

Preparedness of Teachers among Selected Public Secondary Schools in the Implementation of Senior High School

Manuel M. Dela Peña Jr.
Kalinga State University | Camalog National High School
manuel.delapena@deped.gov.ph

Date Submitted:
April 8, 2026

Date Accepted:
May 10, 2026

Date Published:
May 21, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.20326819

ABSTRACT

The study made use of the descriptive research method. The main gathering tool is the questionnaire. The data is gathered from the 39 respondents. The study also used the weighted mean and analysis of variance as the statistical tools. The study found that there are significant differences in the perceptions of respondents on the level of their preparedness in the implementation of senior high school along the moderator variable strand/track, educational attainment and teaching experience. There are also significant differences in the perceptions of respondents on the extent by which the factors affect their preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School. Furthermore, there are also significant differences in the perceptions of respondents on the degree of seriousness of problems in the

implementation of Senior High School along the moderator variable strand/track, educational attainment, and teaching experience. Based from the findings of the study, it is recommended that the schools should be equipped with qualified teachers with their specific expertise. Teachers should be encouraged to undergo training with NC I, II, III even with Training Methodologies. There should be a prioritization and utilization of budget from the National Government according to the needs of the respective schools. Teachers should also be encouraged to attend various trainings in line with their field of specialization. The Department of Education shall provide more opportunities for preparing the teachers to face the challenges of the K to 12 Program. The very objectives of the K to 12 Program should be materialized so that it will not cast doubts among the members of the community. Seminars on K-12 and specialized trainings regarding K to 12 among the teachers shall be conducted by the Department of Education in the locality. Experts in the central region shall also be invited as speakers. The Department of Education should also fast-track the distribution of items among the Senior High School applicants and shall strictly follow the guidelines for the hiring thereof. It further recommended that the teachers should also be encouraged to finish their masters degree, and equipped themselves with necessary skills and trainings along with the strand/track their school is offering in order to prepare them to be more effective and efficient teachers.

Keywords: *Preparedness, Senior High School, Implementation, Curriculum*

INTRODUCTION

A recent change in the Philippines educational system was implemented in 2011. President Aquino signed the K-12 education into law in 2013, adding three years to the country's basic education curriculum.

The new K-12 curriculum guide requires all Filipino students to have one year of kindergarten, six years of elementary schooling (grades 1 to 6), four years of junior high school (grades 7 to 10), and two years of senior high school (grades 11 to 12).

Prior to the implementation of the K-12 curriculum guide, the Philippines was one of only three countries in the world and the only one in Asia that still had only 10 years in basic education.

This has always been seen as a disadvantage for our students who are competing in an increasingly global job market. The longer educational cycle of the K-12 curriculum is seen as critical in giving Filipino students a higher quality of education.

K-12 (also K-12) is an education system under the Department of Education that aims to enhance learners' basic skills, produce more competent citizens, and prepare graduates for lifelong learning and employment. "K" stands for Kindergarten and "12" refers to the succeeding 12 years of basic education (6 years of elementary education, 4 years of junior high school, and 2 years of senior high school).

At present, Philippines is the last country in Asia and one of the only three countries in the world with a 10-year pre-university program.

The K-12 program offers a decongested 12-year program that gives students sufficient time to master skills and absorb basic competencies. Students of the new system shall graduate at the age of 18 and shall be ready for employment, entrepreneurship, middle level skills development, and higher education upon graduation. The K-12 program accelerates mutual recognition of Filipino graduates and professionals in other countries. Kindergarten is mandatory for five-year-old children, a pre-requisite for admission to Grade 1. The new curriculum gives students the chance to choose among three tracks (i.e. Academic; Technical-Vocational-Livelihood; and Sports and Arts) and undergo immersion, which provides relevant exposure and actual experience in their chosen track.

In international tests such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), the Philippines is among the worst participating countries. Out of 25 participating countries, Philippines ranked 23rd in TIMSS' Math and Science in 2003. In 2008 TIMSS, even the science high schools that are recognized to be the best and the brightest in the country fared badly in Advanced Mathematics.

The DepEd pointed out that the deterioration in the quality of education can be partly attributed to the current 10-year basic education cycle.

The Philippine educational system is patterned after the American model, which includes seven years of elementary school. In an attempt to control the costs due to a rapid increase in school enrollment during that time, the Education Act of 1940 did away with Grade 7. It was intended to be a temporary measure. However, to this date, the six-year elementary school cycle remains in effect (International Qualifications Assessment Service, 2007).

Numerous studies have proposed restoring Grade 7 or adding an extra school year to the basic education cycle. The UNESCO Mission Survey of 1949, the Education Act of 1953 and the Swanson Survey of 1960 all recommended the restoration of Grade 7. In 1970, the Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education called for the implementation of an 11-year program while the Congressional Commission on Education in 1991 proposed to have either seven years of elementary education or five years of secondary education. A study by the Presidential Commission on Education Reforms in 2000 proposed the establishing of a one-year pre-baccalaureate system while the Presidential Task Force on Education in 2008 had discussions on a 12-year pre-university program (DepEd Discussion Paper, 2010).

The recommendations, however, were not heeded and as such, the Philippines now has the shortest basic education cycle in Asia. The country joins Djibouti and Angola of Africa, as the only three remaining countries with a 10-year pre-university education system. Other countries even have 13- or 14-year cycles.

In 2004, in another attempt to extend the basic education cycle, the High School Bridge Program, a one-year remedial program for underperforming first-year high school students, was proposed. However, it met strong opposition from students who will have to stay longer in school and their parents who will have to shoulder the extra expenses of another school year.

Bowing to public pressure, the DepEd offered it then as an optional program. K to 12 program is the latest effort of the government to elevate the educational system to the global 12-year standard. K to 12 means one year of kindergarten and 12 years of elementary and secondary education. It was one of President Noynoy Aquino's campaign promises and as such, was included in the priority list of bills of the Legislative-Executive Development Advisory Council (LEDAC).

In fact, the rationale behind its implementation is to decongest the curriculum. According to the DepEd, while the K to 12 is not the solution to all the ills of the Philippine educational system, it will address one of its main weaknesses—the congested curriculum.

The DepEd explained that the students are hard-pressed to learn in 10 years a curriculum that is actually designed for 12 years in other countries. Hence, Filipino students are not able to achieve comprehension and mastery, particularly of core subjects. Perhaps the most damning proof of this is the result of the 2008 FLEMMS, which revealed that 19 percent of elementary graduates are not functionally literate (Action for Economic Reforms and E-NET, 2008). Functional literacy means a person can read, write, compute and comprehend.

