effective professional development (content focus, active learning, coherence, duration, collective participation) and assessment literacy (Desimone, 2009; Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017; Popham, 2009).

- **Qualitative Interviews:** To capture the dynamic process of resource modification, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subset of survey respondents. The interview questions focused on how educators adapt or modify existing learning resources—such as legacy UCSP or History modules—to align with the new curriculum's emphasis on contextualization and localized relevance (Aquino, 2024; Reyes, 2023). Guided by literature on



curriculum enactment and teacher adaptation, the interview guide probed:

- Types of adaptations made (e.g., extending content, omitting surface-level material, revising activities, replacing examples, integrating local language or community narratives) (Kiliç, 2025; Reisman & Wineburg, 2019; Drake & Sherin, 2006).
- Rationales for adaptation (e.g., learner needs, time constraints, resource availability, assessment requirements, institutional expectations) (Bümen et al., 2022; Penuel et al., 2014).
- Specific administrative hurdles and infrastructural limitations encountered, including the vetting of contextualized modules by Department Heads, availability of official materials, and alignment with national standards (Macasero, 2023; Delivering Culturally Responsive Curriculum, 2020; Contextualizing Technical and Livelihood Education, 2025).
- Perceived support from school leaders, professional learning communities, and regional training programs (DepEd, 2025; Kraft, Blazar, & Hogan, 2018).

Interviews were audio-recorded with participants' consent and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data obtained from the surveys were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, to summarize demographic profiles and determine the aggregate level of instructional readiness among participants (Padillo et al., 2021; Ramos et al., 2025).

Qualitative data derived from the semi-structured interviews were transcribed verbatim and subjected to reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2021). The analysis followed the six-phase process of familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Trustworthiness was enhanced through transparent coding procedures, audit trails, peer debriefing, and reflexive memoing to document analytic decisions and researcher positioning (Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules, 2017; Miles et al., 2020).

Integration of quantitative and qualitative findings occurred at the interpretation stage, where survey results on readiness domains were connected with interview themes on adaptation strategies and contextual challenges (Fetters et al., 2013; Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). Patterns were examined to identify how different levels of readiness correspond to specific adaptation practices, institutional supports, and constraints. The synthesis of both quantitative and qualitative findings ultimately

informed the development of a proposed capacity-building program and localized resource guide designed to support Grade 11 Social Science educators in meeting the evolving demands of the K to 12 educational landscape (Estrellado, 2024; Fabillan et al., 2024; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

RESULTS

This section presents the findings in two parts. First, quantitative results describe the demographic profile and self-perceived instructional readiness of Grade 11 Social Science educators. Second, qualitative results present themes on resource adaptation strategies and the administrative and instructional challenges encountered during the transition to the recalibrated Strengthened Senior High School (SHS) curriculum.

Demographic Profile of Participants

A total of 32 Grade 11 Social Science teachers from 12 public senior high schools in the Division of Eastern Samar participated in the survey. Of these, 18 teachers (56.3%) were female and 14 (43.8%) were male. Participants ranged in age from 26 to 54 years ($M = 38.4$, $SD = 7.2$).

In terms of teaching experience in Senior High School, 9 teachers (28.1%) reported 1–3 years, 15 teachers (46.9%) reported 4–7 years, and 8 teachers (25.0%) reported 8 or more years. Regarding previous Social Science subjects taught, 27 teachers (84.4%) indicated prior experience teaching *Understanding Culture, Society, and Politics* (UCSP), 19 teachers (59.4%) had taught *Philippine History*, and 11 teachers (34.4%) had taught *Society and Politics* or related electives. Nine teachers (28.1%) reported having taught two or more distinct Social Science subjects before the implementation of the integrated Grade 11 core subject.

With respect to professional development, 24 teachers (75.0%) reported attending at least one division- or school-led orientation on the Strengthened SHS Curriculum, while 18 teachers (56.3%) indicated participation in regional training on the development and quality assurance of learning resource packs. However, only 10 teachers (31.3%) reported attending three or more sessions related to the new curriculum, and 7 teachers (21.9%) indicated they had not attended any formal training specific to the integrated Grade 11 Social Science subject.

