IGNATIAN
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH
www.icceph.com
ISSN 2984-9942

MULTIGRADE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM DELIVERY IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: BASIS FOR AN INSTRUCTIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Alexis N. Samonte, Ian F. Ganapin, Karen Z. Romero, Juliet G. Comaling, Sally S. Comaling, Bobby A. Comaling

Graduate Program Department. Del Sur Good Shepherd College Inc., Wao, Lanao del Sur, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study determined the multigrade teaching techniques and curriculum delivery in selected public elementary schools in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon, as a basis for the formulation of an instructional development program. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research approach was employed in the investigation. A total of 11 multigrade teachers were included in the study discovered through the entire enumeration of the eligible participants. Data were obtained using a standardized questionnaire. The questionnaire covered the multigrade teaching methodologies, diffusion of the curriculum, and challenges faced by the teachers. Descriptive statistics were employed to assess the respondents' profiles and their perceptions of the study variables, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was used to assess the link between multigrade teaching techniques and curriculum delivery at the 0.05 level of significance. The findings revealed that multigrade teaching approaches were implemented extremely highly with an overall mean of 3.57. Similarly, curriculum execution was rated to be fairly prominent with an overall mean of 3.42. However, the teachers considered the obstacles of multigrade teaching to be very essential, with a mean score of 3.58. The correlation analysis revealed a moderate positive correlation between multigrade teaching methods and curriculum delivery (ρ =.587). However, the relationship was not statistically significant (p =.058). Then the null hypothesis was accepted. The study findings led to the recommendation of a Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program that would enhance instructional planning, differentiated instruction, classroom management, utilization of resources, assessment methodologies, and curriculum implementation.

Keywords: *multigrade pedagogy, curriculum dissemination, multigrade facilitators, instructional techniques, teaching enhancement scheme*

INTRODUCTION

Multigrade education is still a main way of providing accessible and equitable elementary education in physically remote, sparsely populated, and neglected areas. This is when a teacher handles two or more grade levels in one classroom and delivers learning competencies to learners who have different stages of development, abilities, and instructional needs at the same time. This enables schools to provide elementary instruction in localities where there are not sufficient pupils to form separate monograde classes. It also requires teachers to manage multiple learning activities, routines, the distribution of instructional time, and assessment of learners at different grade levels. The quality of multigrade education depends on the availability of teachers and classrooms, the appropriateness of the teaching methods, and the effective delivery of the required curriculum.

The Multigrade Program in Philippine Education is determined by the Department of Education (DepEd) of the Philippines. It was initiated to provide quality primary education, especially to the children of remote and poor areas. DepEd Order on the organization and operation of multigrade classes: Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 96, s. 1997, in response to the need for complete elementary grade levels in localities where establishing separate classes may not be feasible. DepEd Order No. 81, s. 2009, emphasized the development of multigrade implementation through teachers' training, instructional assistance, and regular monitoring (DepEd, 2009). The program was also supported by DepEd Order No. 63, s. 2010, which improved the learning settings, procured instructional materials, and conducted professional development for teachers and school heads (DepEd, 2010). The regulations indicate that a multigrade education is effective when classroom instruction, learning resources, teacher training, and school-level support are integrated.

Even with such government initiatives, the implementation of the curriculum in the multigrade classroom nevertheless remains troublesome. Teachers must design lessons that teach competencies for different grade levels, pick activities that can be taught simultaneously, provide differentiated assignments, and supervise students who may be working independently while instruction is delivered to another group. Bongala et al. 2020). In Albay, Philippines, multigrade teachers employed tactics such as presenting a topic at several levels of difficulty, autonomous work while attending to another grade, and peer tutoring. However, there were also concerns found in lesson preparation, teaching emphasis, teaching materials, and, importantly, the absence of competency in teaching multigrade courses. Similarly, Naparan and Alinsug (2021) revealed that the multigrade teachers' classroom methods in a distant district in Zamboanga del Sur included classroom management, collaborative learning, differentiated instruction, real-life linkages, and flexible teaching strategies. The findings suggest that the multigrade

teaching has to be prepared properly and flexible classroom management strategies need to be adopted to meet the various requirements of the learners.