The DepEd claimed that with K to 12, students will not have to rush through the lessons anymore. It will also do away with unnecessary topics in the curriculum so that students will develop competencies and acquire life skills that will make them productive members of the society.

In like manner, the curriculum prepares the students for higher education. From the DepEd's assessment, secondary graduates of the current system are not adequately prepared for college. They pointed out that this is why most of the courses, the so-called General Education subjects, taken by first year college students are actually remedial as they should have already been mastered in high school. With K to 12, students will be better prepared as introductory courses that are currently taught at the tertiary level will be included in the high school curriculum.

In addition it also prepares the students for the labor market. According to the DepEd, with the 10-year basic education cycle, students usually graduate from high school below 18 years old, too young to legally join the labor force or put up a business that will entail them to enter into contracts. In addition, because they have not mastered the necessary competencies, graduates of the current system often lack skills and hence, are vulnerable to exploitative labor practices. The DepEd claimed that K to 12 will empower them to confidently join the labor market as by the time they graduate they are already of legal age and equipped with sufficient skills.

Moreover, the curriculum will of great help to comply with the global standards. At present, graduates who wish to work abroad are at a disadvantage because they are not automatically recognized as professionals while students who apply for post-graduate studies often have to enroll in or take remedial courses to meet the entrance requirements of the foreign country. For instance, the Washington Accord signed in 1989 prescribes 12 years of basic education as a requirement for the recognition of engineering professionals. Likewise, the Bologna Accord of 1999 requires 12 years of education for university admission and practice of profession in European countries.

The K to 12 model proposed by the DepEd is the K-6-4-2 model. This includes one year of kindergarten, six years of elementary education (Grades 1 to 6), four years of junior high (Grades 7 to 10) and two years of senior high (Grades 11 to 12).

Under K to 12, the official school age for kindergarten is five years old, 6 to 11 years old for elementary (Grades 1 to 6), 12 to 15 years old for junior high (Grades 7 to 10), and 16 to 17 years old for senior high (Grades 11 to 12).

K to 12 shall cover both public and private schools. It will be provided by the government for free in public schools and its implementation will be phased over a period of six years. According to the DepEd, kindergarten will be made mandatory starting this SY 2011-2012. A new curriculum for Grade 1 and first-year students beginning SY 2012-2013 will be devised. Senior high, on the other hand, will be offered

starting SY 2016-2017. By SY 2018- 2019, all students would have already finished 12 years of basic education before they enter college.

The DepEd explained that those who are not inclined to go to college and want to pursue technical-vocational courses or entrepreneurial fields stand to benefit from K to 12 as well.

The announcement of the K to 12 program has sparked myriad reactions not only from those within the education sector but from the public as well. Supporters of the program have claimed that the K to 12 program will be the answer to the basic education woes while critics argued that it merely glosses over the more fundamental problems of the educational system.

One of the issues raised is the relationship between the length of school cycle and quality of education.

In addition, preliminary findings of a SEAMEO INNOTECH study, which looked at the curriculum, structure and duration of education in Malaysia, Brunei, Singapore and the Philippines, revealed that although the duration of education is longer for the other countries, the amount of instructional time per subject is significantly longer in the Philippines. The said countries also placed more emphasis on the mastery of process and skills rather than on content. They also had a stronger emphasis on examinations which could explain their higher test scores.

Furthermore, the 2005 Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report (GMR) pointed out that lengthening the learning time did not necessarily lead to better performance. The report instead emphasized that what is more important is how effectively learning time is spent. In addition, a World Bank (2007) study said that among the developing countries, returns to increased years of schooling go hand in hand with increases in the quality of education. If the school system is of low quality then it does not pay to keep children in school longer.

In like manner, the funding constraint and shortage of inputs was also raised. Critics pointed out that educational outcome are largely dependent on resources made available to support teaching and learning. While DepEd received the biggest slice of the national budget in 2011 (12.6%) and that it significantly increased both in nominal terms and as percentage of gross domestic product (2.7%) compared to previous years, the amount allocated is still well below international standards. The UNESCO prescribes the spending of at least 6 percent of GDP for education while according to the World Bank, the average share of education in the national budget in developing countries is 20 percent.

As a result of the perennial underinvestment in the sector, the educational system is plagued by long standing shortages in important enabling inputs like classrooms, teachers, chairs, textbooks and sanitation facilities. For SY 2011-2012, for instance, the school system lacks 152,569 classrooms which amount to PhP104 billion. The situation is worsened by Republic Act No. 7880, otherwise known as the "Fair and Equitable Access to Education Act," which allocates the budget for capital outlay on education among legislative districts in favor of its population rather than on actual shortages.

Pupil-input ratios reflect the extent of shortages, especially when disaggregated on regional levels. While the national average is 38.9 for pupil-classroom ratio, it could go to as high as 77 students in one classroom in the National Capital Region. Thirty five (35) to forty (40) students in a classroom is considered to be the manageable class size (UNESCO, 2009).

For example, in Amparo Elementary School in Caloocan City the pupil-teacher ratio is 49 is to one while the pupil-classroom ratio is 148 is to one. Granted that there are two shifts in this school, it still translates to 74 pupils packed in one classroom. The condition is as bad, if not worse, in the secondary level where on the average, 82 students share a classroom in the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM).

Critics of the K to 12 program pointed out that as it is, the government has yet to fully fund the existing 10- year basic education cycle. Introducing K to 12 into the picture would only magnify the lack of resources and further strain the already insufficient education budget. Input shortages in the existing system should hence be dealt with first before thinking of additional school years.

Although the DepEd admitted that funding K to 12 is one of its biggest challenges, its initial computations of the cost show that government can fund the program. DepEd Secretary Armin Luistro, in particular, is confident that money will come in as K to 12 is a good idea. Moreover, the DepEd is not banking solely on budgetary allocations from the national government but will also do its share in securing partnerships to help fund the program. For instance, the DepEd plans to partner with local governments for the possibility of counterpart funding for classrooms (Educator Magazine, 2011). DepEd Undersecretary Francisco Varela also added that the program is not asking too much in terms of budgetary allocation and that raising the DepEd's budget to 3 percent of GDP would suffice.