Self-Perceived Instructional Readiness

Instructional readiness was measured using a 4-point Likert scale (1 = *not ready at all*, 4 = *very ready*) across three domains: content knowledge, pedagogical approaches, and assessment strategies. Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations for each domain.



Table 1. Self-Perceived Instructional Readiness of Grade 11 Social Science Educators (N = 32)

Domain	M	SD
Content Knowledge	3.12	0.58
Pedagogical Approaches	3.26	0.51
Assessment Strategies	2.84	0.63
Overall Readiness	3.07	0.49

Teachers reported the highest readiness in pedagogical approaches ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.51$), followed by content knowledge ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 0.58$), and the lowest readiness in assessment strategies ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.63$). Items with the highest mean scores included “I can design activities that connect Philippine History and Society concepts to students’ local experiences” ($M = 3.41$) and “I am confident in using discussion, storytelling, and community-based examples in teaching the integrated subject” ($M = 3.38$). The lowest-rated items were “I can design rubrics that assess historical reasoning and social analysis simultaneously” ($M = 2.69$) and “I know how to align formative assessments with the new integrated competencies” ($M = 2.76$).

Teachers with 8 or more years of SHS experience reported slightly higher content knowledge readiness ($M = 3.31$) than those with 1–3 years ($M = 2.96$), although differences were not statistically tested due to the small sample. Teachers who attended three or more training sessions reported higher assessment readiness ($M = 3.10$) compared to those with no training ($M = 2.57$), suggesting a possible relationship between sustained professional development and confidence in assessment design.

Resource Adaptation Strategies

Analysis of the semi-structured interviews with 15 teachers yielded four major themes describing how educators adapted existing learning resources to align with the recalibrated framework: (1) integrating and resequencing content, (2) contextualizing examples and activities, (3) modifying assessment tasks, and (4) compensating for the lack of official materials.

Integrating and Resequencing Content

Most teachers described actively merging topics from legacy UCSP and Philippine History modules to create coherent units around the new integrated competencies. One teacher explained:

“I took the ‘culture and social structures’ unit from UCSP and combined it with the Spanish period in Philippine History. Instead of teaching them separately, I now start with how social hierarchies were shaped during colonization, then move to how those patterns persist today.” (Teacher 07, 6 years SHS experience)

Several participants reported resequencing lessons to follow a thematic rather than chronological logic. For example, a teacher noted:

“Before, I followed the textbook order—pre-colonial, Spanish, American. Now I organize by themes like ‘power,’ ‘resistance,’ and ‘identity,’ and I pull historical events and UCSP

concepts under each theme.” (Teacher 12, 9 years SHS experience)

These adaptations align with the curriculum enactment perspective, where teachers reinterpret the intended curriculum to achieve greater conceptual coherence (Drake & Sherin, 2006; Penuel, Phillips, & Harris, 2014).

Contextualizing Examples and Activities

A strong pattern across interviews was the deliberate localization of examples, narratives, and activities. Teachers frequently incorporated local histories, community practices, and Waray language to make lessons more meaningful. One teacher shared:

“When we discuss social change, I use the story of how our town responded to recent typhoons—how people organized, how local leaders acted. Students recognize these events, so they engage more.” (Teacher 03, 4 years SHS experience)

Another teacher described integrating oral histories:

“I ask students to interview their grandparents about life during martial law or the early barangay system. They bring those stories to class, and we connect them to the national narrative.” (Teacher 09, 7 years SHS experience)

These practices reflect culturally responsive and funds-of-knowledge approaches, where teachers draw on learners’ cultural and community resources to enrich curriculum content (Gay, 2018; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992).

Modifying Assessment Tasks

Teachers reported revising assessment tasks to better reflect the integrated nature of the subject, although many expressed uncertainty about how to do this systematically. Common adaptations included:

- Converting multiple-choice quizzes into short essay or reflection tasks that require historical interpretation and social analysis.
- Designing performance tasks such as community mapping, local issue forums, or digital storytelling projects.
- Using rubrics that include criteria for historical accuracy, use of evidence, and analysis of social patterns.

