



RESEARCH ARTICLE

TAXONOMY OF SOCIAL ACCEPTABILITY INDICATORS FOR K TO 12  
BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

<sup>1,\*</sup>Rosenda B. Borres and <sup>2</sup>Daisy P. Ruiz

<sup>1</sup>Extension Coordinator, Jose Rizal Memorial State University, Dipolog City, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>College of Arts and Sciences, Jose Rizal Memorial State University, Dipolog City, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 29<sup>th</sup> December, 2017  
Received in revised form  
29<sup>th</sup> January, 2018  
Accepted 12<sup>th</sup> February, 2018  
Published online 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2018

Key words:

Social Acceptability, K to R Basic  
Education Program Taxonomy,  
Indicators, Curriculum.

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to find out the taxonomy of social acceptability indicators for K to 12 Program. The descriptive survey design utilizing a questionnaire-checklist was used in the study. The respondents of the study were teachers and parents of selected Public Elementary Schools in the three districts of Zamboanga del Norte during the School Year 2015 – 2016. There were 240 teacher-respondents and 240 parent-respondents employed in the study. Out of 240 respondents, 80 were taken in every district. The statistical tools used in the study were the frequency and percentage count. The study revealed that the teachers and parents have different views regarding the taxonomy of social acceptability indicators of K to 12 Program with respect to pupil development, teachers' preparedness, curriculum relevance and material resources. This implies that they have different priorities and level of acceptance of the program. The most encountered problems in the implementation of K to 12 Program were in sufficient facilities and equipment and lack of awareness among parents. It is recommended that additional classrooms should be built for accommodation of incoming bulk of students. Parents should be well-informed on the implementation for K to 12 Curriculum to make them aware of the quality of education being given to their children. Adequate physical facilities should be provided in the implementation of K to 12 Curriculum for better teaching-learning process.

Copyright © 2018, Rosenda B. Borres and Daisy P. Ruiz. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Rosenda B. Borres and Daisy P. Ruiz, 2018. "Taxonomy of social acceptability indicators for k to 12 basic education program", *International Journal of Current Research*, 10, (03), 67278-67282.

INTRODUCTION

K-12 is a new curriculum that covers kindergarten and twelve years of senior high school (six years of primary education, four years of junior high school and two years of senior high school). This seeks to develop a progressive, just and humane society. Luistro (2011) said that the K to 12 promises to give students more time to master competencies and skills yet it is highly doubtful that students will master anything given the lacks of the education sector. Kindergarten has now been integrated into the basic education system to ensure that all grade I pupils are ready for academic learning. From kindergarten to Grade III, the mother tongue will be the medium of instruction. This includes the following: Tagalog, Kapampangan, Pangasinense, Ilokano, Cebuano, Hiligaynon, Waray, Tausug and Chabakano. It is believed that language plays a strategic role in shaping the formative years of learners. So, when instruction is delivered in languages understood by learners, the teacher-learning process is effective. Children who complete standard-based kindergarten program

will be better prepared for primary education. Gatmaitan said that in education lies the future of a society; it is appropriate then that the students be educated properly, because their individuals' as well societal growth depends in it. The additional two years (Grade 11 and 12) or the senior high school will allow students to choose among academic, technical-vocational or sports and art tracks depending on their interest, the community needs, and the results of skills assessment. The senior high school will allow mastery of core competencies for lifelong learning and preparedness for work, higher education, middle-level skills development or entrepreneurship. Based on DepEd findings, the Philippines have not met the standards required of students to compete on an international level. Our country ranks lowest in Mathematics and Science in international test such as 2003 TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study). The low achievement scores of the Filipino students can be attributed to the poor quality of basic education in our schools, more especially because the current basic education designed as a 12-year curriculum is delivered in just 10 years. The K-12 curriculum will provide sufficient time for mastery of concepts and skills develop lifelong learners and prepare graduates for tertiary education, middle-level skills development, employment and entrepreneurship. Moreover, Del Mundo,

\*Corresponding author: Rosenda B. Borres,  
Extension Coordinator, Jose Rizal Memorial State University,  
Dipolog City, Philippines.

(2006) said that teacher training and hiring current DepEd teachers will be retained to meet the content and performances standards of the new K to 12 curriculum. The researchers' motivation to conduct this study is conceived with the aim of finding out the taxonomy of social acceptability indicators of teachers and parents on the K to 12 program's implementation since these two sectors are directly affected by it. Also knowing the extent of the K to 12 program's implementation and how its implementers take part in the said implementation.

