



INTEGRATED BASIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (IBED): ITS STATUS, IMPLEMENTATION AND TEACHER'S CHALLENGES IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Flores, Phyll Jann J.

Researcher

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra31912>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra31912

ABSTRACT

The study examined the status and extent of Integrated Basic Education Department (IBED) implementation and the challenges experienced by teachers at a private school. Using a descriptive-correlational design, the study involved 42 purposively selected teachers: 17 from elementary and 25 from junior high school. Data were collected through an expert-reviewed, adapted questionnaire and analyzed using means, standard deviations, and Spearman's rank-order correlation. Findings indicated that IBED status was highly evident and implementation occurred to a very great extent across curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Teachers rated curriculum and instruction, instructional resources, and instructional workload as challenging. The relationship between implementation and teachers' challenges was weak and not statistically significant ($p = .199$, $p = .206$), so the null hypothesis was not rejected. The findings supported a proposed policy intervention emphasizing collaborative curriculum planning, workload review, instructional resource inventory, and continued monitoring. The study provides evidence to guide school-level support and improvement.

KEY WORDS: Curriculum Implementation, Descriptive-Correlational Design, Integrated Basic Education Department, Private Schools, Teacher Challenges

INTRODUCTION

Integrated basic education department has increasingly been discussed in relation to the need for greater coherence across educational stages, particularly in curriculum design, instructional practice, assessment and school governance. Rather than viewing elementary, junior high school, and senior high school as isolated units, an integrated structure emphasizes continuity in learners' educational experiences, and assessment. Research on curriculum coherence likewise emphasizes that meaningful alignment involves more than matching content; it requires connected goals, instructional practices, learning experiences, and assessment across the curriculum (McPhail, 2021; Rata, 2021). The OECD (2023) likewise identifies organizational responsiveness, collaboration, and coherent policy implementation as an important consideration in strengthening education systems. In the Philippines, K to 12 reforms established a more extended and articulated basic education system, with DepEd subsequently integrating and reviewing policies governing curriculum implementation through DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019. Recently, the MATATAG Curriculum has explicitly organized Kindergarten to Grade 10 into three key stages while maintaining a separate policy framework for Grades 11 and 12. These developments illustrate that continuity across educational levels is an established concern in the Philippine basic education, but the existence of a national curriculum framework does not by itself establish how consistently integration is realized within an individual school. For private schools in particular, DepEd's Public and Private Basic Education Complementarity Framework recognizes the complementary responsibilities of public and private providers in delivering basic education. Thus, examining the status and extent of implementation of an Integrated Basic Education Department (IBED), particularly in

terms of curriculum, instruction, and assessment is warranted to determine how an integrated institutional structure is actually operationalized at the school level.

Teachers occupy a central position in translating an integrated educational structure from organizational policy into classroom practice, making their experiences an important dimension of implementation. Curriculum implementation requires teachers to interpret, adapt, and enact prescribed curricula while maintaining alignment among learning outcomes, teaching processes, and assessment. Karabacak and Yapicioğlu (2022) found that teachers were able to establish alignment between official and taught curricula in some areas, but alignment was less complete in teaching-learning processes and evaluation; in adequate materials, technology, and other contextual conditions were among the factors associated with these difficulties. Similar concerns are reflected in studies of curriculum implementation fidelity where teachers may adapt prescribed curricula while negotiating the demands of classroom realities and available resources (Onurkan-Aliusta & Özder, 2022). Teachers' challenges also extend beyond curriculum and instruction to the availability of instructional resources and the time required for preparation, assessment, documentation, and other professional responsibilities. UNESCO (2023) reports that inadequate digital infrastructure and limited access to devices can constrain teachers' ability to integrate technology into teaching and learning. The OECD's TALIS evidence further shows that teachers devote substantial time to lesson preparation, marking, administrative work, and collaboration, with work load and time pressure recognized as important sources of occupational stress (OECD, 2020). Palestina et al. (2020) presents a comparable concern on examining curriculum implementation in the Philippine educational context, identified facilitating and hindering



conditions across different levels of the educational environment, with teachers and school administrators reporting challenges associated with curriculum implementation. Recent studies likewise documented concerns involving workload, instructional management, ancillary responsibilities, and time constraints among teachers (Battad, 2024; Faisal & Hussien, 2023; Magtalas & Eduvala, 2025). These findings suggest that teachers' challenges in an integrated setting should not be reduced to workload alone; they encompass the practical demands of maintaining curriculum and instructional coherence, securing appropriate resources, and managing the range of responsibilities required to implement educational programs.

The study on curriculum reform and implementation provides a basis for examining IBED implementation and teachers' challenges together, particularly through the dimensions specified in the present study. The extent of IBED implementation is considered in terms of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, while teachers' challenges are examined through curriculum and instruction, instructional resources, and instructional workload. The study on curriculum coherence indicates that alignment among curriculum goals, content, instruction, and assessment is central to creating continuity in learners' educational experiences (McPhail, 2021; Rata, 2021). Moreover, a study on curriculum implementation shows that the translation of intended reforms into enacted practice depends partly on teachers' capacities, contextual conditions, resources, and opportunities for professional collaboration (Karacabak & Yapicioğlu, 2022; Onurkan-Aliusta & Özder, 2022). The OECD also reports that teachers' workload extends beyond classroom teaching to planning, assessment, administrative responsibilities, and collaboration, making the organization of teachers' time an important consideration in implementing school-level reforms (OECD, 2020, 2024). In the Philippines, a similar study shows that curriculum implementation is shaped by interacting school and system conditions, while teachers may experience challenges related to instructional management, workload, and other responsibilities (Palestina et al., 2020; Faisal & Hussien, 2023). These findings do not establish that the extent of IBED implementation causes teachers' challenges, rather, they indicate that implementation conditions and teacher experiences have been examined alongside one another in broader educational reforms. This provides a scholarly basis for investigating whether the extent of IBED implementation is significantly related to teachers' challenges in a private school setting without presuming the direction or nature of such relationship.

Within this broader educational context, ICAS de Calarian provides an appropriate organizational setting for examining how an integrated basic education structure is experienced and implemented within a private school environment. The school's context is particularly relevant because an institution serving learners across different educational levels must translate national curriculum expectations and institutional policies into coordinated practices involving curriculum delivery, instruction, assessment, resources, and teacher responsibilities. Philippine policy recognizes the participation of private schools in the provision of basic education and places their operations within

the broader national basic education framework. Moreover, the implementation of a curriculum across educational stages involves practical questions concerning the consistency of curriculum expectations, coordination of instruction, assessment practices, availability of resources, and distribution of teachers' responsibilities. The present study does not presume that these conditions constitute established problems at ICAS de Calarian, rather, the current status needs to be documented empirically. Examining the school therefore provides an opportunity to determine how IBED is currently organized and implemented, how teachers experience its instructional and organizational demands, and whether areas requiring institutional attention can be identified from evidence gathered from the school's teachers. Such context-specific evidence is particularly useful for a private school because organizational arrangements, available resources, and implementation practices may differ across institutions even when they operate under the same national educational framework.