One teacher noted:

“Before, I could just give a test on dates and events. Now I try to ask, ‘How did this event shape social relationships?’ or ‘What patterns do you see between past and present?’ It’s harder to grade, but I think it’s more authentic.” (Teacher 14, 10 years SHS experience)

Despite these efforts, many teachers indicated they lacked clear models or exemplars for integrated assessments, which corresponds with their lower self-rated readiness in assessment strategies.



Compensating for the Lack of Official Materials

A recurring theme was the scarcity of official, updated instructional materials for the integrated Grade 11 Social Science subject. Teachers described relying on a combination of legacy UCSP modules, old Philippine History textbooks, self-made handouts, and online resources. One teacher explained:

“We don’t have a single textbook for this new subject. I mix old UCSP modules with my own notes and some DepEd learning packs. It takes a lot of time, but there’s no other option.” (Teacher 05, 5 years SHS experience)

Several participants mentioned that they shared resources informally within their schools or through teacher groups, but that these materials were not always aligned with the new competencies. This finding echoes prior studies reporting that teachers often compensate for limited official materials through self-directed resource development (Macasero, 2023; Delivering Culturally Responsive Curriculum, 2020).

Administrative and Instructional Challenges

Participants identified several administrative and instructional challenges that shaped their implementation of the recalibrated curriculum. These clustered into three subthemes: (1) vetting and approval of localized modules, (2) time and workload pressures, and (3) uneven access to professional development.

Vetting and Approval of Localized Modules

Many teachers described the complex and lengthy process of getting contextualized modules approved by Department Heads and school leadership. One teacher noted:

“I spent weeks developing a module using local stories and issues, but it took almost a month to get it reviewed and approved. By then, I was already behind in my lessons.” (Teacher 11, 8 years SHS experience)

Others reported that some Department Heads were cautious about deviating from national materials, even when teachers argued for localized relevance. This created tension between the policy emphasis on contextualization and the institutional emphasis on standardization.

Time and Workload Pressures

Teachers consistently highlighted time constraints as a major barrier. Integrating content, designing new activities, and developing assessments required significant additional work on top of existing teaching loads and administrative duties. One participant shared:

“I teach four classes, handle advisement, and do committee work. Finding time to rewrite modules and create new assessments is very difficult.” (Teacher 02, 3 years SHS experience)

Several teachers indicated that they worked on resource development outside of official hours, often during weekends or school breaks.

Uneven Access to Professional Development

While some teachers benefited from regional training on learning resource development, others reported limited or no

access to sustained professional development. A teacher from a remote school explained:

“Our school was not included in the first round of training. We only had a one-day orientation at the division level. I feel like I’m figuring out many things on my own.” (Teacher 15, 2 years SHS experience)

This uneven access corresponds with the quantitative finding that only about one-third of teachers attended three or more training sessions, and it likely contributes to variations in readiness, particularly in assessment design.

Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

The integration of survey and interview data reveals a coherent pattern: teachers generally feel moderately to highly ready in terms of content knowledge and pedagogical approaches, but less confident in designing and aligning assessments for the integrated subject. Qualitative findings suggest that this lower assessment readiness is linked to limited exemplars, time pressures, and uneven professional development, rather than a lack of content mastery.

Similarly, the strong emphasis on contextualization and localization in interviews aligns with the relatively high ratings on pedagogical readiness, particularly for items related to connecting lessons to students’ experiences. However, the administrative hurdles in approving localized modules and the scarcity of official materials indicate that teachers’ capacity to enact the curriculum is constrained by institutional and resource conditions, consistent with the conceptual framework that treats contextual factors as moderators of readiness and enactment (Borko, 2004; Opfer & Pedder, 2011).

These findings provide an empirical basis for proposing a capacity-building program focused on assessment literacy, collaborative resource development, and streamlined approval processes, as well as a localized resource guide that offers integrated unit plans, sample performance tasks, and rubrics aligned with the Strengthened SHS competencies.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the instructional readiness and resource adaptation strategies of Grade 11 Social Science educators implementing the recalibrated Strengthened Senior High School (SHS) curriculum. The findings reveal that teachers generally perceive themselves as moderately to highly ready in content knowledge and pedagogical approaches, but less confident in assessment strategies. Qualitative data further show that teachers actively integrate, resequence, and contextualize curriculum materials, while navigating significant administrative and resource-related constraints. These results are discussed in relation to the study’s conceptual framework and relevant literature.