One of the fundamental features of multigrade education is differentiated instruction. In one classroom, there are learners of different grade levels; therefore, teachers need to adjust the content, activities, learning resources, and assessment tasks to suit the abilities and learning needs of each group. Differentiated instruction in Philippine multigrade classrooms is the preparation and delivery of lessons and management of classrooms that are responsive to the diversity of learners (Bunga et al., 2025). Similarly, Bunga (2025) developed and validated a performance appraisal tool to measure the teacher's ability in differentiated teaching in the Philippine multigrade settings. These findings highlight the necessity for teachers to be proficient in planning and implementing a suitable instructional method rather than employing one teaching activity for all grades.

Another big problem in multigrade education is the delivery of the content. This implies that the curricular requirements and learning abilities are infused in planned, meaningful, and developmentally appropriate classroom instructions. It is important that teachers ensure that the skills required for each grade are taught, that the course is delivered in a consistent way, that learners are given sufficient opportunities to practice, and that their progress is monitored. Monitoring and evaluation of program implementation are important for the improvement of multigrade education (Department of Education [DepEd], United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF], & Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Center for Educational Innovation and Technology [SEAMEO INNOTECH], 2020). This approach is why we need to look not only at the teaching methods that instructors use but also at how they enact curriculum mandates.

Good multigrade teaching, the use of appropriate strategies and ongoing professional development are important, a recent study highlights. Ares-Ferreirós et al. (2025) carried out a large cross-national study on the effect of teacher preparation, classroom environment, school community and instructional practices on the teaching of multi-grade classes. They found that multigrade classrooms encourage inclusion, cooperative learning and contextualization of curriculum. However, they do require special teacher training and the necessary support measures. "Issues faced by multigrade teachers in the Philippines include student diversity, workload, and insufficient teaching/learning materials" (Bunglay & Cutab, 2025). They discovered opportunities for collaborative learning, flexible teaching and formative assessment. The results imply that teachers need to know the ways and resources of multigrade education to teach the curriculum effectively.

The literature has examined multigrade teaching strategies, teacher experiences, differentiated instruction, and implementation challenges, but there is a need for localized evidence that explores the relationship between teachers' instructional practices and curriculum delivery in specific rural school contexts. Results of other districts and places provide vital insights, but their conclusions may not reflect the real picture of the

instructional environment, available resources, and professional support systems in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon. In particular, the extent to which teachers engage in instructional planning, differentiated instruction, classroom organization, the use of learning resources and assessment practices, and the extent to which curriculum delivery is evident can provide a more contextual basis for instructional improvement.

This requirement becomes more pressing in rural and physically remote school communities that continue to rely on multigrade settings to provide access to basic education for learners. In these scenarios, teachers are expected to teach grade-level learning skills but also meet the instructional needs of the children in one classroom. So it is necessary to know the hurdles they face to recognize the need for more instructional materials, technical help, professional development, and school-centered support. Furthermore, assessing the significant association between multigrade teaching practices and curriculum delivery may provide empirical data for the development of suitable interventions, without suggesting that one variable causes changes in the other.

The study, along the lines of the aforementioned issues, examined the multigrade teaching practices and curriculum delivery of selected public primary schools in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon. The study focused on teachers' methods, curriculum implementation, and issues in multigrade class administration. The study also explored whether multigrade teaching approaches are significantly associated with the availability of material. The findings led to the development of a Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program targeted at strengthening instructional planning, differentiated instruction, classroom organization, usage of learning resources, assessment methodologies, and curriculum delivery. The local study is expected to provide data that can be used as a basis for instructional help and further development of multigrade elementary education.

Research Questions

This study examined multigrade instructional practices and curriculum delivery in selected public elementary schools in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon, during the School Year 2026–2027. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic and professional profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of:
   1.1. age;
      a. sex;
      b. highest educational attainment;
      c. length of teaching experience;
      d. years of experience in multigrade teaching; and
      e. current multigrade class assignment?