On the part of the parents the issue was on the additional expenses incurred. One of the top reasons for dropping out of school is the high cost of education. The 2009 Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES) revealed that education is not a priority among poor households as bulk of their spending goes to food (60%). During the said year, only 1.2 percent of the family budget is spent for education.

Critics argued that while K to 12 will be provided free by the government in public schools where most of the poor enroll in, parents will still have out-of-pocket expenses to cover their school children's food, transportation and allowance. Adding two more years of high school would therefore entail additional burden on the households and this could inadvertently increase dropouts and worsen completion rates.

The DepEd reasoned out that in the process of providing various tracks of specialization that cater to students' preferences, K to 12 could actually lower dropout rates since it is partly the highly academic nature of formal schooling that alienates students and causes them to lose interest (Educator Magazine, 2011).

Proponents also averred that K to 12 should be seen not as additional two years of schooling but a reduction of two years in college as high school graduates will already be employable as if they are college graduates. The additional two years could also increase their wage potential and as such should be seen as an opportunity by poor families to raise their economic well-being.

To include as well, the increasing school leaving age was also raised. Supporters argued that increasing the school leaving age to 18 years old is advantageous as senior high graduates are no longer minors and therefore could be lawfully employed, legally able to start their own business and enter into contracts. Critics contended though that increasing the school leaving age would be particularly unfavorable to the poor who, in general, want to finish high school in the shortest time possible so that they can help their families right away. Adding two more years of senior high would further delay their entry into the labor market and result in foregone earnings from work. They also added that increasing the school leaving age would not also be an outright advantage even if students graduate at 18 because businesses still prefer college graduates over fresh graduates from high school.

The DepEd explained that the public perception that high school is inferior compared to college is exactly what K to 12 wants to change. The education sector would work with the business sector in developing the curriculum of senior high so that the skills that students learn are exactly what the labor market needs. Industry hiring practices must be changed to take into account the enhanced skills and competencies of the K to 12 graduates. The DepEd consultations with the business sector showed that firms are generally supportive of K to 12.

The DepEd said that a 12-year basic education cycle will enable every graduate to be compliant with international standards such as the Washington and Bologna Accords. Critics maintained though that while it is important to comply with standards, actual experience as cited by Tan (2010) showed that foreign employers look primarily at competencies and not at the number of years of schooling when hiring workers. Filipino engineers, nurses, teachers, accountants, etc. get hired as professionals despite the difference in the required years of schooling overseas.

Non-supporters also pointed out that not all graduates will study or work abroad and as such, only those who will be affected by the non-standardized cycles should be the ones to bear the costs. The rest should be spared from undergoing a system of education that will not really benefit them. Instead of altering

the entire basic education cycle, an appropriate system of assessment and training could be put in place for those who want to study or work out of the country (Felipe and Porio, 2010).

Inarguably, the system of basic education in the country is in dire need of resuscitation. The main question though is whether increasing the number of years of schooling as proposed by the K to 12 program could lead to improvements in quality or just exacerbate the present situation.

The proposal to make kindergarten mandatory and institutionalize it as part of the basic education cycle is not as contentious as the additional two years in high school as there is a universal acceptance of the importance of pre-school in improving the quality and efficiency of education. Various studies have indicated that quality Early Childhood Care and Development (ECCD) is associated with better cognitive and social skills development. Students who have undergone ECCD tend to stay in school longer and learn more. In fact, informal pre-school programs that operate with inadequate resources and facilities, and are saddled with unfavorable class sizes still manage to produce positive results in students (EFA GMR, 2005). A formal and institutionalized pre-school program with trained pre-school teachers is thus expected to produce more gains. In contrast, researches have mixed findings on lengthening the basic education cycle.

Critics have raised a real and valid concern that adding two more years of senior high would not only strain the government's resources but also contribute additional burden to households. With the increasing cost of living, and the budget, particularly of the poor, already stretched to the limit, K to 12 is a rather ambitious and expensive program, especially when it does not guarantee favorable results. On the other hand, there is also merit in the argument that the current curriculum needs decongesting and that the country needs to catch up with the rest of the world in terms of the length of basic education cycle. Nearly all countries have complied with the 12-year global standard and the Philippines is one of the last holdouts. If less-developed and poorer countries can commit to providing a longer basic education cycle, why can't the Philippines?

Ultimately, the government's ability to secure resources to implement the K to 12 program and at the same time address the unresolved shortages in educational inputs will determine the country's quality of education in the future. As wisely stated in the Philippine EFA plan, "Good education is expensive but lack of education costs many times more."

Indeed the transition from the 10-year Basic Education program to the 12 years of the K to 12 program is also critical to teachers as these professionals will also need to upgrade their skills so they will not be left behind when the program is fully implemented come 2016. For schools to be able to shift to the K to 12 program, administrators have to make adjustments to the movement of faculty, as well as resources.

This study ascertained the preparedness of teachers among selected public secondary schools in the implementation of senior high school in Kalinga Division.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following objectives:

1. To determine the extent of preparedness of teachers in the implementation of Senior high school.
 - 1.1 There are significant differences in the responses of teachers on their extent of preparedness in the implementation of senior high school program along the moderator variables as to strand/track, educational attainment and years in teaching;
 - 1.2 There are no significant differences in the responses of teachers on their extent of preparedness in the implementation of senior high school.
2. To determine the extent of factors affecting the preparedness of teachers in the implementation of senior high school.
 - 2.1 There are significant differences in the responses of teachers on the extent of factors affecting their preparedness in the implementation of senior high school along the moderator variables.
 - 2.2 There are no significant differences in the responses of teachers on the extent of factors affecting their preparedness in the implementation of senior high school.
3. To determine the degree of seriousness of problems affecting the preparedness of teachers in the implementation of senior high school.

3.1 There are significant differences on the degree of seriousness of problems affecting the preparedness of teachers in the implementation of senior high school along the moderator variables.

3.2 There are no significant differences on the degree of seriousness of problems affecting the preparedness of teachers in the implementation of senior high school.

METHODS

Research Design

This study made use of descriptive research design. This described the level of preparedness of teachers on the implementation of senior high school. In like manner, the design made used to describe the profile of the respondents and the elaboration of the responses of the respondents.

Research Locale

This study was conducted in the 12 selected public secondary schools and 1 stand-alone senior high school which does not have an expanded junior high school which offered grades 11 and 12 in the Schools Division of Kalinga. Respondents of this study were the 39 permanent teachers who were deployed to their respective schools upon the implementation of the Senior High School who were chosen through total enumeration.