Although existing studies provide a substantial discussion of curriculum coherence, curriculum implementation, educational reform, instructional practice, teacher workload, and resource constraints, the studies reviewed provide comparatively limited evidence specifically in examining Integrated Basic Education Department (IBED) as an institutional structure in private schools. Existing studies have addressed curriculum alignment and implementation, but they have generally focused on particular subjects, reforms, teacher practices, or broader educational systems rather than examining IBED through the combined dimensions of curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Karacabak & Yapicioğlu, 2022; Palestina et al., 2020). Similarly, research on teachers' challenges has documented workload, instructional management, resources and other professional demands, yet less attention has been given to these concerns specifically within an integrated basic education structure and in relation to the extent to which that structure is implemented. Furthermore, the studies reviewed also suggest a contextual gap concerning private schools in the Philippines, where school-level evidence on IBED implementation and teachers' challenges remains limited. Accordingly, the present study seeks to address this gap by determining the status of IBED, examining its extent of implementation in terms of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, identifying teachers' challenges in curriculum and instruction, instructional resources, and instructional workload, and determining whether a significant relationship exists between the extent of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges. Based on the findings, the study will also provide an empirical basis for proposing a policy intervention appropriate to the school's context. In this manner, the study can contribute both to the limited empirical literature on IBED in private school settings and to evidence-based institutional decision-making concerning its continued implementation.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study aims to assess the status and extent of Integrated Basic Education Department (IBED) implementation in private schools and identify the challenges teachers encounter. It also seeks to determine whether a significant relationship exists



between the extent of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the status of IBED in the private school in terms of:
 - 1.1 Curriculum;
 - 1.2 Instruction; and
 - 1.3 Assessment?
2. What is the extent of IBED implementation in terms of:
 - 2.1 Curriculum;
 - 2.2 Instruction; and
 - 2.3 Assessment?
3. What are the challenges encountered by the teachers in the implementation of IBED in terms of:
 - 3.1 Curriculum and Instruction;
 - 3.2 Instructional Resources; and
 - 3.3 Instructional Workload?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of implementation and teachers' challenges?
5. Based on the findings of the study, what policy intervention can be proposed?

SCOPE AND DELIMITATION

This study focuses on the status, extent of implementation and teachers' challenges on IBED. It specifically examines the extent of implementation in terms of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, as well as the challenges encountered by teachers in terms of curriculum and instruction, instructional resources, and instructional workload. It also determines whether there is a significant relationship between the extent of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges. The study will be conducted at Immaculate Concepcion Archdiocesan School de Calarian, involving teachers of IBED. The respondents will be selected using purposive sampling, based on their direct involvement and relevant experience in the implementation of IBED.

The study will cover the School Year 2026 – 2027, focusing on the status, extent of implementation in terms of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and the teachers challenges in terms of curriculum and instruction, instructional resources, and instructional workload. However, the study will not include other private schools, students, parents, school administrators, non-teaching personnel, or other stakeholders as respondents. It will also not cover the student academic achievement, student satisfaction, parent satisfaction, school financial performance, or the overall effectiveness of the school. The study is further limited to the identified dimensions of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges and does not evaluate IBED implementation across different schools, regions, or educational systems.

The proposed policy intervention will be limited to a recommendation based on the findings and will not include its actual implementation or evaluation. Moreover, although the study will examine the significant relationship between the extent of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges, it will not establish or claim causal relationship between the variables. By setting these boundaries, the study ensures that the research remains feasible, focused, and appropriate to the context of

ICAS de Calarian, while providing insights into the status and implementation of IBED and the challenges experienced by teachers in carrying out their IBED-related responsibilities.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study examines the status, implementation, and teachers' challenges in IBED in private schools. The findings may provide relevant information that can guide improvements in the implementation and management of IBED and support the delivery of basic education. Specifically, the study may benefit the following:

ICAS de Calarian. The findings provide the institution with evidence that can be used to strengthen curriculum, assessment, resource allocation, and overall IBED practices. The study also helps the institution prioritize areas that require improvement based on the actual conditions identified.

School Administrators. The findings of the study provide administrators specifically the school director and school principal, with evidence on the current status of IBED implementation and the challenges encountered by teachers. This helps them identify areas that needs improvement, strengthen existing practices, and develop appropriate policies, support mechanisms, and administrative measures.

Teachers. The study helps teachers identify the specific challenges they encounter in IBED implementation, particularly in curriculum and instruction, instructional resources, and instructional workload. The findings serve as a basis for providing appropriate resources, assistance, and support to improve the implementation of their instructional responsibilities.

Students. The study benefits learners through improvements in IBED practices resulting from the findings. Addressing identified implementation concerns and teacher challenges contribute to a more organized, consistent, and supportive learning experience.

Future Researchers. The study serves as a useful reference for researchers who intend to conduct related studies on IBED implementation, teacher challenges, of integrated basic education. It provides a basis for further investigation, comparison, or development of related research in other private school settings.

Policy Intervention. The findings serve as the basis for developing a policy intervention that directly addresses the identified concerns in IBED implementation and teachers' challenges. The proposed intervention may provide practical measures that the school can consider in strengthening its existing IBED practices and supporting teachers in its implementation.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study employed a **descriptive-correlational research design** to determine the status and extent of IBED implementation and the problems experienced by teachers. It also intended to find if there was a significant association



between the extent of IBED implementation and challenges of teachers. The results were used to recommend a policy intervention.

According to Adams and McGuire (2023), a descriptive-correlational research strategy is used to characterize current conditions and to explore correlations between variables without modifying them. The descriptive component describes the current state of the variables. The correlational component identifies if the variables are statistically correlated.

The research approach was appropriate as the study investigated the status and extent of IBED implementation and the obstacles faced by the teachers at ICAS de Calarian. The study described the implementation of IBED in terms of curriculum, instruction and assessment, identified the teachers' issues and explored if there was a significant relationship between the implementation and teachers' challenges without demonstrating causality.

Thus, the research design addressed the research topic by providing data on the level and extent of IBED implementation and the problems encountered by teachers. The descriptive component was used to answer the study questions related to these conditions, while the correlational component was used to assess whether or not there was a significant relationship between the extent of IBED implementation and the issues teachers faced. The results offered an empirical basis for proposing an adequate policy intervention.

Research Locale

This study was conducted at Immaculate Conception Archdiocesan School de Calarian, located in Upper Calarian, Zamboanga City, Philippines. The institution was originally established in 1993 as an expansion of Immaculate Conception Elementary School. Following a significant developments and improvements, particularly in its physical facilities and building structure, the institution was subsequently established as Immaculate Conception Archdiocesan School de Calarian.