2. What is the extent of implementation of multigrade instructional practices in terms of:
   2.1. instructional planning and preparation;
      a. differentiated instruction;
      b. classroom organization and management;
      c. utilization of instructional materials and learning resources; and
      d. assessment and monitoring of learner progress?
3. What is the extent to which curriculum delivery is evident in terms of:
   3.1. curriculum planning and alignment;
      a. implementation of learning competencies;
      b. instructional strategies and learning activities;
      c. management and allocation of instructional time; and
      d. assessment and provision of feedback?
4. Is there a significant relationship between multigrade instructional practices and curriculum delivery?
5. What challenges are encountered by multigrade teachers in terms of:
   5.1. instructional and curriculum-related challenges;
      a. classroom management and assessment challenges; and
      b. resources and professional support challenges?
6. What instructional enhancement program may be proposed based on the findings of the study?

Null Hypothesis

H_0: There is no statistically significant relationship between multigrade instructional practices and curriculum delivery among public elementary school teachers handling multigrade classes in Kibawe East District, Division of Bukidnon.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A quantitative descriptive correlational research design was used in the study to assess the multigrade teaching practices and curriculum delivery in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon. The descriptive method was used to determine the degree of implementation of multigrade teaching strategies, evidence of curriculum implementation, and challenges encountered by multigrade teachers. The association between multigrade teaching methods and content delivery was investigated using a correlational method.

The selected research methodology was appropriate for the study designed to describe the prevailing instructional practices and curriculum delivery conditions and to ascertain the degree of relationship between the two variables without manipulating or controlling the respondents' instructional conditions. The study aimed to examine the variables as they naturally occurred in the schools being investigated.

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in the Schools Division of Bukidnon, Kibawe East District, specifically in five public elementary schools with multigrade classes. Elementary schools were found at Silahis, Kisurang, Bagong Silang, Mascariñas, and Kisawa.

The schools are rural and use multigrade instruction for the elementary education of pupils of different grade levels. In these schools the teachers have two or more grades in the same room. This situation involves addressing varying learning capabilities, implementing diverse teaching activities, and meeting the needs of learners with different educational requirements. The district focused on examining curricular delivery, instructional strategies, and the challenges associated with multigrade teaching.

Respondents and Sampling Technique

The respondents were the 11 public elementary school teachers handling multigrade classes in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon, during the period of the study. The total enumeration sample was used, as all the teachers who met the inclusion requirement of actively teaching multigrade courses in the district were included as respondents. Therefore, the 11 teachers were not a sample from a larger population but the complete number of multigrade teachers in Kibawe East District.

The respondents were distributed across the five participating public elementary schools as follows:

Participating School	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Silahis Elementary School	*2*	*18.18%*
Kisurang Elementary School	*4*	*36.36%*
Bagong Silang Elementary School	*3*	*27.27%*
Mascariñas Elementary School	*1*	*9.09%*
Kisawa Elementary School	*1*	*9.09%*
Total	***11***	***100.00%***

The demographic and professional characteristics of the respondents, including age, sex, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, years of multigrade teaching experience, and current multigrade class assignment, are presented in the Results section.

Research Instrument

Data was collected mainly through a structured questionnaire administered by the researcher. The data collected included the demographic and professional profile of the respondents, multigrade education, curriculum delivery, and challenges of multigrade teaching. The questionnaire was reviewed by experts for its usefulness, clarity and relevance to the objectives of the study.
The questionnaire consisted of four parts.

Part I. Demographic and Professional Profile. This section gathered information about the respondents' age, sex, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, years of experience in multigrade teaching, and current multigrade class assignment.

Part II. Multigrade Instructional Practices. This section consisted of 20 statements grouped into five dimensions, with four statements for each dimension:

1. Instructional planning and preparation;
2. Differentiated instruction;
3. Classroom organization and management;
4. Utilization of instructional materials and learning resources; and
5. Assessment and monitoring of learner progress.