Sampling Technique

The study made used of a total enumeration.

Table 1. Distribution of the Respondents

School	Frequency	Percentage
1.Balbalan Agricultural and Industrial School	5	12.82
2.Lubuagan National High School	2	5.13
3.Central Pasil National High School	2	5.13
4.Cal-owan Agricultural Vocational NHS	1	2.56
5.Pinukpuk Vocational School	6	15.38
6.Macutay-Palao National High School	2	5.13
7.Rizal National School of Arts and Trades	8	20.51
8.Magtoma Pangol National High School	1	2.56
9.Tanudan Vocational School	2	5.13
10.Tanudan National High School	2	5.13
11.Bangad National High School	3	7.69
12.Southern Tinglayan NHS	4	10.26
13.Stand Alone Senior High School-Lubuagan	1	2.56
TOTAL	39	100

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School

Table 2. *Level of Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School*

Level of preparedness	MP (3)	MoP (2)	LP (1)	Wtd. mean
1. Verticalization of Specialization with the subject assignment/Teaching workload	10 (30)	29 (58)	0 (0)	2.26
2. Orientation ON THE k TO 12 Curriculum	33 (99)	3 (6)	3 (3)	2.77
3. Communication skills	36 (108)	3 (6)	0 (0)	2.92
4. Awareness of the K to 12 objectives	39 (117)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3.00
5. Mastery on the content of K to 12 Curriculum	8 (24)	31 (62)	0 (0)	2.20
6. Knowledge on assessment methods and requirements	7 (21)	32 (64)	0 (0)	2.18
7. Awareness on the K to 12 Teaching Strategies	5 (15)	30 (60)	4 (4)	2.03
8. Availability of Materials, facilities and Equipment	9 (27)	15 (30)	15 (15)	1.85
9. With NC I/II/III	10 (30)	3 (6)	26 (26)	1.5
Total Average Weighted Mean				2.31

The table shows that the obtained total average weighted mean is 2.31 which described as moderately prepared. This implies that the respondents perceived that the level of preparedness of teachers is moderate in the implementation of Senior High School. This can be attributed to the fact that most of the teachers are licensed teachers with a degree in education which means that the nature of their profession entails the ability to be flexible in their specific field.

The highest mean of 3.00 is obtained by indicator four (4) which is the, “awareness of the K to 12 objectives”. This is not surprising because the K to 12 program of the government has already been discussed thoroughly in all social media networks prior to its implementation. Add to this, all teachers were required by the Department of Education to attend training and seminars relative to K to 12 program in order prepare them for the implementation of the program.

The teachers revealed that they have adequate knowledge on the background and rationale of the program through series of advocacy gatherings and consultation. They recognized the efforts of the government, through the Department of Education, to improve the quality of education via the Senior High School

Program. They understood that the program is one among the responses to the President’s proposed ways to fix the Philippine Basic Education. They realized that the program is not actually adding two years in the basic education schooling rather it is minus two years in college studies and a way of reducing the expenses of the parents in sending their children to college and most importantly employment is already assured in the basic education level. They learned that the SHS is an answer on the need to address the issue on mismatch of competencies and the job requirements of industries and the business sector. They realized that program prepares to every learner for higher education, employment, entrepreneurship, and middle level skills development.

The second highest mean of 2.92 is obtained by indicator number three (3) which is the “Communication Skills”. This is due to the fact that, one of the requirements for the teaching position among senior high teachers as required by the Department of Education is to pass the English Proficiency Test (EPT). The EPT covers both written and oral communication skills. This means that those who were hired in the senior high curriculum possessed the necessary communication skills of a professional teachers. Moreover, recent study shows that 93.70 percent of the Filipinos know how to speak the English language.

The third highest mean of 2.77 is obtained by indicator number two (2) which is the “Orientation ON THE k TO 12 Curriculum”. The Department of Education has issued a memo whereby all teachers both in the junior and senior high should undergo pre-in service training. This training helped the teachers to be informed on the K to 12 curriculum according to their specific areas. Syllabus and modules were also introduced during the training. This memo is a must to all the teachers in the senior high. According to our interview, all of the respondents attended the training. Moreover, all newly hired teachers are required to attend the “Teachers’ Induction Program” which helped them to be more aware of the k to 12 curriculum. The induction is focused on how the teachers will formulate their syllabus, modules, and VMGO’s in congruence with the objective of the K to 12 curriculum.

The lowest mean of 1.5 or not prepared is obtained by indicator number (9) which is the “With NC 1/II/III”. This can be attributed to the fact that most of the senior high school teachers are in general academic track and those who are in line with technical, vocational and livelihood track are the only one with NC I, NC II and NC III.

The second lowest mean is obtained by indicator number eight (8) which is the “availability of materials, facilities and equipment”. This need not be disputed because the most common problem besetting our educational setting today is the lack of materials, facilities and equipment. Moreover, since the K to 12 program is still new, the materials and the budget for its full blown implementation is still on the process. This is the most common problem in the government system of the Philippines, the budget is already allocated but the process for its distribution is being prolonged in the different government agencies.

The third lowest mean of 2.03 or less prepared is obtained by indicator number seven (7) which is the “awareness on the K to 12 teaching strategies”. This is due to the fact that some of the teachers have different baccalaureate degrees, they only have earned units in education to qualify themselves for the teaching profession. Moreover, the new trend of teaching today requires efficiency in Information, Communication, Technology (ICT) integration in teaching and there are some who really need to undergo more trainings to adopt themselves to this new trend in teaching and learning strategy.

Level of Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School as to the moderator variable Variable of Strand/Track.

Table 3. Level of Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior high School as to Strand/Track

Stand/Track	Mean	Description	Rank
ABM	1.67	MoP	4
STEM	1.94	MoP	3
TVL	2.12	MoP	2
GAS	2.54	MP	1
TAWM	2.31	MoP	

As shown on the table, the GAS respondents obtained the highest average mean of 2.54 or much prepared. The TVL respondents obtained the second highest average weighted mean of 2.12 or moderately prepared. The STEM obtained an average weighted mean 1.94 or moderately prepared. The ABM obtained the lowest average weighted mean of 1.67 or moderately prepared in description.

The General Academic Strand/Track obtained the highest mean of 2.54 or much prepared in description. This is due to the fact that most of the senior high schools are offering general academic track

where most of the teachers are in line to teach subjects under this track. Moreover, the bachelor's degree and masters of the teachers is vertical to the subjects under general academic track.