### Conceptual/Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on the Instructional Theory that offers explicit guidance on how to better help people learn and develop. Instructional theories focus on how to structure material for promoting the education of human beings, particularly youth. Originating in the United States in the late 1970s, this theory is typically influenced by three general influences in educational thought: the behaviorist, the cognitive, and the constructivist schools of thought. Instructional theory is heavily influenced by the 1956 work of Benjamin Bloom, a University of Chicago professor, and the results of his Taxonomy of Education Objectives — one of the first modern codifications of the learning process. One of the first instructional theorists was Robert M. Gagne, who in 1965 published *Conditions of Learning* for the Florida State University's Department of Educational Research. Instructional theory is the potential of learning objects to deliver content. A stand-alone educational animation is an example of learning object that can be re-used as the basis for different learning experience.

### Research Design and Method

The study utilized the descriptive survey design utilizing a questionnaire-checklist. The questionnaire consisted items on the taxonomy of social acceptability indicators for K to 12 Program as perceived by teachers and parents with respect to pupil development, teacher's preparedness, curriculum relevance and material resources.

The respondents of the study were teachers and parents of selected Public Elementary Schools in the three districts of Zamboanga del Norte during the School Year 2015 – 2016. There were 240 teacher-respondents and 240 parent-respondents employed in the study. Out of 240 respondents, 80 were taken in every district. They were chosen through random sampling. The statistical tools used in the study were the frequency and percentage count.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 showed that the teachers in the three districts have the same views on the social acceptability indicators of K to 12 Program with respect to pupil development. This implies that their responses go along with TESDA's Agenda that right after they have completed the needed competencies they will acquire certificate of competency. Meanwhile, parents and teachers do differ on social acceptability on K to 12 Program in terms of pupil development. This implies that parent-respondents are precised with developing the skills and competencies of their children while the teacher-respondents are particular in the pupils' acquisition of certificate of competency. This finding corroborates the study of Forbes (2012) which stressed that with K to 12, students are given opportunity to acquire Certificates of Competency and National Certificates in accordance with TESDA training regulations thus allowing graduates to have middle level skills which will offer them better opportunities to be gainfully employed. Table 2 shows the social acceptability indicators for K to 12 Program with respect to teachers' preparedness. The findings showed that teacher-respondents are concerned with developing their professional attributes while parent-respondents are concerned on the outputs of the teachers after attending the trainings/seminars. This implies that the perceptions of the teacher-respondents are positive that the program will be effective in achieving its goals. Since the teachers are the ones who will receive trainings on the additional two years of the curriculum.

**Table 1. Taxonomy of Social Acceptability Indicators for K to 12 Program in Terms of Pupil Development**

A. Pupil Development	Teachers			Parents		
	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
1. The pupils find K-12 program more enjoyable and fulfilling.	60 (75%)	73 (91%)	57 (71%)	48 (60%)	52 (65%)	38 (48%)
2. The pupils will be given sufficient knowledge can easily get their job without going to college.	51 (64%)	70 (88)	61 (76%)	43 (54%)	56 (70%)	49 (61%)
3. The pupils find K-12 program more challenging.	50 (62%)	68 (85%)	48 (60%)	29 (36%)	47 (59%)	34 (42%)
4. The pupils will have enough learning resources in line with their skills and competencies.	66 (82%)	73 (91%)	64 (80%)	47 (59%)	51 (64%)	40 (50%)
5. The pupils will be more prepared for work and college life.	65 (81%)	75 (94%)	60 (75%)	35 (44%)	58 (72%)	40 (40%)
6. The pupils will finish senior high school even with the additional cost.	61 (76%)	76 (95%)	64 (80%)	26 (32%)	43 (54%)	38 (48%)
7. The pupils will acquire certificate of competency.	78 (98%)	79 (99%)	71 (89%)	46 (58%)	61 (76%)	47 (59%)
8. The pupils will develop self-reliance and confidence in their actions.	58 (72%)	64 (80%)	55 (69%)	31 (39%)	50 (62%)	36 (45%)
9. The pupils will have enough learning resources in line with their skills and competencies.	54 (68%)	62 (78%)	58 (72%)	46 (58%)	53 (66%)	44 (55%)
10. The pupils knowledge and skills will be improved under K-12 program.	67 (84%)	74 (92%)	57 (71%)	40 (50%)	60 (75%)	52 (65%)