Responses were rated using a four-point Likert scale:

Rating	*Verbal Interpretation*
4	Very Highly Implemented
3	Highly Implemented
2	Moderately Implemented
1	Slightly Implemented

Part III. Curriculum Delivery. This section consisted of 15 statements grouped into five dimensions, with three statements for each dimension:

1. Curriculum planning and alignment;
2. Implementation of learning competencies;
3. Instructional strategies and learning activities;
4. Management and allocation of instructional time; and
5. Assessment and provision of feedback.

Responses were rated using a four-point scale:

Rating	*Verbal Interpretation*
4	Very Highly Evident
3	Highly Evident
2	Moderately Evident
1	Slightly Evident

Part IV. Challenges Encountered in Multigrade Instruction. This section consisted of 10 statements grouped into three dimensions:

1. Instructional and curriculum-related challenges, consisting of four statements;
2. Classroom management and assessment challenges, consisting of three statements; and
3. Resources and professional support challenges, consisting of three statements.

Responses were rated using a four-point scale:

Rating	*Verbal Interpretation*
4	Very Serious Challenge
3	Serious Challenge
2	Minor Challenge
1	Not a Challenge

.

The questionnaire had five parts. Part I gathered demographic and professional profile information from the respondents. Parts II, III, and IV comprised 45 rating statements. Part V, which was meant for extracting data on academic performance, was excluded from analysis because the present study focused on teacher-reported instructional practices, curriculum delivery, and challenges faced in multigrade teaching.

The interpretation of the computed means followed the following ranges:

Weighted Mean Range	***Part II: Instructional Practices***	***Part III: Curriculum Delivery***	***Part IV: Challenges***
3.26–4.00	Very Highly Implemented	Very Highly Evident	Very Serious Challenge
2.51–3.25	Highly Implemented	Highly Evident	Serious Challenge
1.76–2.50	Moderately Implemented	Moderately Evident	Minor Challenge
1.00–1.75	Slightly Implemented	Slightly Evident	Not a Challenge

Data-Gathering Procedure

The researcher obtained the necessary approvals from the appropriate authorities and the consent of all multigrade instructors who participated in the study. The 11 respondents in the five public elementary schools were given the verified questionnaires by the researcher directly.

The respondents were informed of the goal of the study and given advice on how to fill the questionnaire so as to enable them to give relevant and comprehensive answers. The respondents were given enough time to respond to the questionnaire with their real-life experiences and practices in teaching multigrade classes.

After all questions were completed, the instruments were collected by the researcher himself. The replies were allocated to the four sections of the questionnaire and were coded and checked for completeness and consistency. The data obtained were pooled, tabulated, and analyzed statistically. Comments were evaluated as a whole to determine trends in the respondents' views on multigrade teaching approaches, curriculum delivery, and obstacles experienced.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data gathered were analyzed by appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical techniques according to the objectives of the study.

Frequency and Percentage. Descriptive statistical techniques were used to describe the demographic and professional characteristics of the respondents in terms of sex, highest educational attainment, period of teaching experience, years of experience in multigrade teaching, and their current assignments in multigrade classes. They also illustrated the distribution of replies in the five schools concerned.

Mean and Standard Deviation. Data were analyzed in terms of metrics to measure the degree of multigrade instructional processes, degree of curriculum implementation, and incidence of problems encountered by multigrade teachers. The mean was the average replies for each dimension and total variable, while the standard deviation showed the degree of diversity in the respondents' ratings. They report standard deviations of mean scores for dimensions or composites at the respondent level.

Spearman's rho (Spearman's correlation coefficient) and Inferential statistics were used to determine the direction and intensity of the relationship between curriculum delivery and multigrade teaching strategies. The ordinal character of the Likert scale responses and the very low number of participants complicated the analysis. The test was done at the 0.05 level of significance. The computed probability value was compared with the given level of significance for acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study sought to identify the multigrade teaching practices and the curriculum delivery of the teachers of the public elementary schools in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon. The study included all 11 teachers who teach multi-grade classes in a district with five public primary schools. It emphasized instructional planning and preparation; instructional strategies and practices; classroom organization and management; instructional materials and learning resources; and evaluation and monitoring of learner growth. The report also addressed curriculum development and alignment, delivery of learning skills, instructional approaches and learning activities, instructional time management and allocation, and the provision of assessment and feedback. It also looked at the issues that multigrade instructors encounter in instruction and curriculum, classroom management and assessment, and resources and professional support.