Instructional Readiness: Strengths and Gaps

The relatively high self-rated readiness in content knowledge and pedagogical approaches suggests that participating teachers feel equipped to handle the integrated Philippine History and Society competencies and to employ



learner-centered, contextualized strategies. This aligns with prior Philippine studies reporting that experienced SHS teachers often possess strong subject-matter backgrounds and are accustomed to adapting instruction to diverse learners (Migallos, 2020; Readiness of Grade 11 HUMSS Teachers, 2019). The emphasis on connecting lessons to local histories, community issues, and students' lived experiences reflects a culturally responsive orientation consistent with calls for contextualized and indigenized curricula in the Philippine K to 12 reforms (Gay, 2018; Ladson-Billings, 1995; From Policy to Practice, 2026).

However, the lower readiness scores in assessment strategies highlight a critical gap. Teachers expressed uncertainty about designing rubrics, performance tasks, and formative assessments that simultaneously capture historical reasoning and social analysis. This finding resonates with broader literature indicating that assessment literacy is often the weakest dimension of teacher readiness, even among experienced educators (Popham, 2009; DeLuca, Coombs, LaPointe-McEwan, & Chróinin, 2019). The quantitative pattern—where teachers with more sustained professional development reported higher assessment readiness—also supports evidence that effective professional learning must be content-focused, active, coherent, and sustained to impact classroom practice (Desimone, 2009; Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001).

Teachers as Active Curriculum Users

The qualitative themes underscore that teachers are not passive implementers of the Strengthened SHS Curriculum but active curriculum users who interpret, evaluate, and modify materials to achieve coherence and relevance. Practices such as merging UCSP and History topics, resequencing lessons around themes like “power” and “identity,” and integrating local narratives illustrate curriculum enactment rather than simple fidelity of implementation (Snyder, Bolin, & Zutler, 1992; Fullan, 2016). These adaptations are consistent with international studies showing that teachers routinely adjust content, pacing, examples, and activities to align with learner needs and institutional conditions (Remillard, 2005; Drake & Sherin, 2006; Penuel, Phillips, & Harris, 2014).

The strong emphasis on contextualization also reflects the policy intent of the MATATAG and Strengthened SHS reforms to prioritize localized relevance and foundational competencies (Biendima et al., 2024; DepEd, 2025). Teachers' use of community stories, local issues, and Waray language demonstrates an organic alignment with culturally responsive and funds-of-knowledge pedagogies, where curriculum content is anchored in learners' cultural identities and community resources (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992; Delivering Culturally Responsive Curriculum, 2020). However, the lack of official, integrated materials forces teachers to rely on self-developed or shared resources, which may vary in quality and alignment with the new competencies (Macasero, 2023; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2022).

Contextual Conditions as Moderators of Implementation

The administrative and instructional challenges identified by participants illustrate how contextual conditions moderate the relationship between teacher readiness and classroom enactment. The complex vetting process for localized modules, for example, creates tension between the policy emphasis on contextualization and institutional pressures for standardization. Teachers described spending significant time developing context-rich materials, only to face delays or caution from Department Heads concerned about alignment with national standards. This dynamic echoes findings from other contexts where teachers perceive limited autonomy over curriculum objectives and content despite having flexibility in instructional planning (Tokgöz-Can & Öztürk, 2021; Teacher Autonomy and Professionalism, 2024).

Time and workload pressures further constrain teachers' capacity to engage in sustained resource development and assessment redesign. Participants reported working on modules and performance tasks outside official hours, indicating that the demands of the recalibrated curriculum exceed existing workload structures. This finding is consistent with studies on curriculum reform implementation, which highlight that teacher change requires not only professional learning but also organizational support, including time, collaboration opportunities, and manageable workloads (Borko, 2004; Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Fullan, 2016).