**Table 2. Taxonomy of Social Acceptability Indicators for K to 12 Program in Terms of Teachers Preparedness**

B. Teachers Preparedness	Teachers			Parents		
	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
1. Preparedness of teachers' attendance to national seminars on K-12.	61 (76%)	67 (84%)	60 (75%)	31 (39%)	44 (55%)	39 (49%)
2. Participation of teachers to regional trainings on K-12 program.	75 (94%)	75 (94%)	70 (88%)	39 (49%)	46 (58%)	43 (54%)
3. Attendance to local and in-house forum on K-12 for teachers.	67 (84%)	63 (79%)	68 (85%)	36 (45%)	40 (50%)	28 (35%)
4. Monitoring of teachers attendance to trainings done to check participation.	64 (80%)	66 (82%)	60 (75%)	28 (35%)	33 (41%)	34 (42%)
5. Performance evaluation of teachers during the training on K-12.	66 (82%)	69 (86%)	68 (85%)	41 (51%)	58 (72%)	45 (56%)
6. Achievement of target goals at the end of the sessions is part of the requirement.	73 (91%)	76 (95%)	71 (89%)	40 (50%)	61 (76%)	40 (50%)
7. Buddy system to monitor teachers' performance during the training is observed.	61 (76%)	63 (79%)	67 (84%)	45 (56%)	48 (60%)	43 (54%)
8. Newly-hired teachers are exposed to trainings and seminars on K-12.	73 (91%)	78 (98%)	70 (88%)	32 (40%)	60 (75%)	27 (34%)
9. Performance of teachers during the seminars and trainings are evaluated as part of their annual appraisal.	63 (79%)	69 (86%)	70 (88%)	43 (54%)	62 (78%)	47 (59%)
10. Begins and ends the seminars and trainings equipped with knowledge on K-12 program.	70 (88%)	73 (91%)	68 (85%)	35 (44%)	44 (55%)	30 (38%)

**Table 3. Taxonomy of Social Acceptability Indicators for K to 12 Program in Terms of Curriculum Relevance**

C. Curriculum Relevance	Teachers			Parents		
	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
1. Alignment of subjects in the junior high school.	62 (78%)	74 (93%)	61 (76%)	45 (56%)	49 (61%)	54 (68%)
2. Inclusion of details on a certain subject for students mastery.	67 (84%)	75 (94%)	68 (85%)	43 (54%)	41 (51%)	40 (50%)
3. Incorporation of suggestions from teachers in the introduction of new subjects.	56 (70%)	73 (91%)	64 (80%)	35 (44%)	52 (65%)	30 (38%)
4. Pilot testing of new subjects.	35 (44%)	41 (51%)	38 (48%)	25 (31%)	46 (58%)	20 (25%)
5. Gathering of flaws during instructions as the new subjects are implemented.	48 (60%)	61 (76%)	50 (62%)	28 (35%)	41 (51%)	25 (30%)
6. Assistance from master teachers on areas confusing to newly hired teachers.	53 (66%)	59 (74%)	48 (60%)	31 (34%)	39 (49%)	24 (30%)
7. Demonstration teaching of new subjects.	64 (80%)	73 (91%)	60 (75%)	36 (45%)	47 (59%)	30 (38%)
8. Creation of committee to oversee curriculum implementation.	44 (55%)	48 (60%)	45 (56%)	24 (30%)	38 (48%)	18 (22%)
9. Periodic check through observation of teachers being observed.	47 (59%)	51 (64%)	45 (56%)	36 (45%)	48 (60%)	23 (29%)
10. Thorough review of new curriculum in all year levels for mastery of all teachers.	41 (51%)	46 (58%)	70 (88%)	21 (26%)	34 (42%)	20 (25%)