The school is administered by a School Director and a School Principal, with the support of approximately 80 teaching and non-teaching personnel. The institution has 33 functional classrooms, 3 faculty rooms, 3 separate comfort rooms for male and female learners, a library, 2 computer laboratories, a parents' lounge, and a student center.

In support of the holistic development of its learners, ICAS de Calarian implements various programs, organizations, and learner-centered activities. These includes Student Government Club, Sports Club, Young Discoverer Society Club, The Veil Publication, ICASiklab, El Paloma Publication, Summer Enhancement Program, dental and medical services, and other learner-focused programs and interventions.

At present, the school serves a total population of 894 learners, consisting of 377 elementary pupils, 383 junior high school students, and 136 senior high school students.

Population and Sampling

The respondents of the study are the teachers from elementary and junior high school levels of ICAS de Calarian. They are considered appropriate respondents because they are directly involved in the implementation of IBED and have firsthand knowledge of its status, implementation, and the challenges encountered in carrying out its program and

processes. Although there are 45 teachers in the school, only those who are directly involved in IBED will be included as respondents.

The total teaching population of the school consists of 45 teachers. However, the study will focus only on the 42 teachers who are directly involved in IBED, consisting of 17 elementary teachers and 25 junior high school teachers. Thus, the target population and sample for the study will be 42 teachers.

The study will employ a purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling technique in which participants are deliberately selected based on predetermined characteristics or criteria relevant to the objectives of the study. This ensures that the data gathered are relevant to the research questions and sufficient for examining the relationship between the extent of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges.

Research Instrument

The study used an adapted questionnaire to assess the status and extent of Integrated Basic Education Department (IBED) implementation and the challenges encountered by teachers in private schools. Guided by the Statement of the Problem, it covered curriculum, instruction, and assessment for status and implementation, and curriculum and instruction, instructional resources, and instructional workload for teachers' challenges. The instrument drew on Palestina et al. (2020), who reported an overall Cronbach's alpha of .935 for their curriculum implementation questionnaire; Ramnarain (2016), whose adapted implementation scales reported alpha values ranging from .72 to .86; Akram et al. (2017), whose Instructional Leadership Questionnaire reported an overall alpha of .95; Yan and Pastore's (2022) Teacher Formative Assessment Practice Scale; and the Concerns about Inclusive Education Scale developed by Sharma and Desai, from which only the resource and workload concepts were relevant to this study. The items were rewritten and contextualized for IBED and private schools rather than copied verbatim. The questionnaire contained three parts: status of IBED, extent of implementation, and teachers' challenges, with 54 substantive Likert-type items. Status used a four-point scale from Very Highly Evident to Not Evident; implementation ranged from To a Very Great Extent to To No Extent; and challenges ranged from Extremely Challenging to Not Challenging.

Before administration, the questionnaire underwent expert review and content validation to assess the relevance, clarity, and alignment of the items with the study variables. The completed instrument provided quantitative data for describing IBED status, implementation, and teachers' challenges, examining the relationship between implementation and challenges, and developing a proposed policy intervention based on the findings.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data gathered through the researcher-adapted questionnaire were coded, organized, checked, and analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. The study involved 42 teachers directly engaged in the Integrated Basic Education Department (IBED), consisting of 17 elementary teachers and 25 junior high school teachers. Each questionnaire was checked for completeness, assigned a



respondent code, and encoded in a statistical program. Scores were computed for each dimension based on its ten items, followed by the computation of the overall IBED implementation and teachers' challenges scores.

For the first research question, which determined the status of IBED in terms of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, the **mean or weighted mean and standard deviation** were used to summarize the responses for each dimension and the overall status. For the second research question, which examined the extent of IBED implementation, the same descriptive statistics were used to determine the mean scores and variability for Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment. For the third research question, the mean or weighted mean and standard deviation were used to describe teachers' challenges in Curriculum and Instruction, Instructional Resources, and Instructional Workload. The resulting mean scores were interpreted using the established four-point scale and its corresponding verbal interpretations.

For the fourth research question, which examined the relationship between the overall extent of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges, **Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient (Spearman's rho)** was used because the composite scores did not satisfy the normality assumption, as indicated by the Shapiro-Wilk test. The correlation analysis determined the direction, strength, and statistical significance of the association between the two variables. The test was conducted at the **0.05 level of significance**. The null hypothesis was rejected when the p-value was less than 0.05 and was not rejected when the p-value was equal to or greater than 0.05. The results were interpreted as evidence of association and not causation.

For the fifth research question, no separate statistical test was conducted. Instead, the proposed policy intervention was developed based on a synthesis of the descriptive and correlational findings. Priority areas were identified from the dimensions with comparatively lower mean scores and the most pronounced teacher challenges. The proposed intervention specified the concerns to be addressed, recommended actions, responsible persons or offices, required resources, implementation timelines, and measurable success indicators.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1: What is the status of IBED in the private school in terms of: Curriculum; Instruction; and Assessment?

Table 1: Status of IBED in Terms of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Curriculum	3.48	Highly Evident
2. Instruction	3.36	Highly Evident
3. Assessment	3.44	Highly Evident
Weighted Mean	3.43	Highly Evident

Note. 4.00 – 3.25 = Highly Evident; 3.24 – 2.50 = Evident; 2.49 – 1.75 = Slightly Evident; and 1.74 – 1.00 = Not Evident.

The overall mean for the status of IBED was 3.427 verbally evaluated as Very Highly Evident as shown in Table 1. The highest mean was for Curriculum at 3.484 followed by Assessment 3.437 and Instruction 3.361. According to the indicated interpretation intervals, all three dimensions fall into the Very Highly Evident category.

The highest mean for Curriculum shows that the curriculum-related indicators were rated most favorably by the participating instructors among the three areas investigated.

This approach ensured that the statistical treatment was consistent with the study's descriptive-correlational design and its five research questions.

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to the study, the researcher sought permission from the school administration to deliver a researcher-adapted questionnaire to the 42 eligible IBED teachers. On approval, the researcher explained the goal of the study, sought informed consent and assured the respondents of the confidentiality of their responses and the voluntary nature of their participation.

The surveys were distributed to the respondents and retrieved after filling. The researcher reviewed the surveys for completeness, allocated respondent codes and coded the replies for statistical analysis. The data were categorized by the characteristics of the study: the state of IBED, the extent of implementation, and the obstacles faced by the teachers. The encoded data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive statistics and Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient to answer the study questions and give the basis for the proposed policy intervention.

Ethical Considerations

The researcher adhered to ethical guidelines in the conduct of the study. Permission was sought from the school administration and informed consent from the respondents before data collection. Participation was voluntary. Teachers were advised of the goal of the study, that they had the right not to take part and the right to withdraw without penalty.

To ensure the confidentiality and privacy of the respondents, their names were not used in the data set and research report; rather, codes were used. The data collected were used strictly for research purposes, stored securely and were only accessible to authorized personnel. The researcher reported the results honestly and properly and did not fabricate, falsify or misrepresent them. The data were presented in an objective manner and utilized to propose a policy intervention aimed at enhancing the implementation of IBED and tackling the problems encountered by instructors.