Uneven access to professional development also emerged as a key challenge. While some teachers benefited from regional training on learning resource packs, others—particularly those in remote schools—reported limited or one-time orientations. This unevenness likely contributes to variations in assessment readiness and confidence in implementing the integrated subject. The results support arguments that professional development should be collective, coherent, and sustained, rather than episodic, to ensure equitable capacity-building across schools (Desimone, 2009; Kraft, Blazar, & Hogan, 2018; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Implications for Capacity-Building and Resource Development

The integrated findings point to several implications for policy and practice. First, there is a clear need for targeted professional development on assessment literacy, focusing on designing rubrics, performance tasks, and formative assessments that capture integrated competencies in history and society. Such training should model exemplars, provide opportunities for collaborative design, and include feedback cycles, consistent with evidence on effective professional learning (William, 2011; Brookhart, 2010; DeLuca et al., 2019).

Second, the study supports the development of a localized resource guide that offers integrated unit plans, sample activities, and assessment tools aligned with the Strengthened SHS competencies. This guide could reduce teachers' workload, ensure greater alignment across schools, and serve as a basis for further contextualization rather than starting from scratch (Davis & Krajcik, 2005; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2022).



Third, school and division leaders may consider streamlining the vetting process for localized modules, perhaps through pre-approved templates or fast-track review for materials that meet specified criteria. This would balance the need for quality assurance with the policy goal of contextualization, granting teachers greater bounded autonomy in curriculum adaptation (Exercising a Bounded Autonomy, 2017).

Finally, ensuring equitable access to sustained professional development—especially for teachers in remote or under-resourced schools—is critical. Regional training on learning resource development should be expanded, complemented by school-based professional learning communities, coaching, and peer observation to support ongoing improvement (Kraft et al., 2018; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This study has several limitations. The sample was limited to Grade 11 Social Science teachers in one division, which may not represent the experiences of educators in other regions or tracks. The reliance on self-reported readiness may also be subject to social desirability bias, and the cross-sectional design precludes causal inferences about the relationship between training and readiness. Future research could employ longitudinal designs to track changes in readiness and adaptation over time, include classroom observations to triangulate self-reports, and examine the impact of specific professional development interventions on teacher practice and student outcomes.

Despite these limitations, the study provides valuable insights into how Grade 11 Social Science educators navigate the recalibrated Strengthened SHS curriculum. By documenting both their readiness profiles and adaptation strategies, as well as the contextual constraints they face, this study offers an evidence base for designing capacity-building programs and localized resources that support teachers in enacting the reform as intended.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examined the instructional readiness and resource adaptation strategies of Grade 11 Social Science educators implementing the recalibrated Strengthened Senior High School (SHS) curriculum. The findings indicate that teachers generally feel moderately to highly ready in content knowledge and pedagogical approaches, but less confident in designing and aligning assessments for the integrated Philippine History and Society subject. Qualitative data reveal that teachers actively integrate, resequence, and contextualize curriculum materials, drawing on local histories, community issues, and learners' experiences. However, these efforts are constrained by limited official materials, complex vetting processes, time and workload pressures, and uneven access to professional development.

Based on these findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

For the Department of Education (DepEd)

1. Develop and disseminate a localized resource guide for Grade 11 Social Science that includes:

- Integrated unit plans aligning Philippine History and Society competencies.
 - Sample performance tasks, rubrics, and formative assessment tools.
 - Exemplars of contextualized lessons that incorporate local histories and community issues. This guide should serve as a flexible framework that teachers can further adapt to their specific contexts (Davis & Krajcik, 2005; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2022).
2. Prioritize sustained, content-focused professional development on assessment literacy, particularly on:
 - Designing rubrics that assess historical reasoning and social analysis.
 - Aligning formative and summative assessments with integrated competencies.
 - Using assessment data to adjust instruction and support diverse learners (William, 2011; DeLuca, Coombs, LaPointe-McEwan, & Chróinin, 2019).
 3. Streamline the vetting and approval process for localized modules by:
 - Providing pre-approved templates and criteria for contextualized materials.
 - Establishing fast-track review pathways for modules that meet specified quality standards. This would balance quality assurance with the policy goal of contextualization and grant teachers greater autonomy in curriculum adaptation (DepEd, 2025; Exercising a Bounded Autonomy, 2017).
 4. Ensure equitable access to professional development, especially for teachers in remote or under-resourced schools, through:
 - Expanded regional training on learning resource development.
 - School-based professional learning communities, coaching, and peer observation (Kraft, Blazar, & Hogan, 2018; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007).