The lowest mean of 1.67 or less prepared in description is obtained by Accountancy and Business Management (ABM). This is not surprising because there are only few in the province of Kalinga who are really qualified to teach under this track. Most of the accountants in Kalinga are in private offices or in the college. Such is also the case among business and management graduates.

Table 4. *Summary of ANOVA as to Strand/Track*

Source of variance	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F ratio
Between groups	3.058	3	1.019	14.543
Within groups	2.453	35	.070	
Total	5.511	38		

F.05= 0.001 decision: significant/ Ho Rejected

The study reveals that there are significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents on their level of preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School. This conclusion is based on the computed F ratio of 14.543 which is much higher than the F tabular of 0.001 at .05 level of significance.

The null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences on the perceptions of the respondents on their level of preparedness in the implementation of senior High School along stand/track is therefore rejected.

Level of Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School as to the moderator variable of Educational Attainment

Table 5. *Level of Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School as to Educational Attainment*

Educational attainment	Mean	Description	Rank
Bachelor Graduate	1.91	MoP	4
Masters Graduate	2.30	MoP	2
With Doctoral Units	2.98	MP	1
With Masters units	2.11	MoP	3
TAWM	2.31	MoP	

The table shows that the respondents who are with doctoral units obtained the highest average mean of 2.98 or much prepared followed by those who are masters graduates with a mean of 2.30 or moderately prepared, those who are with masters units obtained a mean of 2.11 or moderately prepared and those with bachelors degree obtained an average weighted mean of 1.91 or moderately prepared.

Those with doctoral units obtained the highest mean because they have a wider range of comprehension. They are able to connect their past learning experiences with the present, and use these experiences to help them understand new materials. They are willing to learn how to think critically (i.e., to comprehend, apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information), and they understand how these skills can benefit them in their future careers. According to Jones-DeWeever (2007), a college education particularly the completion of a four year degree provides the best opportunity to every individual. It is understandable that those with doctorate units have the highest perception because of their longer exposure in learning institutions and information activities such as seminars, for a, and panel discussion. They have also an advantage in the interpretation, understanding and retention of information according to ABD Education and National Development in Asia (2001).

According to www.crosswalk.com, Higher Education improves an individual's quality of life. Studies show that, compared to high school graduates, college graduates have longer life spans, better access to health care, better dietary and health practices, greater economic stability and security, more

Table 8. *Summary of ANOVA as to Teaching Experience*

Source of variance	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	f- ratio
Between groups	3.784	3	1.261	
Within groups	1.726	35	.049	25.571
Total	5.511	38		

F.05=.002 decision: Significant/Ho Rejected

The table presents that the computed F-ratio of 25.571 is higher than the Tabular F-ratio of .002 at .05 level of significance. This implies that there are significant differences on the perceptions of the respondents on their level of preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School as to teaching experience.

The null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents on their level of preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School as to teaching experience is therefore rejected.

Extent of Factors Affecting the Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School

Table 9. *Extent by which the Factors Affect the Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School*

A. FACTORS	3 MA	2 MoA	1 NA	AWM
A. -Related Factors				
B. 1.School Policies	0 (0)	6 (12)	33 (33)	1.15
1. 2. Leadership and management Styles of administrators	2 (6)	31 (62)	6 (6)	1.90
2. 3.Administration-subordinate relationship	1 (3)	32 (64)	6 (6)	1.88
3. 4.School-community relations	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (39)	1.00
4. 5.Administrative support	3 (9)	29 (58)	7 (7)	1.90
5. 6.Consistency of supervision/monitoring and evaluation.	4 (12)	28 (56)	7 (7)	1.92
Sub Mean				1.63
B. Teacher-Related Factors				
6. 1. Work loads	30 (90)	4 (8)	5 (5)	2.64
2. Co-curricular activities	5 (15)	27 (54)	7 (7)	1.95
3. Class schedule	7 (21)	30 (60)	2 (2)	2.13
4. Specialized trainings	30 (90)	9 (18)	0 (0)	2.77
5. Attitudes of Colleagues	0 (0)	7 (14)	32 (32)	1.18
Sub Mean				2.13
C.Community-Related Factors				
1.Expectations from community	39 (117)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3.00

2. Peace and order situation	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (39)	1.00
3. Support and cooperation of Parents	3 (9)	30 (60)	6 (6)	1.92
Sub Mean				1.97
D. Student- Related Factors				
7. 1. Students understanding and attitude of senior high school.	6 (18)	26 (52)	7 (7)	1.97
8. 2. Attendance	8 (24)	27 (54)	4 (4)	2.10
3. Health	0 (0)	6 (12)	33 (33)	1.15
4. Study Habits	5 (15)	24 (48)	10 (10)	1.87
5. Comprehension skills	10 (30)	20 (40)	9 (9)	2.02
Sub Mean				1.82
E. School-Related Factors				
1. Classroom lighting and ventilation	0 (0)	3 (6)	36 (36)	1.08
2. Distance/location of school	0 (0)	7 (14)	32 (32)	1.18
3. Laboratory facilities and equipment	2 (6)	26 (52)	11 (11)	1.77
4. Book-student ratio	22 (66)	11 (22)	6 (6)	2.41
5. Organizational climate	0 (0)	2 (4)	37 (37)	1.05
6. Class size	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (39)	1.00
Sub Mean				1.42
TAWM				1.79

As shown in the Table , the factors moderately affect the preparedness of teachers in the implementation of Grade 11 and 12 as evidenced by the obtained weighted mean of 1.79.

According to President Aquino, “.....Likewise, tuition costs for parents whose children have no public SHS fund available should not hold those students hostage to the financial capabilities of the parents. That is not what we mean when we talk about “public education” as a constitutional right. And, sadly, anytime large sums of government money are being passed out, we come face to face with the ubiquitous problems of potential corruption.

All that said, I still tend toward proceeding with K-12. The K-10 approach is as problematic as—indeed, is part of—the continued neglect our public educational system has suffered since the Marcos years. It is time and past time to begin making amends.