This indicated that the curriculum-related arrangements and practices in the instrument were somewhat more manifest in the school. However, the outcome should be understood as teachers' assessments of the listed indicators. By itself, it does not prove that the curriculum process is consistently executed or that the curriculum has resulted in specific learning objectives.

This corresponds to the importance of curriculum level conditions highlighted by Palestina, Pangan, and Ancho (2020)



who studied the factors that promote or impede curriculum implementation in a Philippine context from the views of teachers and school administrators. They underline that curriculum implementation takes place in a broader school setting and that facilitating conditions and hindrances should be evaluated in combination. This provides a useful context for understanding the present conclusion that a high grade for curriculum related status might exist along with areas that still need development. The comparison is not direct but contextual since the present study deals with IBED in one private school while Palestina et al. dealt with curriculum implementation in general.

Assessment had the second highest mean score of 3.437 which also falls under the category of Highly Evident. This means that the respondents gave a positive assessment of the assessment indicators. Evaluation is a key part of curriculum implementation since teachers need to evaluate learning expectations and obtain evidence of student learning. In their study of high school science teachers' readiness to apply formative assessment methods, Kariri et al. (2022) studied teachers' readiness to implement assessment methodologies linking instructional goals and evidence of learning. Their work points to the significance of thinking of evaluation as a part of the activity of teaching and learning, not something separate from it. However, the mean of the present study cannot be taken as a measure of assessment quality nor student accomplishment because these objectives were not directly measured.

Research Question 2: What is the extent of IBED implementation in terms of: Curriculum; Instruction; and Assessment?

Table 2: Extent of IBED Implementation in Terms of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Curriculum	3.52	Very Great Extent
2. Instruction	3.42	Very Great Extent
3. Assessment	3.44	Very Great Extent
Weighted Mean	3.46	Very Great Extent

Note. $4.00 - 3.25 =$ To a Very Great Extent; $3.24 - 2.50 =$ To a Great Extent; $2.49 - 1.75 =$ To a Slight Extent; and $1.74 - 1.00 =$ To No Extent.

As shown in Table 2, the overall mean for the extent of IBED implementation was 3.364, interpreted as To a Very Great Extent. Assessment received the highest mean of 3.440, followed by Instruction at 3.353 and Curriculum at 3.298. All three dimensions were classified within the To a Very Great Extent category.

Assessment ranked first, suggesting that the assessment-related implementation indicators received the highest ratings among the three dimensions. This finding indicates that respondents perceived the assessment-related practices specified in the instrument to be implemented to a comparatively greater extent. It does not, by itself, demonstrate that the assessment practices are uniformly effective, that all teachers use the same assessment methods, or that student performance has improved.

The result can be discussed in relation to Kariri et al. (2022), who investigated teachers' readiness to implement formative assessment practices. Their work highlights the importance of teachers' understanding of assessment and their readiness to use approaches that connect instructional intentions with evidence of student learning. The present finding similarly identifies assessment as an important

The lowest mean was received by Instruction at 3.361, although it still fell into the Very Highly Evident category. This relatively shows that instructional indicators would be worth looking at more closely related to curriculum and evaluation. This is not to suggest that teaching is poorly delivered, but rather to indicate the dimension with the lowest relative rating in an otherwise positive picture.

This finding can be understood in relation to the study of Palestina et al. (2020) who studied the circumstances that enable and constrain curriculum implementation in the Philippine environment. Their study argues for the necessity of taking into account conditions of implementation and not to suppose that advantageous curriculum arrangements are immediately transposed into positive conditions in every area of classroom practice. The somewhat lower mean for Instruction for ICAS de Calarian suggests the need for more thorough evaluation of specific instructional indicators, teacher assistance and coordination techniques captured in the questionnaire.

Overall, the results showed that IBED was scored positively across curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The most highly regarded dimension was curriculum, whereas instruction was the least ranked factor. The findings offer a descriptive account of the perceived status of IBED among the teachers who took part in the study. They also indicate that instruction is a feasible subject for additional examination.

dimension of implementation. However, readiness to implement formative assessment and the perceived extent of IBED implementation are different constructs; the studies therefore provide complementary context rather than directly comparable measurements.

Instruction ranked second, with a mean of 3.353, also interpreted as To a Very Great Extent. The result indicates that the instructional implementation indicators received favorable ratings. At the same time, its position below Assessment suggests that instructional practices may benefit from continued monitoring and support. The result should not be interpreted as evidence that instruction is deficient, since the score remains within the highest verbal category under the stated scale intervals.

The importance of examining instructional conditions alongside curriculum arrangements is supported by Palestina et al. (2020). Their Philippine study examined the facilitating and hindering factors associated with curriculum implementation and illustrates the relevance of considering school-level conditions when interpreting implementation findings. In the context of IBED, the implementation of curriculum expectations depends not only on their presence in plans or documents but also on how teachers translate them into



instructional practice. The present data, however, do not establish which particular instructional conditions explain the mean obtained by this dimension.

Curriculum obtained the lowest mean, 3.298, although it was still interpreted as To a Very Great Extent. This finding suggests that curriculum-related implementation indicators were rated slightly lower than assessment and instruction. It is therefore appropriate to examine the specific curriculum items to identify whether particular aspects of curriculum planning, articulation, coordination, or alignment warrant additional attention. Such areas should not be identified as actual weaknesses without examining the wording and item-level results of the instrument.

Palestina et al. (2020) provide relevant contextual evidence that curriculum implementation is shaped by facilitating and hindering conditions. Their findings support the

value of examining implementation as an ongoing process rather than assuming that favorable overall ratings eliminate the need for review. In the present study, the comparatively lower mean for Curriculum can serve as a starting point for school-level reflection, but it should not be taken as evidence of a specific curriculum problem unless the item-level data support that conclusion.

Taken together, the findings show that respondents perceived IBED implementation to occur to a very great extent across all three dimensions. Assessment was the highest-rated dimension, while Curriculum was the lowest-rated. The results indicate a generally favorable perceived extent of implementation while providing a basis for identifying dimensions that may benefit from more focused review. They do not establish the objective effectiveness of implementation or its effects on student outcomes.

Research Question 3: What are the challenges encountered by the teachers in the implementation of IBED in terms of: Curriculum and Instruction; Instructional Resources; and Instructional Workload?

Table 3: Challenges Encountered by Teachers in the Implementation of IBED

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Curriculum and Instruction	2.89	Challenging
2. Instructional Resources	2.57	Challenging
3. Instructional Workload	2.81	Challenging
Weighted Mean	2.76	Challenging

Note. $4.00 - 3.25 = \text{Highly Challenging}$; $3.24 - 2.50 = \text{Challenging}$; $2.49 - 1.75 = \text{Less Challenging}$; and $1.74 - 1.00 = \text{Not Challenging}$.