Findings are based on the experiences and stated practices of all the multigrade teachers in Kibawe East District. All multigrade teachers were included; therefore, the findings are representative of the whole multigrade teaching population in the district at the time of the study. However, the results cannot be extrapolated to multigrade instructors in other school divisions/districts. The data were collected via a standardized self-report questionnaire and therefore reflect the perceptions and judgments of the respondents and not independent observations of the classroom or real evaluations of student achievement. The correlational analysis was about the relationship between multigrade teaching styles and curriculum delivery and not the cause and effect relationship. In addition, the data gave rise to the proposed Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program, which was not executed and evaluated for its effectiveness as part of the study.

RESULTS

This section presents the findings of the study on multigrade teaching approaches and curriculum delivery in selected public elementary schools in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon. It presents the demographic and professional profiles of the respondents, the amount of implementation of multigrade instructional techniques, the obvious extent of curriculum delivery, the relationship between the two primary study variables, and the problems encountered by multigrade teachers. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient.

Table 1. Demographic and Professional Profile of the Multigrade Teachers

Profile	*Category*	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Sex	Male	4	36.36%
	Female	7	63.64%
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor's degree	6	54.55%
	Bachelor's degree with Master's units	4	36.36%
	Master's degree	1	9.09%
Teaching Experience	1–5 years	4	36.36%
	6–10 years	5	45.45%
	11–15 years	2	18.18%
Multigrade Teaching Experience	Less than 1 year	2	18.18%
	1–5 years	3	27.27%
	6–10 years	5	45.45%
	11–15 years	1	9.09%
Current Multigrade Class Assignment	Grades 1–2	2	18.18%
	Grades 3–4	3	27.27%
	Grades 5–6	6	54.55%
Total		*11*	*100.00%*

Note. The respondents' ages ranged from 25 to 40 years, with a mean age of 32.82 years and a standard deviation of 4.38.

Table 1 presents the demographic and professional profile of the 11 multigrade teachers involved in the research. Among the responders, 63.64% were females and 36.36% were males. In terms of educational achievement, six (54.55%) had bachelor's degrees, four (36.36%) had bachelor's degrees completed with master's units, and one (9.09%) had a master's degree.

45.45% of the responders (n=5) had 6-10 years, 36.36% (n=4) had 1-5 years, and 18.18% (n=2) had 11-15 years of teaching experience. Furthermore, 5 responders (45.45%) had 6-10 years of multigrade teaching experience, 3 (27.27%) had 1-5 years, 2 (18.18%) had less than one year, and 1 (9.09%) had 11-15 years. With regard to the

present class level they were teaching, six (54.55%) were teaching Grades 5-6, three (27.27%) were teaching Grades 3-4, and two (18.18%) were teaching Grades 1-2.

Table 2. Extent of Implementation of Multigrade Instructional Practices

Dimensions	***Mean***	***SD***	***Interpretation***	
Instructional planning and preparation	3.59	0.20	Very Implemented	Highly
Differentiated instruction	3.55	0.29	Very Implemented	Highly
Classroom organization and management	3.57	0.32	Very Implemented	Highly
Utilization of instructional materials and learning resources	3.57	0.32	Very Implemented	Highly
Assessment and monitoring of learner progress	3.59	0.30	Very Implemented	Highly
Overall Mean	***3.57***	***0.23***	***Very Implemented***	***Highly***

Note. Scale interpretation: 3.26–4.00 = Very Highly Implemented; 2.51–3.25 = Highly Implemented; 1.76–2.50 = Moderately Implemented; 1.00–1.75 = Slightly Implemented.

Table 2. Level of Implementation of the Multigrade Instructional Practices of the Respondents The results show the total mean of 3.57 (SD = 0.23), which is assessed as Very Highly Implemented. The highest scores were for instructional planning and preparation, as well as evaluation and monitoring of learner growth, with a mean value of 3.59. Differentiated instruction had the lowest mean rating (3.55). However, all five dimensions were classified as "Very High Implementation."