This result disputes the study of Crisol, et.al (2014) where he stated that teachers are not prepared because they think they are not equipped with trainings and facilities that will make effective for the program. Table 3 presents the responses of the two groups of respondents on the social acceptability indicators for K to 12 Program with respect to curriculum relevance. The findings show that teacher-respondents are very particular with the content of the curriculum compared to parent-respondents who are concerned only with the alignment of subjects in the K to 12 Curriculum. This means that the two groups have different levels of acceptability in terms of curriculum relevance. These imply that teachers consider the bits of details in the K to 12 Curriculum and focused on the content of the curriculum while parents are concerned on the orientation of the subjects. Table 4 presents the responses of the two groups of respondents on the social acceptability indicators for K to 12 Program with respect to material resources. 1<sup>st</sup> district, 2<sup>nd</sup> district teacher-respondents and 2<sup>nd</sup> district parent-respondents

believed the importance on the evaluation of building provisions for everybody's safety compared to 3<sup>rd</sup> district teacher-respondents who believed that submission of DepEd building program to check needs of the school. The findings show that 2<sup>nd</sup> district parent-respondents considered the evaluation or the renovation of school building. On the other hand, 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> district parent-respondents said that building of more academic facilities in preparation for more incoming students. Since 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> districts are located in the far flung areas and don't have adequate infrastructure facilities to accommodate students. These implies that majority of the parent-respondents are concerned with the construction of more academic facilities while teacher-respondents are concerned with the durability of the building being built for everybody's safety. The result corroborates on the International Review of Education (Vol. 62, pp187-204) which stressed that without improvement in material and human resources, adult trainees will continue to experience difficulties integrating into the

labour market, and the cycle of poverty and social exclusion will remain unbroken. Table 5 shows the problems encountered on the implementation for K to 12 Program.

the unavailability of learning materials is just one of the problems still hounding the country's new basic education program, K to 12, in the last three years of its implementation.

**Table 4. Taxonomy of Social Acceptability Indicators for K to 12 Program in Terms of Material Resources**

D. Material Resources	Teachers			Parents		
	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
1. Additional classroom.	46 (58%)	51 (64%)	43 (54%)	21 (26%)	35 (44%)	19 (24%)
2. Inclusion of amenities of co-curricular activities.	40 (50%)	47 (59%)	41 (51%)	25 (31%)	30 (38%)	21 (26%)
3. Procurement and equipment for non-academic areas.	45 (56%)	50 (62%)	40 (50%)	23 (29%)	36 (45%)	20 (25%)
4. Adjustment of classrooms according to the needs of K-12 program.	47 (59%)	52 (65%)	45 (56%)	26 (32%)	39 (49%)	23 (29%)
5. Allocation of equipment for a particular specialization considered.	42 (52%)	49 (61%)	38 (48%)	31 (39%)	45 (56%)	29 (36%)
6. Building of more academic facilities in preparation for more incoming students.	48 (60%)	53 (66%)	45 (56%)	38 (48%)	45 (56%)	40 (50%)
7. Collaboration with local government on further repairs of old buildings.	53 (66%)	58 (72%)	50 (62%)	29 (36%)	38 (48%)	25 (31%)
8. Submission to Dep Ed building program to check needs of the school.	68 (85%)	71 (89%)	70 (88%)	33 (41%)	42 (52%)	29 (36%)
9. Provision of equipment for vocational courses so that students achieve skills at par with the world's best.	60 (75%)	73 (91%)	61 (76%)	30 (38%)	37 (46%)	25 (31%)
10. Evaluates building provisions for everybody's safety.	75 (94%)	79 (99%)	69 (86%)	33 (41%)	46 (58%)	31 (39%)

**Table 5. Problems Encountered on the Implementation of K to 12 Program**

Problems	Teachers			Parents		
	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
1. Inattentiveness of pupils	31	39	34	40	45	49
2. Pupils inappropriate behavior	20	32	38	38	40	48
3. Lack of classrooms	57	50	60	68	61	72
4. Lack of reference materials	69 <sup>(3)</sup>	57 <sup>(3)</sup>	72 <sup>(3)</sup>	76 <sup>(2,5)</sup>	67	80 <sup>(1,5)</sup>
5. Lack of pupil's participation in class Discussion	35	24	36	45	35	41
6. Absenteeism among pupils	39	29	43	40	41	45
7. Inadequate textbooks	71 <sup>(2)</sup>	60 <sup>(2)</sup>	74 <sup>(2)</sup>	71	65 <sup>(3)</sup>	74
8. Insufficient facilities and equipment	78 <sup>(1)</sup>	70 <sup>(1)</sup>	79 <sup>(1)</sup>	76 <sup>(2,5)</sup>	72 <sup>(1)</sup>	78 <sup>(3)</sup>
9. Poor study habits	41	35	46	51	41	51
10. Lack of awareness in the K to 12 Program	48	39	50	80 <sup>(1)</sup>	71 <sup>(2)</sup>	80 <sup>(1,5)</sup>