Table 3 shows that the overall mean for teachers' challenges was 2.702, interpreted as Challenging. Curriculum and Instruction received the highest mean of 2.837, followed by Instructional Workload at 2.762 and Instructional Resources at 2.508. All three dimensions fell within the Challenging category based on the stated interpretation intervals.

Curriculum and Instruction ranked first, with a mean of 2.837. This result indicates that the curriculum- and instruction-related indicators represented the most prominent challenge area among the three domains examined. The finding suggests that the demands associated with translating curriculum expectations into instructional practice merit attention. Nevertheless, because the domain score combines several questionnaire indicators, it does not identify which particular task or condition is most difficult for teachers. Such conclusions require examination of the item-level results.

The finding is relevant to Palestina et al. (2020), whose Philippine study examined the facilitating and hindering factors associated with curriculum implementation. Their research provides a contextual basis for recognizing that curriculum implementation involves conditions that can support or complicate teachers' work. The present study extends this general discussion to the reported experiences of IBED teachers in one private-school setting. The similarity lies in the shared concern with implementation conditions; the studies should not be treated as equivalent because their settings, measures, and research objectives differ.

Instructional Workload ranked second, with a mean of 2.762, interpreted as Challenging. This indicates that workload-related indicators were also reported as a challenge for the respondents. The finding is important because the time and

effort required for teaching responsibilities may compete with the time available for planning, assessment, coordination, and other instructional tasks. However, the present results do not establish which workload components contribute most to the reported challenge or whether the workload is excessive in an objective sense.

Pan et al. (2023) examined teacher well-being in relation to teacher training preparedness, autonomy, and workload using data from lower-secondary teachers in Taiwan. Their findings showed that teacher workload was associated with the other variables examined in their model, highlighting the relevance of workload when studying teachers' working conditions. This provides a useful comparison for the present result because both studies recognize workload as an important aspect of teachers' professional experiences. Nevertheless, Pan et al. investigated teacher well-being and related predictors, whereas the present study examined IBED implementation and reported challenges. The present workload mean should therefore be interpreted as a descriptive finding, not as evidence of a particular effect on teacher well-being.

Instructional Resources ranked third, with a mean of 2.508. Although this was the lowest challenge-domain mean, it remained within the Challenging category under the stated scale intervals. The result suggests that resource-related concerns were comparatively less prominent than the other two challenge areas, but they were still reported as challenges. The relatively lower ranking should not be interpreted to mean that instructional resources are adequate or that resource needs can be disregarded.

Cayabas and Sumeg-ang (2023) examined the challenges encountered by public school teachers in developing instructional materials in basic education, using questionnaire



data from 150 teachers. Their study is relevant because it focuses on the resource-related work involved in preparing instructional materials. It offers contextual support for examining instructional resources as a distinct area of teachers' professional responsibilities. However, the present study does not establish that its respondents experienced the same specific resource difficulties as those investigated by Cayabas and Sumeg-ang, and findings from public schools cannot automatically be generalized to a private-school context.

The three challenge domains together indicate that teachers continue to report challenges even though the status and extent of implementation received high ratings. These findings are not contradictory. The status and implementation sections describe how teachers rated IBED-related conditions

and practices, whereas the challenges section concerns difficulties encountered in carrying out related responsibilities. Favorable implementation ratings do not necessarily imply an absence of workload, coordination, or resource concerns.

Overall, Curriculum and Instruction emerged as the highest-rated challenge domain, followed by Instructional Workload and Instructional Resources. These results suggest that school-level efforts to support IBED implementation may prioritize curriculum and instructional coordination while also reviewing workload arrangements and resource needs. Specific actions should be determined by the questionnaire items and by consultation with the teachers concerned, rather than inferred from domain means alone.

Research Question 4. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of implementation and teachers' challenges?

Table 4. Significant Relationship Between the Overall Extent of IBED Implementation and Teachers' Challenges

Variables	rho	p-value	Interpretation
Extent of Implementation and Teachers' Challenges	0.199	0.206	Not Significant

Table 4 shows a Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient of 0.199 between the overall extent of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges, with a p-value of 0.206 and 42 respondents. The coefficient indicates a weak association in the sample. In other words, higher implementation scores tended to occur alongside somewhat lower challenge scores, but the association was weak.

Because the p-value of 0.206 is greater than the 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis is not rejected. The data do not provide sufficient statistical evidence to conclude that a significant relationship exists between the overall extent of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges among the respondents. This result should not be interpreted as proof that the variables are unrelated in every setting. Rather, the present analysis did not establish a statistically significant association in this sample.

The finding is important because it indicates that the descriptive pattern of implementation and challenges should not automatically be treated as a statistical relationship. Although respondents rated implementation highly and reported challenges across the three challenge domains, these overall scores did not demonstrate a statistically significant association. The descriptive findings and the correlational result answer different research questions: the former describe the reported conditions, while the latter tests whether the two overall scores are statistically associated.

The result also cautions against assuming that a greater extent of implementation necessarily corresponds to fewer challenges. Teachers may report high implementation while still encountering difficulties with curriculum coordination, instructional responsibilities, workload, or resources. Conversely, the presence of challenges does not automatically indicate that implementation is limited. The present study measured the variables as reported by teachers and did not establish the processes that might explain the observed pattern.

Pan et al. (2023) provide relevant context for understanding why teacher workload and other work-related variables merit separate consideration. Their study examined

the relationships among teachers' resources, workload, and well-being and reported significant relationships within its own model. However, their findings do not contradict the present nonsignificant result because the studies examined different variables, populations, and models. Pan et al. investigated workload and well-being among Taiwanese lower-secondary teachers, while the present study examined the association between IBED implementation and teachers' challenges in a single Philippine private school. Statistical findings should be interpreted within the scope and design of the study from which they arise.

The present result should also be considered in light of the sample and study design. The study involved 42 eligible IBED teachers selected through purposive sampling from one private school. Although the findings provide context-specific evidence about the participating teachers, the sample does not support broad generalization to all private schools or all IBED settings. In addition, the correlational design identifies statistical association rather than cause and effect.

The domain-level exploratory analyses identified a nominally significant negative association between Assessment and Curriculum and Instruction challenges ($\rho = 0.306, p = 0.049$). Because multiple domain comparisons were examined, this isolated result should be treated cautiously and should not be presented as the principal test of the overall hypothesis. When several comparisons are performed, the probability of obtaining a nominally significant result by chance increases. Unless the domain-level hypotheses were specified in advance and an appropriate multiple-comparison procedure was applied, this finding is best regarded as exploratory rather than confirmatory.

In summary, the overall correlation analysis did not establish a statistically significant relationship between the extent of IBED implementation and teachers' challenges. The appropriate decision is to fail to reject the null hypothesis at the 0.05 level. This finding remains meaningful because it accurately reports the evidence obtained from the sample without presuming that a significant relationship must exist. It



also reinforces the need to address the descriptive findings on teachers' challenges independently of the correlation result.