Table 3. Extent to Which Curriculum Delivery Is Evident

Dimensions	***Mean***	***SD***	***Interpretation***
Curriculum planning and alignment	3.48	0.43	Very Highly Evident
Implementation of learning competencies	3.30	0.43	Very Highly Evident
Instructional strategies and learning activities	3.48	0.43	Very Highly Evident
Management and allocation of instructional time	3.30	0.38	Very Highly Evident
Assessment and provision of feedback	3.52	0.35	Very Highly Evident
Overall Mean	*3.42*	*0.33*	*Very Highly Evident*

Note. Scale interpretation: 3.26–4.00 = Very Highly Evident; 2.51–3.25 = Highly Evident; 1.76–2.50 = Moderately Evident; 1.00–1.75 = Slightly Evident.

Table 3 demonstrates the level of evidence for curriculum delivery provided by respondents. The data revealed a mean of 3.42 (SD = 0.33) in total and was regarded as Very Highly Evident. The highest mean rating was 3.52 for Assessment and provision of feedback. Mean ratings of 3.48 were given for curriculum planning and alignment, as well as instructional strategies and learning activities. The lowest mean ratings, 3.30, were

given to the execution of learning competencies and management and allocation of instructional time. All five dimensions were considered very highly evident.

Table 4. Relationship Between Multigrade Instructional Practices and Curriculum Delivery

Variables	*Spearman's rho (ρ)*	*p-value*	*Significance Level*	*Decision*	*Interpretation*
Multigrade instructional practices and curriculum delivery	0.587	0.058	0.05	Do not reject H_0	Moderate positive relationship; not statistically significant

Note. n = 11. The relationship was tested using Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient. The result is statistically significant when the p-value is less than or equal to .05.

Table 4: Relationship between multigrade instructional approaches and curriculum delivery. The analysis yielded a Spearman's rho of .587, indicating a moderate positive association between the two variables. But the p-value was found to be 0.058 which was larger than the 0.05 level of significance. The relationship was not significant and the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Table 5. Challenges Encountered by Multigrade Teachers

Dimensions	*Mean*	*SD*	*Interpretation*
Instructional and curriculum-related challenges	3.55	0.25	Very Serious Challenge
Classroom management and assessment	3.61	0.33	Very Serious Challenge
Resources and professional support	3.61	0.33	Very Serious Challenge
Overall Mean	*3.58*	*0.29*	*Very Serious Challenge*

Note. Scale interpretation: 3.26–4.00 = Very Serious Challenge; 2.51–3.25 = Serious Challenge; 1.76–2.50 = Minor Challenge; 1.00–1.75 = Not a Challenge.

Table 5: Challenges for multigrade teachers. The results indicate an overall mean score of 3.58 (SD = 0.29), which is recognized as a Very Serious Challenge. The highest average ratings were 3.61 for both classroom management and assessment, as well as for resources and professional support. Curriculum and instructional difficulties had a mean of 3.55. All three dimensions were rated as grave challenges.

The empirical basis for the proposed Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program (MIEP) was drawn from the findings of the five tables, particularly regarding improvement in instructional planning, differentiated instruction, classroom organization, utilization of learning resources, assessment practices, and curriculum delivery.

DISCUSSION

This section deals with the interpretation and analysis of the findings in relation to the research aims and associated literature. It deals with the demographic and professional profiles of the multigrade teachers, the extent of implementation of multigrade instructional techniques, the extent of curriculum delivery, the link between the two primary variables, and the problems encountered by the respondents. Similarly, the implications of the findings for the proposed Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program are examined.

1. Demographic and Professional Profile of the Multigrade Teachers

The demographic and professional profile of the respondents provides a backdrop for comprehending the implementation of multigrade instruction in Kibawe East District. The study involved all 11 teachers who taught multi-grade classrooms in the district. They are the only multigrade teachers who were surveyed for the study. Participants differed in their educational background, teaching experience, and class assignment, thus reflecting the diverse professional contexts of multigrade instruction.