**Table 6. Summary Results on the Taxonomy of Social Acceptability Indicators for K to 12 Program**

Social Acceptability Indicators	Teachers			Parents		
	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District	1 <sup>st</sup> District	2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3 <sup>rd</sup> District
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
1. Pupil Development	61 (76%)	71 (89%)	59 (74%)	39 (49%)	53 (66%)	41 (51%)
2. Teachers Preparedness	67 (84%)	70 (88%)	67 (84%)	37 (46%)	50 (62%)	38 (48%)
3. Curriculum Relevance	52 (65%)	60 (75%)	55 (69%)	32 (40%)	44 (55%)	28 (35%)
4. Material Resources	52 (65%)	58 (72%)	50 (62%)	29 (36%)	39 (49%)	26 (32%)

Teacher-respondents have common problem encountered such as insufficient facilities and equipment as well as 2nd district parent-respondents. Meanwhile 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> district parent-respondents also have common problem encountered such as lack of awareness in the implementation of K to 12 Program. The findings showed that teacher and parent respondents differed on the problems encountered in the implementation of K to 12 Program. This implies that the burden is shouldered more on the teachers compare to parents whose concern is only on the awareness of the program. The finding corroborates the report of Legaspi (2014), GMA News where she stressed that

Table 6 shows the summary on the taxonomy of social acceptability indicators for K to 12 Program in terms of pupil development, teachers' preparedness, curriculum relevance and material resources. The findings show that the two groups of respondents have different views on the social acceptability indicators for K to 12 Program. This means that they have different priorities and level of acceptance of the program. This implies that the level of acceptance of the parent-respondents is very low as compared to the level of acceptance of the teacher-respondents with respect to the social acceptability indicators. Teachers are more focused on the teachers' preparedness while

the parents give more priority on the development of their children.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the findings, it was concluded that teachers and parents have different views regarding the social acceptability indicators for K to 12 Program. The level of acceptance of the parent-respondents is very low as compared to the level of acceptance of the teacher-respondents with respect to the social acceptability indicators. Parent-respondents are précised with developing the skills and competencies of their children while the teacher-respondents are particular in the pupils' acquisition of certificate of competency. Moreover, their concerns differ in terms of teachers' preparedness where teacher-respondents are concerned with developing their professional attributes while parent-respondents are concerned on the outputs of the teachers after attending the trainings/seminars. Teachers are focused on the content of the curriculum while parents are concerned on the orientation of the subjects. Majority of the parent-respondents are concerned with the construction of more academic facilities while teacher-respondents are concerned with the durability of the building built for everybody's safety. Lastly, the burden in the implementation of K to 12 Program is shouldered more on the teachers compare to parents whose concern is only on the lack of awareness of the program. After thorough examination of the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are given; Additional classrooms should be built for accommodation of incoming bulk of students.

Parents should be well-informed on the implementation of K to 12 Curriculum to make them aware of the quality of education being given to their children. Adequate physical facilities should be provided in the implementation of K to 12 Curriculum for better teaching-learning process.

### REFERENCES

- Bellin and Marissa, 2015. Social Acceptability of K-12 Program as Perceived by Selected by Parents and Teachers in Juan Sumolong, Elementary School, Antipolo City
- Forbes and Gilbert, 2012. Benefits of the K to 12 Program of the Department of education, DepEd-Quezon, Region IV-A International Review of Education (Vol. 62, pp187-204)
- Masing and Clara, 2012. InterAksyon.com, K to 12 Gains Acceptance.
- Quismundo and Tarra, 2012. People Changing Attitude toward K to 12- DepEd.
- Uyquiengco, Mariel. Benefits of K to 12 Curriculum for Filipino Students.
- Zellman, Gail L. *et al.*, Education Reform, International Education, Persian Gulf Region, Qatar, Teachers and Teaching, West Asia  
<http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG880.html>  
[www.ched.gov.ph](http://www.ched.gov.ph)  
[www.gov.ph/k-12](http://www.gov.ph/k-12)

\*\*\*\*\*