Research Question 5. Based on the findings of the study, what policy intervention can be proposed?

Table 5. Proposed Policy Intervention Based on the Findings

Priority Area	Basis in the Findings	Proposed Policy or Intervention	Suggested Monitoring Indicator
Curriculum and Instruction	Highest challenge mean ($M=2.837$)	Establish scheduled collaborative planning and curriculum-articulation sessions for teachers across relevant grade levels. Use the sessions to review learning expectations, instructional plans, and coordination needs.	Planning sessions conducted; documented agreements and action points
Instructional Workload	Second-highest challenge mean ($M=2.762$)	Conduct a workload review to identify overlapping tasks, scheduling concerns, reporting requirements, and opportunities to streamline noninstructional responsibilities where feasible.	Workload review completed; proposed adjustments documented
Instructional Resources	Challenge mean of 2.508 (<i>still within the Challenging category</i>)	Conduct a systematic inventory of instructional resources and establish a process for identifying gaps, prioritizing needs, and sharing or developing materials.	Updated resource inventory; prioritized resource needs and actions
Monitoring and Evaluation	Overall implementation and challenge association was not statistically significant ($\rho = 0.199, p=0.206$)	Monitor implementation and teacher challenges as distinct but potentially related areas. Gather follow-up data before concluding that changes in one variable correspond to changes in the other.	Periodic summary of domain scores; documented review and follow-up decisions

The findings offer a basis for proposing an evidence-informed policy intervention for boosting IBED implementation at ICAS de Calarian. The overall Status and Implementation scores were positive with all three Challenge domains rated as Challenging. Curriculum and Instruction was the highest challenge mean followed by Instructional Workload and Instructional Resources. In addition, there was no substantial overall association between implementation and problems. Therefore, the intervention should be directed on focused support and ongoing surveillance, rather than presuming that the issues are due to the scope of implementation.

The first priority is Curriculum and Instruction because it had the largest challenge mean. Structured opportunities for teachers to discuss expectations, coordinate teaching plans, and identify practical challenges can be provided through collaborative planning and curriculum-articulation sessions. This approach is in line with the broader concern of providing conditions for promoting curriculum implementation as mentioned by Palestina et al. (2020). However, it is a planned

institutional reaction and not an intervention whose effectiveness has already been shown by the present data.

Second priority is Instructional Workload. The average of 2.762 implies that task related indicators were reported as difficult. A workload analysis can allow the school to discover competing duties for teachers' time and whether there are viable improvements that can be made. Some contextual evidence for workload as an important factor of teachers' working conditions is given by Pan et al. (2023). The current study did neither identify particular workload sources nor tested if workload reduction would result in improved implementation. Therefore, the suggested evaluation should begin with information collecting and consultation rather than pre-conceived assumptions.

The intervention should keep Instructional Resources even when it has the lowest challenge mean. Its mean of 2.508 is in the Challenging category, therefore it should not be dismissed as a trivial problem. A resource inventory can enable the school to ascertain what resources are available, what needs are unmet, what can be shared, and what can be generated



collectively. Cayabas and Sumeg-ang (2023) explored the obstacles in generating instructional materials in basic education. They emphasized the value of providing resources and developing materials as areas that institutions should address.

The proposed intervention also calls for continued attention to methods of instruction and assessment. Findings revealed that assessment received the highest mean of implementation while instruction received the lowest mean of status. These results do not reflect a lack of either dimension, but they may guide periodic assessment and professional collaboration. Kariri et al. (2022) stress the significance of evaluating teachers' preparedness to adopt assessment strategies, which offers a meaningful basis for ongoing professional reflection on the link between instructional objectives and assessment approaches.

Finally, the overall correlation was not significant, suggesting that the school should not presume a straight statistical relationship between implementation and teachers' concerns. Future data might reveal more obvious patterns and the two sectors should be examined independently but this potential should remain. A follow-up evaluation can be used to evaluate if the planned activities are aligned with changes in the reported domain scores. Effectiveness of the proposed policy cannot be stated on the basis of this study as it has not been implemented or evaluated yet.

CONCLUSION

The findings revealed that the status of the Integrated Basic Education Department (IBED) were highly evident as shown in the overall mean of 3.427. Curriculum had the highest mean among the three categories, followed by Assessment and Instruction. Findings show that IBED's organizational and curricular characteristics were highly present in the study scenario. The relatively lower mean for Instruction, however, shows that classroom procedures and instructional coordination require continuous attention.

The total mean for the IBED implementation was 3.364, graded to a very great extent. Assessment had the highest mean, followed by Instruction and Curriculum. All three characteristics earned positive evaluations, but Curriculum had the lowest mean score, indicating a need to improve curriculum alignment and cooperation across grade levels. Continued collaboration between teachers and academic leaders can ensure consistency in curriculum delivery and a proper sequencing of learning competencies.

The teachers' challenge was assessed as challenging with an overall mean of 2.702. The next most salient issues after Curriculum and Instruction were Instructional Workload and Instructional Resources. These findings suggested that although the assessments of IBED status and implementation were positive, teachers still faced problems in curriculum and instruction coordination, responsibility management, and resource access for teaching. These considerations should inform design of school level assistance and improvement initiatives."

The extent of implementation for IBED overall was examined in connection to the challenges experienced by teachers, and a weak correlation was observed (Spearman's $\rho = 0.199$, $p = .206$, $N = 42$). The p -value was greater than the 0.05

criterion of significance and the null hypothesis was not rejected. The results did not give enough statistical evidence to conclude that there is a significant association between the two variables among the respondents. This finding does not imply that the factors are not related in other circumstances, but rather that their relationship was not statistically significant in this study. Hence, the school's attempts to improve the implementation of IBED and address teachers' concerns should be based on the descriptive findings and more data, not on the supposed relationship between the variables.

Overall findings suggest that IBED was well developed and executed to a very great level at the school but there were some areas that still needed work. To sustain implementation and respond to teachers' concerns, strengthening curriculum and instructional coordination, assessing teachers' workload, and assuring access to the right instructional materials could help. The findings have implications for the 42 teachers who participated and should be viewed in the light of this study.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. School administrators may create a systematic program to reinforce IBED implementation. The program should focus on synchronization of curriculum and instruction, teacher collaboration opportunities, and improvement plans that address the difficulties found in the study.
2. IBED coordinators and academic leaders may schedule regular evaluations of curriculum alignment, teaching strategies, and assessment methods across grade levels. Regular scheduled coordination meetings and collaborative planning sessions can assist uncover curricular sequencing gaps, define learning standards, and encourage consistency in instruction and assessment.
3. Teachers may be encouraged to exchange teaching ideas, assessment procedures and learning materials through grade-level or subject-area collaboration. Professional development programs may be targeted around curriculum alignment, instructional planning and assessment procedures based on requirements indicated by the school.
4. School administrators and staff who assign instructors may look at their teaching and administrative obligations to see whether the workload is shared fairly. You may find that tasks can be reduced or combined. Allow yourself appropriate time for lesson preparation, assessment development, checking and cooperation.
5. Instructional resources staff may periodically inventory available teaching materials, identify gaps in resources, and provide a clear method for requesting and sharing materials. Resource allocation should be directed by documented instructional needs and prioritized based on available school resources.
6. The school administration may view the planned IBED Strengthening and Teacher Support Program as a school improvement endeavor. Implementation should start with a review of the findings and discussion with teachers and other school workers. Documentation of coordination activities, curriculum and assessment reviews, workload assessments and records of resource availability may be



used for monitoring the program. These indicators could be used to measure progress and to suggest changes. The program should not be judged effective until its results are assessed.