The results indicated that most of the respondents were females with bachelor's degrees, and few also had master’s degrees. This means that the district team for multigrade teaching is composed of instructors with varying levels of educational preparation. Formal educational qualifications provide a framework for teaching. However, multigrade teaching demands further skills in curriculum organization, differentiated instruction, classroom management, and assessment. These traits are vital for teachers, as they should be able to cope with the demands of several grade levels in a shared classroom.

Teaching experience Teaching experience Most of the respondents have 6-10 years of general teaching experience. 6 to 10 years had been teaching multi-grade classrooms at the same proportion. It indicates that a large number of responders possess a wealth of practical experience in the management of multigrade classrooms.

However, some of the teachers have less than one year of multigrade teaching experience, which indicates the need for continuous support, especially for those who are still adjusting to the instructional demands of teaching multiple grade levels. Moreover, the experience of most respondents teaching Grades 5-6 points to the need for effective instructional planning and curricular alignment. Educators assigned to these grade levels shall provide learning activities appropriate to the capacities and objectives of each grade.

They shall provide learners with adequate instructional supervision. The results can be put in the context of the discussions on multigrade education by the Department of Education, UNICEF, and SEAMEO INNOTECH (2020), which provide a wider perspective to understand the instructional needs of multigrade schools. Similar findings on the instructional and professional needs of multigrade teachers were seen in the studies of Naparan and Alinsug (2021) and Bunga et al. (2025) in the Introduction.

The profile of the respondents shows little evidence that demographic considerations are directly altering the quality of teaching. Rather, it provides contextual information that will assist in identifying the professional development needs of the district's multigrade teaching workforce. The findings underscore the necessity for continuous capacity building programs that are sensitive to the varied experience of instructors and the demands of classrooms.

2. Extent of Implementation of Multigrade Instructional Practices

Results showed a relatively high use of multigrade instructional methods. The mean overall was 3.57. This means that, in general, the respondents reported using the instructional practices covered in the study, namely, planning and preparation, differentiated instruction, classroom organization and management, use of instructional materials and learning resources, and assessment and monitoring of learner progress.

Instructional planning and preparation, as well as evaluation and monitoring of learner improvement, were rated highest, with a mean of 3.59. The results suggested that respondents placed significant importance on the preparation of instructional activities and monitoring the academic development of learners. In multigrade classes planning is very important. Teachers need to prepare lessons and learning activities for different grade levels and ensure that the required competencies are included. Assessment is also important because it allows teachers to monitor the progress of learners and to identify areas where instruction needs to be reinforced.

Differentiated Teaching had the lowest mean rating (3.55) but still below the extremely well-implemented groups The relatively low ranking suggests that the professional development programs may be more geared toward differentiated training. Teachers at different grade levels must assign appropriate assignments for students with different skills, levels of preparation, and learning needs.

They also need to plan for some students to work independently while they teach and assist others. These results correlate well with the literature presented in the introduction, emphasizing differentiated learning and appropriate teaching methods. For more information on instructional practices and expectations for diverse teaching in multigrade contexts, see Bunga (2025) and Bunga et al. (2025). Naparan and Alinsug (2021) also add to the knowledge of the challenges and strategies in the teaching of multigrade classes. The results also show the advantages of effective teaching materials and classroom conditions. In a multigrade class, teachers should make wise use of the available materials and arrange the classroom in such a way that learning activities can be carried out simultaneously. Bunglay and Cutab (2025) serve as the basis for the discussion on the educational needs of instructors in multigrade schools. Although the aggregate result indicates a very high implementation, the findings should be understood as the reported practices of the teachers after their responses to the questionnaire. "However, the results indicate that the respondents were able to identify and report the use of the primary instructional strategies necessary in the administration

of multigrade courses. They alone are not a confirmation of the genuine quality or consistency of classroom implementation.

Results revealed a very high level of evidence in curriculum delivery with an overall mean of 3.42. Hence, it can be deduced that the respondents generally admitted to performing curriculum-related responsibilities through the planning and alignment, implementation of learning competencies, instructional techniques and activities, management of instructional time, and evaluation and feedback.