We should not ignore the serious challenges of shifting to a K-12 program. At the same time, we should seize upon its very real potential to improve the lives of everyone. K-12 is obviously a work in progress that will go through many changes as it is implemented. Top-down planning will invariably be reshaped and modified by bottom-up concerns and existing practices of teaching and learning. What remains imperative is that we provide our youth with all the skills they need, especially education, to prepare them to live meaningful and productive lives. This means, among other things, preparing for the constantly changing demands of the workplace. But they should also be able to question those changes and craft

alternatives for a better world. There are many problems to be fixed in education and we should pursue these solutions with zeal. To do so means dealing with the many challenges of K-12 rather than simply putting them on hold.”

The highest mean is obtained “expectations from community” under community-related factors with a mean of 3.00 or much affect in description. Among teachers, there are deep-seated anxieties about the new duties expected of them. DepEd has been conducting numerous teacher training to address these concerns, but there is a sense that things remain confused and unsettled. Most likely, uneasiness and suspicion among teachers will linger until the new system is in place and they have a chance to actually work through it and make the needed adjustments. In addition, there still remains the problem of language: what to do with Filipino, how to sustain its place in the curriculum, and what will the changes mean for teaching the language in colleges and universities? For that matter, has the English curriculum been chosen in haste, as some critics allege? What of the adequacy and quality of some of our textbooks and instructional materials? Can schools coordinate better to strengthen job placement for their students?

The second highest mean of 2.77 or much affect is “Specialized training” under teacher-related factor. This is due to the fact that even though most of the teachers have attended seminars and training, most of them still lack the necessary skill to equip them with tool of competence and efficiency.

The third highest mean of 2.64 or much affect is “Work loads” under teacher-related factor. The result is not surprising because only few teachers are hired for grade 11 and 12 and they have to teach all the subjects for the two grades. Teachers for senior high school to be deployed for grade 12 are still to be hired this year. Moreover, due to lack of teachers in the senior high school, teachers in the junior high are required to get some subjects.

The lowest means of 1.00 or not affect are obtained by “class size” under school-related factor, “peace and order situation” under community-related factors and “school-community relations” under related-factors. With respect to class size, this is due to the fact that it is innate among teachers to be flexible and versatile at every given situation. With respect to peace and order situation, this is due to the fact that most of the schools there are police men who are deployed in the areas. With respect to school-community relations, this is due to the fact that there is active involvement of parents in the academic of the students and matters affecting the schools through Parents Teachers Association.

The extent by which the factors affect the preparedness of the respondents in the implementation of Grade 11 and 12 along the moderator variable of Strand

Table 10. *Extent by which Factors Affect the Preparedness of the Respondents in the Implementation of Senior High School*

Strand/Track	Mean	Description	Rank
ABM	2.16	MoA	1
STEM	1.64	LA	3
TVL	1.89	MoA	2
GAS	1.48	LA	4
TOTAL	1.79	MoA	

As shown on the table, the ABM obtained the highest mean of 2.16 or moderately affect followed by the TVL with 1.89 or moderately affect, then the STEM with 1.64 or less affect, and the GAS with 1.48 or less affect in description.

The highest mean of 2.16 or moderately affect is obtained by the group of ABM. This is due to the fact that most of the teachers teaching in the ABM area lack the academic requirements, training and seminars to be competent in the field.

The lowest mean of 1.48 or less affect is obtained by the group of GAS. This is due to the fact that most of the teachers are well versed with general academic subjects.

Table 11. *The summary of ANOVA as to Strand or Track*

Source of variance	Sum of square	Df	Mean square	F-ratio
Between groups	2.288	3	.763	
Within groups	1.396	35	.040	19.118
Total	3.684	38		

F.05=.001

Decision: significant/ Ho Rejected

The table shows that the computed F-ratio of 19.118 is higher than the Tabular F-ratio of .001 at .05 level of significance. This implies that there are significant differences on the extent by which the factors affect the preparedness of the respondents in the implementation of Grade 11 and 12 as to strand or track.

The null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents on the extent by which the factors affect their preparedness in the implementation of Grade 11 and 12 as to strand or track is therefore rejected.

The extent by which the factors affect the perceptions of the respondents on their preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School as to Educational attainment.

Table 12. *Extent of Factors Affect the Preparedness of the Respondents in the Implementation of Senior High School as to Educational Attainment*

Educational attainment	Mean	Description	Rank
Bachelors Degree	2.30	MoA	1
Master's Degree	1.68	MoA	3
With Doctoral Units	1.40	LA	4
With masters unit	1.79	MoA	2
Total	1.79	MoA	

As shown on the table, those with degree obtained the highest mean with 2.30 or moderately affect followed by those with masters units with a mean of 1.79 or moderately affect, then those with masters degree with a mean of 1.68 or moderately affect and those with doctoral units with a mean of 1.40 or less affect in description.

This only means that those who have attained a higher education are less affected with the factors in their preparedness for the implementation of the K to 12 program simply because they have a wider and longer experience in the educational setting hence they are much prepared to every problem that may affect their teaching career.

Those with bachelors degree obtained the highest mean because of their shorter exposure in school matters and they still lack the necessary trainings and seminars.

Table 13. *Summary of ANOVA as to Educational Attainment*

Source of variance	Sum of Square	df	Mean square	F-ratio
Between groups	3.136	3	1.045	
Within groups	.549	35	.016	66.69
Total	3.684	38		

F .05=.001

decision: significant/ Ho Rejected

The table shows that the computed F-ratio of 66.69 is higher than the Tabular F-ratio of .001 at .05 level of significance. This implies that there are significant differences on the extent by which the factors affect the perceptions of the respondents on their preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School as to educational attainment.

The null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences on the perceptions of the respondents on the extent by which the factors affect their preparedness in the implementation of Grade 11 and 12 as to strand or track is therefore rejected.

The extent by which the factors affect the perceptions of the respondents on their preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School along years in teaching.

Table 14. *Extent by which the Factors Affect the Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School along the moderator variable of Teaching Experience*

Teaching experience	Mean	Description	rank
1-5 yrs.	2.32	MoA	1
6-10 yrs.	1.68	MoA	3
11-15 yrs.	1.90	MoA	2
16-20 yrs.	1.27	LA	4
TAWM	1.79	MoA	

As shown on the table, those with 21 and above years of experience obtained the highest mean of 2.32 or moderately affect followed by those with 11-15 years of experience with a mean of 1.90 or moderately affect in description. Those with 6-10 years of experience ranked third with 1.68 or moderately affect in description. Those with 1-5 years of experience obtained the lowest of 1.27 or less affect in description.