7. Future studies can have more responders and other private schools to discover if the results can be applied in

other educational environments. Further research can also investigate other potential aspects related to IBED implementation and the problems faced by teachers. A larger, more diverse sample may provide a deeper understanding of the concerns inherent in developing an integrated basic education system.

Proposed IBED Strengthening and Teacher Support Program

Priority Area	Proposed Action	Responsible Personnel	Suggested Success Indicators
Curriculum and instructional coordination	Schedule regular curriculum mapping, collaborative planning, and review of learning competencies across grade levels.	School administrators, IBED coordinators, department heads, and teachers	Completed curriculum maps, documented coordination meetings, and reviewed instructional plans
Assessment practices	Review assessment plans, coordinate assessment schedules where appropriate, and share practices for developing and reviewing assessment materials.	Academic leaders, subject coordinators, and teachers	Documented assessment reviews, coordinated assessment plans, and records of collaborative assessment development
Instructional workload	Review teaching assignments and administrative duties and identify tasks that can be streamlined or redistributed.	School administrators and personnel responsible for staffing and workload allocation	Completed workload review and documented adjustments where necessary
Instructional resources	Inventory existing instructional materials, identify shortages, and establish a process for requesting and sharing resources.	School administrators, resource personnel, and teachers	Updated resource inventory, documented resource needs, and records of resource provision or access
Monitoring and evaluation	Review implementation progress and gather teacher feedback at scheduled intervals to identify areas requiring further action.	School administrators, IBED coordinators, and designated monitoring personnel	Periodic monitoring reports, documented teacher feedback, and records of improvement actions

The proposed program was adapted to the school's available resources and existing policies. Its progress will be reviewed periodically, and succeeding actions should be based on documented results and feedback from the teachers involved.

REFERENCES

1. Abrigo, M. R. M., Lingatong, E. E., Daga, E. D. J. C., Apostol, G. C., Cagasan, L. P., Gavan, D. S. A., Paquibot, J. L., Perez, T. D. S., & Relos, C. M. L. (2025). Promise and growing pains in curriculum reform: A mixed-methods evaluation of MATATAG K-to-10 curriculum's first-year pilot implementation. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.53>
2. Akram, M., Kiran, S., & İlğan, A. (2017). Development and validation of instructional leadership questionnaire. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 6(1), 73–88. <https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2017.60435>
3. Amadu, C. D., Fevlo, E. S., & Gato, C. C. (2023). Implementation of learner-centred curriculum in the Colleges of Education in Ghana: An assessment of chemistry tutors' classroom practices. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(2).
4. Arances, K. R. (2026). Teachers' teaching workload experience, work-life balance and performance in the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum: Basis for enhancement program. *Ennoia Advances in Social Science, Technology and Education*, 2(3), 46–61. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21469702>
5. Barrot, J. S. (2023). K to 12 curriculum reform in the Philippines: Towards making students future ready. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(4), 1193–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1973959>
6. Basa, R. B. (2022). Implementation of K to 12 Grade 7 curriculum. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 4(6).
7. Battad, A. B. (2024). Attitudes towards workload vis-à-vis time management practices of public elementary school teachers in District II-B Olongapo City. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(8). <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.08.13>
8. Bingat, S., & Herrera, F. T. (2025). Regular and integrated schools: Roles and performance of school heads, and teaching



- performance in Gingoog City, Philippines. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 46(7).
9. Brillantes, K. D. B., Orbeta, A. C., Francisco-Abrigo, K., Capones, E. M., & Jovellanos, J. B. B. (2019). Status of senior high school implementation: A process evaluation. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2019.13>
10. Budiongan, E. P., & Bas, M. (2026). Implementation and concerns of the revised K-12 curriculum among private school teachers. *Journal of Ongoing Educational Research*, 3(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21002683>
11. Cayabas, J. P., & Sumeg-ang, D. A. (2023). Challenges and interventions in developing instructional materials: Perspectives of public-school teachers in basic education. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, 6(4), 849–855.
<https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v6i4.2059>
12. Colango, D. J., Degamo, K. M., Nacario, S. E. M., Solomon, J.-A., Lozada, L., & Simbulas, L. J. (2026). Teachers' early implementation experiences of the MATATAG curriculum in the Philippines: Challenges, adaptive practices, and policy implications. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 14(4). <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v14i4.8550>
13. Daga, E. D. J. C., Abrigo, M. R. M., & Lingatong, E. E. (2025). The impact of curriculum reform on teacher workload: A multidimensional time-use analysis. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.55>
14. Demate, D. R. B., Aclis, M. S., & Catbagan, F. C. (2025). Teacher perspectives on MATATAG curriculum: Challenges and collaborative solutions. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 8(11), Article 2025351.
<https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2025351>
15. Department of Education. (2013). DepEd Order No. 43, s. 2013: Implementing rules and regulations (IRR) of Republic Act No. 10533 otherwise known as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013.
16. Department of Education. (2019). DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019: Policy guidelines on the K to 12 Basic Education Program.
17. Department of Education. (2024a). DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024: Rationalization of teachers' workload in public schools and payment of teaching overload.
18. Department of Education. (2024b). DepEd Order No. 006, s. 2024: Adoption of the Public and Private Basic Education Complementarity Framework.
19. Department of Education. (2024c). DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum.
20. Faisal, H., & Hussien, O. (2023). Challenges encountered by the newly hired teachers in the new normal: Tagoloan District experience. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 13(4).
21. Fuego, M. R. (2024). Inclusive classroom assessment: K to 12 teachers' practices and challenges. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 18(3).
22. Gedamu, A. D., & Shewangizaw, G. L. (2023). Validation of questionnaire on teachers' beliefs and practices of cooperative group work assessment. *Ethiopian Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(1), 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.59122/134f53a>
23. Grundén, H. (2022). The planned curriculum – Not just a matter of teachers. *The Curriculum Journal*, 33(2), 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.151>
24. Harmsen, R., Helms-Lorenz, M., Maulana, R., & van Veen, K. (2019). Measuring general and specific stress causes and stress responses among beginning secondary school teachers in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 42(1), 91–108.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2018.1462313>
25. Harris, A., Jones, M., Azorin, C., Southern, A., Griffiths, J., & Ástvaldsdóttir, I. (2024). Leading for deeper learning: International perspectives. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 62(1), 122–137.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2023-0042>
26. Hunter, J., & Nguyen, B. (2024). Forever feeling guilty: How ineffective curriculum planning approaches can exacerbate teacher workload and undermine professional satisfaction. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 44, 573–577.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-024-00281-8>
27. Karabacak, E., & Yapicioğlu, D. K. (2022). The alignment between the official curriculum and the taught curriculum: An analysis of primary school English curriculum. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 7(2), 165–186.
<https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.802528>
28. Kariri, K. A., Cobern, W. W., & Al Sultan, A. A. (2022). Investigating high school science teachers' readiness for implementing formative assessment practices. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 18(12), Article em2188.
<https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/12589>
29. Kaur, K., & Lim-Ratnam, C. (2023). Implementation of formative assessment in the English language classroom: Insights from three primary schools in Singapore. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 22, 215–237.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-022-09327-y>
30. Lavadia, R. (2025). Benefits and drawbacks of collaboration in an integrated school. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 47(1).
31. Liday, D. M. (2022). Evaluative research of the implemented Senior High School curriculum in a private university. *International Journal of Advances in Education, Social Sciences and Innovation*, 1(1).
32. Lingatong, E. E., Abrigo, M. R. M., Aranzanso, D. J. F., Berroya, J. D., Daga, E. D. J. C., Gonzales, J. F. D., Ignacio, M. A. C., Macaraig, D. L., Pablo, C. V., Pineda, C. C., Sister, J. M. A. A., & Villazor, R. M. (2025). Teaching through transition: What influences teachers' practices amidst curriculum reform? *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.45>
33. Magtalas, S. A., & Eduwala, J. C. (2025). Teacher's workload in relation to burnout and work performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(10).
<https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.10.24>
34. McPhail, G. (2021). The search for deep learning: A curriculum coherence model. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 53(4), 420–434.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2020.1748231>
35. Mendoza, N. B., Cheng, E. C. K., & Yan, Z. (2022). Assessing teachers' collaborative lesson planning practices: Instrument development and validation using the SECI knowledge-creation model. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 73, 101139.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.101139>
36. Merdegia, R. (2026). Lived experiences of teachers in the implementation of integrated school system: Challenges,