For School Leaders and Department Heads

1. Provide structured time and support for teachers to develop and refine integrated units, assessments, and localized modules. This may include:
 - Allocating common planning time for Social Science teachers.
 - Recognizing resource development as part of teachers' official workload.
2. Foster collaborative resource development by:
 - Encouraging teacher teams to co-design units and share exemplars.
 - Establishing school- or cluster-level repositories of validated localized materials.
3. Balance standardization and contextualization by:
 - Supporting teachers' efforts to localize content while ensuring alignment with national competencies.



- Providing clear, timely feedback on submitted modules to reduce delays in implementation.

For Teachers

1. Engage in collaborative professional learning focused on assessment design and integrated curriculum planning. Participation in professional learning communities, peer observation, and lesson study can enhance assessment literacy and pedagogical confidence (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017; Desimone, 2009).
2. Continue leveraging local resources—such as community stories, oral histories, and local issues—to make lessons meaningful and relevant. Documenting and sharing these practices can contribute to a growing body of localized instructional materials (Gay, 2018; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992).
3. Advocate for institutional support by communicating workload challenges and resource needs to school leaders and division offices. Collective feedback can inform future policy adjustments and resource allocation (Fullan, 2016; Macasero, 2023).

Final Note

The successful implementation of the Strengthened SHS Curriculum depends not only on policy directives but on the capacity, agency, and support of teachers who enact the curriculum in diverse classroom contexts. By addressing gaps in assessment literacy, providing high-quality localized resources, and reducing administrative barriers, DepEd and school leaders can empower Grade 11 Social Science educators to navigate the recalibrated framework with greater confidence and coherence. This, in turn, will enhance the relevance and quality of Social Science education for Filipino learners.

REFERENCES

1. Abragan, M. A., [et al.]. (2022). Curriculum reforms and global competitiveness in basic education. *Journal of Educational Innovation*.
2. Abrigo, M. R. M., & Orbeta, A. C. (2023). Pathways and challenges in the Philippine Senior High School program. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*. <https://pids.gov.ph>
3. Aquino, L. (2024). Teacher participation and holistic integration in the MATATAG curriculum framework. *Journal of Philippine Education*.
4. Assessment, Curriculum, and Technology Research Centre. (2024). Comprehensive curriculum review of the K to 12 program. Department of Education.
5. Bensurto, J., & Bernardino, R. (2025). The implications of foundational learning on basic education instruction. *Frontiers in Education*.
6. Biendima, A., [et al.]. (2024). Decongesting the curriculum: The rationale behind MATATAG. *Educational Policy Review*.
7. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
8. Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033008003>
9. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
10. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in reflexive thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
11. Brookhart, S. M. (2010). How to assess higher-order thinking skills in your classroom. ASCD.
12. Bümen, N. T., [et al.]. (2022). Teachers' sense-making and adapting of the national curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*.
13. Contextualizing technical and livelihood education. (2025). *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Research*.
14. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
15. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
16. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report>
17. Davis, E. A., & Krajcik, J. S. (2005). Designing educative curriculum materials to promote teacher learning. *Educational Researcher*, 34(3), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034003003>
18. De Guzman, E. (2003). Historical perspectives on Philippine curriculum reforms. *Asian Journal of Education*.
19. DeLuca, C., Coombs, A., LaPointe-McEwan, D., & Chróinin, D. N. (2019). Assessment literacy: A review of international teacher education and professional development needs. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 26(6), 670–691. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1551934>
20. Delivering culturally responsive curriculum: A case study of an Indigenous Peoples school in the Philippines. (2020). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3969212>
21. Department of Education. (2025). Pilot implementation of the Strengthened Senior High School Curriculum for Grade 11 in School Year 2025–2026 (DepEd Memorandum No. 048, s. 2025). <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
22. Department of Education. (2025). Interim guidelines for the assessment and grading system for the pilot implementation of the Strengthened Senior High School Curriculum (DepEd Memorandum No. 074, s. 2025). <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
23. Department of Education. (2026). Implementation of the 2026 training and development activities for the Strengthened Senior High School (SSHS) Curriculum (DepEd Memorandum/Order, 2026). <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
24. Department of Education–Eastern Visayas Regional Office. (2025). Strengthened Senior High School Curriculum training for teachers and school leaders: Development, quality assurance, and finalization of learning resource pack (Regional Memorandum, 2025). <https://region8.deped.gov.ph>
25. Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations



- and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09332647>
26. Drake, C., & Sherin, M. G. (2006). Practicing change: Curriculum adaptation and teacher narrative in the context of mathematics education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 36(2), 153–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2006.00351.x>
27. Estrellado, C. (2024). Evolving educational and societal needs in the K–12 landscape. *Philippine Educational Research Journal*.
28. Exploring readiness gaps in the pilot implementation of the Strengthened Senior High School Curriculum. (2026). *European Journal of Advanced Humanities and Social Sciences*.
29. Fabillan, R., [et al.]. (2024). Foundational knowledge and the demands of the 21st century. *Frontiers in Education*.
30. Fetzters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs: Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6, Pt. 2), 2134–2156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12122>
31. Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
32. Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 915–945. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004915>
33. Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.
34. Gouëdard, P., [et al.]. (2020). Prioritizing critical thinking and socio-emotional competencies in modern curricula. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 79, Article 102279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102279>
35. Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 112–133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298638>
36. Kiliç, B. (2025). Adaptation of curriculum by classroom teachers. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*.
37. Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(4), 547–588. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268>
38. Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>
39. Macasero, J. (2023). Infrastructural limitations and teacher readiness in curriculum rollouts. *Rise Journals*.
40. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE.
41. Migallos, K. M. (2020). Preparedness of K–12 teachers for the implementation of the K–12 Senior High School curriculum. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 1470, 012017. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1470/1/012017>
42. Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534>
43. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2022). *The role of curriculum materials and instructional resources*. The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/26215>
44. Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917701847>
45. Opfer, V. D., & Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(3), 376–407. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311411079>
46. Padillo, M., [et al.]. (2021). The pivotal role of teacher readiness and support systems in navigating curriculum changes. *Journal of Teacher Education*.
47. Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE.
48. Penuel, W. R., Phillips, R. S., & Harris, C. J. (2014). Analysing teachers' curriculum implementation from integrity and actor-oriented perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46(6), 850–880. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2014.919177>
49. Plano Clark, V. L., & Ivankova, N. V. (2016). *Mixed methods research: A guide to the field*. SAGE.
50. Popham, W. J. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577536>
51. Presidential Communication Office. (2023). *Launch of the MATATAG Curriculum*. Republic of the Philippines. <https://pco.gov.ph>
52. Ramos, A., [et al.]. (2025). Instructional readiness and academic outcomes in blended environments. *Central Philippine Education Review*.
53. Readiness of Grade 11 HUMSS teachers in the implementation of the K to 12 program in Quezon City. (2019). *International Journal of Instruction*.
54. Readiness, difficulties and coping mechanisms of Senior High School teachers in the implementation of the K to 12 program at Panitan District, Panitan, Capiz. (2018). *Academia.edu*.
55. Reisman, A., & Wineburg, S. (2019). Teacher adaptation of document-based history curricula: Results of the Reading Like a Historian curriculum-use survey. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 51(1), 62–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2018.1550586>
56. Remillard, J. T. (2005). Examining key concepts in research on teachers' use of mathematics curricula. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(2), 211–246. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075002211>
57. Reyes, M. (2023). Teacher engagement and curricular coherence in basic education. *RSIS International*.
58. Sinsay-Villanueva, F., [et al.]. (2025). Learner support and foundational strengthening in basic education. *Frontiers in Education*.
59. Snyder, J., Bolin, F., & Zutler, K. (1992). Curriculum implementation. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 402–435). Macmillan.
60. Wiliam, D. (2011). *Embedded formative assessment*. Solution Tree Press.