The length of service group 16-20 respondents have the highest perception because of their longer exposure with school matters and add to that the seminars, trainings and orientations they have attended. Their experience brought them to a higher degree in knowing everything in the school than those who have stayed shorter in the school.

Veterans, according to business leaders interviewed for the report, offer versatility: They're accustomed to uniform policies and structure, but can adapt to dynamic workplace situations. Vets tend to boast leadership and teamwork skills that outpace those of their civilian counterparts, and they're often more loyal as well. "Veterans are committed to the organizations they work for," the report notes, "which can translate into longer tenure (www.theguardian.com).

Table 15. *Summary of ANOVA along Teaching Experience*

Source of variance	Summary of square	df	Mean square	F-ratio
Between groups	2.388	3	.796	
Within groups	1.296	35	.037	21.487
Total	3.684	38		

F.05= .001 decision: significant/ Ho Rejected

The computation yielded an F-ratio of 21.487 which is higher than the F tabular value of .001 at .05 level of significance. This means that there are significant differences in the perceptions of the respondent on the extent by which the factors affect their preparedness in the implementation of Grade 11 and 12 along the moderator variable of teaching experience.

The null hypothesis which states that there are significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents on the extent by which the factors affect their preparedness in the implementation of senior mhigh school along teaching experience is therefore rejected.

Degree of seriousness of Problems Affecting the Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School

Table 16. *Degree of Seriousness of Problems Affecting the Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School*

Indicators	3 VS	2 MS	1 LS	AWM
A. Administration-Related problem				
C. 1.School Policies are not clear	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (39)	1.00
2.poor Administration-subordinate relationship	1 (3)	3 (6)	35 (35)	1.13
3.poor School-community relations	3 (9)	6 (12)	30 (30)	1.31
4.Lack of support from administrators	5 (15)	4 (8)	30 (30)	1.36
5.Lack of Consistency of supervisors	0 (0)	9 (18)	30 (30)	1.23
6. Extreme Leadership styles	9 (27)	20 (40)	10 (10)	1.97
Sub Mean				1.33
B. Teacher-Related problem				
1.Class schedule is not conducive to learning	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (39)	1.00
2.Lack of support from school heads	1 (3)	2 (4)	36 (36)	1.10
3.Class size is too big	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (39)	1.00
4.Lack of knowledge to ICT	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (39)	1.00
5.Lack of relevant seminars and trainings	2 (6)	6 (12)	31 (31)	1.26
6.Lack of understanding of the curriculum	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (39)	1.00
Sub Mean				1.06
C. Community-Related problem				
1.High Expectations of community	3 (9)	33 (66)	3 (3)	1.23
2.Peace and order situation	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (39)	1.00
3.Attitudes of Parents	3 (9)	3 (6)	3 (3)	1.23
Sub Mean				1.15
D. Student- Related Problem				
1. Different Attitudes and interests	0 (0)	39 (78)	0 (0)	2.00
2.Absenteeism and tardiness	4	0	35	1.21

	(12)	(0)	(35)	
3.poor Health	0	0	39	1.00
	(0)	(0)	(39)	
4.Poor Study Habits	0	8	31	1.21
	(0)	(16)	(31)	
5.Poor Comprehension skills	0	4	35	1.10
	(0)	(8)	(35)	
Sub Mean				1.30
E. School-Related Problem				
1. Lack of adequate learning facilities	5	2	32	1.31
	(15)	(4)	(32)	
2. Lack of Laboratory facilities and equipment	1	29	9	1.79
	(3)	(58)	(9)	
3. Lack of books and modules	2	27	10	1.79
	(6)	(54)	(10)	
4.Lack of supplementary reading materials	1	26	12	1.72
	(3)	(52)	(12)	
5.Inconvenient rooms	0	2	37	1.05
	(0)	(4)	(37)	
6.Hazardous school location	0	0	39	1.00
	(0)	(0)	(39)	
Sub Mean				1.44
TAWM				1.26

As shown on the table, the degree of seriousness of problems affecting the preparedness of the respondents in the implementation of Senior High School is less serious as evidenced by the obtained weighted mean of 1.26.

The highest mean of 2.00 of less serious is obtained by “Different Attitudes and interests” under student-related problem. This is because generally, students have different interest and aptitude in learning. The diverse personality of the students also add to the degree of seriousness of the problem.

The second highest mean of 1.97 or moderately serious is obtained by “Extreme Leadership styles” under administration-related problem. This can be attributed to the slow implementation of the programs and policies by the concerned agency. This is very much true in all government agencies of the country as reported and reflected in the corruption index of the most corrupt countries in the world.

The third highest mean of 1.77 or moderately serious are obtained by “Lack of Laboratory facilities and equipment” and “Lack of books and modules” under school-related problem. This is not surprising because this is a problem not only in the province of Kalinga but in the country as a whole.

Table 17. *Degree of Seriousness of Problems Affecting the Preparedness of Teachers in the Implementation of Senior High School as to Strand/Track*

Strand/ Track	Mean	Description	Rank
ABM	1.69	MoS	1
STEM	1.13	LS	2
TVL	1.11	LS	3
GAS	1.09	LS	4
TOTAL	1.26	LS	

Table 20. *The summary of ANOVA as to Educational Attainment*

Source of variance	Sum of square	Df	Mean square	f- ratio
Between groups	2.575	3	.858	
Within groups	.454	35	.013	66.107
Total	3.030	38		

F.05= .003

Decision: Significant/Ho Rejected

The computation yielded an F- ratio 66.107 which is higher than the tabular value of .003 at .05 level of significance. Thus the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of respondents on the degree of seriousness of problems affecting their preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School along the moderator variable of Educational attainment is rejected. This implies that there are significant differences in the perception of the respondents on the degree of seriousness of problems affecting the preparedness of the respondents in the implementation of Senior High School as to Educational attainment.

Table 21. *Degree of Seriousness of Problems Affecting the Preparedness of the Respondents in the Implementation of Senior High School as to Years in Teaching*

Teaching experience	Mean	Description	Rank
1-5 yrs.	1.73	LS	1
6-10 yrs.	1.09	LS	3
11-15 yrs.	1.15	LS	2
16-20 yrs.	1.06	MoS	4
Total	1.26	LS	

It is shown on the table that 1-5 years of experience obtained the highest average mean of 1.73 described as moderately serious. The second in ranked is obtained by teachers with 11-15 years of teaching experience with a mean of 1.15 and falls under less serious. Third in ranked is obtained by those with 6-10 years of experience with a mean of 1.09 or less serious. Those with 16-20 years of teaching experience obtained the lowest mean of 1.06 or less serious.