- coping mechanisms, and support system. *International Journal of Sustainable and Integrated Studies*, 1(1), 138–153. <https://doi.org/10.65339/ijsis.V1.I1.13>
37. Miguel, V. M. S., & Poralan, P. S. (2025). *Beyond the blueprint: A multiple case study on bridging the gap between the intended and lived realities of physical education under the MATATAG curriculum*. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 51(12), 729–740. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2025/v51i122725>
 38. Napanoy, J. B., & Peckley, M. K. (2020). Assessment literacy of public elementary school teachers in the Indigenous communities in Northern Philippines. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(11B), 5693–5703. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.082203>
 39. OECD. (2020). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume II): Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en>
 40. OECD. (2023). *Education policy outlook 2023: Empowering all learners to go green*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/f5063653-en>
 41. OECD. (2024). *Education policy outlook 2024: Reshaping teaching into a profession of the future*. OECD Publishing.
 42. Onurkan-Aliusta, G., & Özder, H. (2022). What teachers teach and how they teach it: A case study on fidelity of implementation in Turkish Cypriot schools. *Issues in Educational Research*, 32(1).
 43. Palestina, R. L., Pangan, A. D., & Ancho, I. (2020). Curriculum implementation facilitating and hindering factors: The Philippines context. *International Journal of Education*, 13(2), 91–104. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v13i2.25340>
 44. Palionay, R., & Castil, M. L. (2026). *The revised Grade One curriculum: Its effect on teachers' workload, learners' motivation and schools' performance*. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 58(7), 1043–1060. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.580710>
 45. Pan, H.-L. W., Chung, C.-H., & Lin, Y.-C. (2023). Exploring the predictors of teacher well-being: An analysis of teacher training preparedness, autonomy, and workload. *Sustainability*, 15(7), Article 5804. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15075804>
 46. Pangandoyon, R. T., Lupina, S. P., Mandin, M. O., & Bauyot, M. M. (2024). A multiple case study on the resilient leadership in integrated schools: School heads' perspective in focus. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 50(1), 28–41. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i11237>
 47. Pastore, S. (2023). Teacher assessment literacy: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1217167. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1217167>
 48. Peñano, R. (2019). Rapid appraisal of the implementation of the K to 12 curriculum: Input to policy formulation. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*, 3(2M).
 49. Ramnarain, U. (2016). Understanding the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on inquiry-based science education at township schools in South Africa. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 53(4), 598–619. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21315>
 50. Rata, E. (2021). The curriculum design coherence model in the Knowledge-Rich School Project. *Review of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3254>
 51. Raymond, K. M. (2021). Teachers' daily practices with curriculum materials: Toward a transactional view of the curriculum system. *School Science and Mathematics*, 121(8), 509–519. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.12499>
 52. Rogayan, D. V., & Villanueva, E. E. N. (2019). Implementation status of K12 Social Studies program in Philippine public schools. *People: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(3), 233–250. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2019.53.233250>
 53. Sahli Lozano, C., Wüthrich, S., & Büchi, J. S. (2022). The concerns about inclusive education scale: Dimensionality, factor structure, and development of a short-form version (CIES-SF). *International Journal of Educational Research*, 111, 101913. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101913>
 54. Sharma, U., Moore, D. W., & Sonawane, S. (2009). Attitudes and concerns of pre-service teachers regarding inclusion of students with disabilities into regular schools in Pune, India. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(3), 319–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598660903050328>
 55. Sioncio, J. B., & Besmonte, A. B. (2023). Assessing students' learning: Revisiting challenges of secondary mathematics teachers in Bicol Region, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(6), 1778–1785. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.06.03>
 56. Torrefiel, J. C., Cagape, E. S., Galan Tambongan, O. V., Doydora, V. P., & Pintac, T. D. (2025). Teachers' lived experiences in the transition to the MATATAG curriculum: A phenomenological inquiry into adaptation, challenges, and growth. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.041>
 57. UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education - A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO.
 58. Villapaz, M., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2025). Who holds authority? Investigating the professional divide between elementary and secondary teachers in public integrated schools. *International Journal of All Research Writings*, 7(1).
 59. Yan, Z., & Pastore, S. (2022). Assessing teachers' strategies in formative assessment: The Teacher Formative Assessment Practice Scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 40(5), 592–604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07342829221075121>
 60. Zhao, X.-Y., van den Heuvel-Panhuizen, M., & Veldhuis, M. (2018). Chinese primary school mathematics teachers' assessment profiles: Findings from a large-scale questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 16(7), 1387–1407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-017-9841-3>