The length of service group 16-20 respondents have the highest perception because of their longer exposure with school matters and add to that the seminars, trainings and orientations they have attended. Their experience brought them to a higher degree in knowing everything in the school than those who have stayed shorter in the school.

Veterans, according to business leaders interviewed for the report, offer versatility: They're accustomed to uniform policies and structure, but can adapt to dynamic workplace situations. Vets tend to boast leadership and teamwork skills that outpace those of their civilian counterparts, and they're often more loyal as well. "Veterans are committed to the organizations they work for," the report notes, "which can translate into longer tenure (www.theguardian.com).

Table 22. *Summary of ANOVA as to Teaching Experience*

Source of variance	Sum of square	Df	Mean square	F-ratio
Between group	1.890	3	.630	
Within group	1.138	35	.033	19.358
Total	3.030			

F.05= .004

Decision: Significant/ Ho Rejected

The study reveals that there are significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents on the degree of seriousness of problems affecting the preparedness of teachers in the implementation of Senior

High School along the moderator variable of teaching experience. This conclusion is based on the computed F ratio of 19.358 which is much higher than the F tabular of 0.004 at .05 level of significance.

The null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences on the responses of teachers on the degree of seriousness of problems affecting the preparedness of teachers in the implementation of Senior High School along the moderator variable of teaching experience is therefore rejected.

In summary, there are significant differences found along the variables of strands or tracks, teaching experience, and as to educational attainment.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the following were formulated:

1. The level of preparedness of teachers in the implementation of Senior High School is moderate.
 - 1.1. There are significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents on the level of their preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School along strand or track, educational attainment and teaching experience.
2. The factors moderately affect the preparedness of teachers in the implementation of Senior High School.
 - 2.1. There are significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents on the extent by which the factors affect their preparedness in the implementation of Senior High School along variables of strand or track, educational attainment and teaching experience.
3. There is less degree of seriousness of problems encountered by the respondents in the implementation of Senior High School.
 - 3.1. There are significant differences in the perceptions of respondents on the degree of seriousness of problems in the implementation of Senior High School along strand or track, educational attainment and teaching experience.

References

- Action for Economic Reforms & E-NET. (2008). *Preliminary notes on FLEMMS*.
http://enetphil.org/main/images/stories/research_materials/Flemms_Notes_2008.pdf
- Anniban, C. G. (2007). *Factors affecting the performance of public high school teachers in Balbalan District, Kalinga Division* [Unpublished manuscript].
- Asian Development Bank. (1999). *Philippine education for the 21st century: The 1998 Philippine education sector study*.
- Brunello, G., Fort, M., & Weber, G. (2007, October). *For one more year with you: Changes in compulsory schooling, education and the distribution of wages in Europe* (Discussion Paper No. 3102). Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines (1987). art. XIV, §§ 1, 5.
- Cruz, I. (2010a, September 16). Mini critique: The best of times. *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=612391>
- Cruz, I. (2010b, September 23). Mini critique: Subtracting two years. *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=614393>
- Cruz, I. (2010c, September 30). Mini critique: Changing the curriculum. *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=616556>
- Cruz, I. (2010d, October 7). Mini critique: The enhanced curriculum. *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=618534>
- Cruz, I. (2010e, October 14). Mini critique: The K+12 debate. *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=620727>
- Cruz, I. (2010f, October 21). Mini critique: What is the K+12 plan? *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=622815>

- Cruz, I. (2010g, October 28). Mini critique: K+12 for the poor. *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=624807>
- Cruz, I. (2010h, November 25). Mini critique: K+12 and HEIs. *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=633259>
- Cruz, I. (2010i, December 2). Mini critique: K+12 and COCOPEA. *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=635318>
- Cruz, I. (2010j, December 9). Mini critique: Afterthoughts. *The Philippine Star*.
<http://www.philstar.com/Article.aspx?articleId=643747>
- Department of Education. (2010, November 2). *Salient points on the enhanced K+12 basic education program*.
- Education Policy and Data Center & UNESCO. (2009). *Estimating the costs of achieving education for all in low-income countries*.
- Felipe, A., & Porio, C. (2010, September). Length of school cycle and “quality of education.” *Philippine Education Research Journal*. <http://www.perj.org>
- Graduate Management News. (2005, January–February). *The Bologna Accord: A European revolution with global implications*. <http://www.gmac.com/gmac/NewsandEvents/GMNews/2005/JanFeb/>
- Hanushek, E., & Wößmann, L. (2007). *Education quality and economic growth*. World Bank.
- House of Representatives. (1991). *Congressional Commission on Philippine Education (EDCOM) report*.
- House of Representatives, 15th Congress. (n.d.). *House Bill No. 4199: An act enhancing the curriculum and increasing the number of years for basic education, appropriating funds therefor, and for other purposes*.
- International Qualifications Assessment Service. (2007). *International education guide for the assessment of education from the Philippines*. Government of Alberta.
- Manasan, R. (2011, February 17). *Equity of government spending on education and health* [Conference presentation]. 2010 Philippine Public Expenditure Review Dissemination Workshop.
- National Education For All Committee. (2006). *Functionally literate Filipinos: An educated nation. Philippine Education For All (EFA) 2015 National Action Plan*.
- National Statistics Office. (2008). *Functional Literacy, Education and Mass Media Survey (FLEMMS)*.
- Senate of the Philippines, 15th Congress. (2011a, March 31). *Committee Report No. 24 (Re: House Bill No. 3826 and Senate Bill No. 2700)*.
- Senate of the Philippines, 15th Congress. (2011b, May 5). *Committee Report No. 31 (Re: Senate Bill No. 2802)*.
- Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Center for Educational Innovation and Technology. (2011). *Content, structure, duration and adequacy of primary and secondary education in Southeast Asian countries: Preliminary findings*.
- Tan, E. (2011, January 26). *The challenge of K-12* [Forum presentation]. Instituting Reforms: A Forum on the K+12 Program.
- Teves, G., et al. (2011, January–February). K+12 in focus: A look at the Aquino administration’s flagship program in basic education. *Educator Magazine*.
- UNESCO. (2004). *Education for all global monitoring report 2005: The quality imperative*.
- UNESCO. (2010). *EFA global monitoring report 2010: Reaching the marginalized*.