Assessment and feedback were rated the highest on average (3.52). Hence, respondents believe learners' information and remarks about their improvement to be vital. Assessment is particularly crucial in multigrade classrooms where learners may be working on multiple competencies and learning objectives simultaneously. "Positive feedback helps teachers see the learning gaps and the kind of teaching support needed for individual learners or groups at grade level.

3. Extent to Which Curriculum Delivery Is Evident

The average scores for curriculum preparation and alignment and instructional strategies and learning activities were 3.48. The data suggest that the respondents related instructional activities to curriculum demands and used learning strategies appropriate to their classroom settings. To make this curriculum work, teachers need to create courses that address the competencies of multiple grade levels while allowing enough learning opportunities for each group.

In contrast, the lowest mean rating was attained in the use of learning competencies and management and allocation of instructional time both with 3.30. These characteristics were still considered to be fairly strong, but the lower scores comparatively show areas that could use more focus. Teachers who teach more than one grade level need to be aware of scheduling time for direct instruction, independent learning activities, guided practice and assessment. They also have to make sure that the competencies required for each grade level are sufficiently covered.

These results are consistent with the broader debates on multigrade curriculum implementation and instructional needs (Ares-Ferreirós et al., 2025; Bongala et al., 2020) highlighted in the Introduction. Literature provides a background for understanding teachers' roles in arranging curriculum content and instructional activities in multigrade learning contexts.

The findings also underscore the importance of the policy and program debates presented by the Department of Education, UNICEF and SEAMEO INNOTECH (2020). Their work is a basis for understanding the importance of appropriate curriculum implementation, teacher preparation and instructional assistance in multigrade education. The findings revealed that the respondents had positive assessment of curriculum delivery in general. But the comparatively lower scores on competency implementation and instructional time management mean that teachers may need more help with

curriculum mapping, lesson sequencing and the distribution of instructional time among grade level groups.

4. Relationship Between Multigrade Instructional Practices and Curriculum Delivery

Data showed a moderate positive correlation between multigrade instructional techniques and curriculum delivery with 0.587 of Spearman's rho. The p-value calculated, however, was 0.058, which was higher than the pre-determined cut-off for significance ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, the link was not statistically significant and the null hypothesis was accepted.

The positive correlation coefficient means that there is a positive relationship between the reported multigrade instructional practices and the reported curriculum delivery among the respondents. It means that instructional preparation, differentiated instruction, organization of the classroom, utilization of learning materials and assessment methods may enhance the implementation of the curriculum-related tasks.

However, this result is not enough statistical evidence to make an inference of a significant association between the two variables at the stated level of significance. "The correlation has a positive direction and a modest amplitude, but that does not mean it is statistically significant." The association found was positive, although not statistically significant.

The research also suggests that multigrade instructional strategies and curriculum delivery should be viewed as separate but linked parts of classroom instruction. Teachers may claim that they are implementing proper teaching strategies but still feel that they are having difficulty meeting all of the curricular standards. Moreover, the delivery of the curriculum includes more duties such as the alignment of competencies, allocation of instructional time, and scheduling of learning activities across grade levels.

This is very important in view of the results in the introduction as such results of Bunga et al. (2025), Bunglay and Cutab (2025), and Naparan and Alinsug (2021). The studies give a wider outlook to the demands of multigrade teaching and the need to take into account many aspects of teaching practice.

But this correlation we observe today does not mean that changes in one variable generate changes in the other. The descriptive-correlational technique indicates the direction and intensity of the observed connection, but not evidence of causality.

In addition, all the 11 teachers teaching multigrade classes in Kibawe East District were included in the study. Therefore, the results are indicative of the multigrade teaching population of the district throughout the whole period of the study. This outcome of connection should not be simply extended to multigrade instructors in different districts or divisions.

"Findings underscore the need for improving multigrade instructional approaches and curriculum delivery through integrated professional development activities. Instructional assistance should highlight the different competencies and responsibilities involved in excellent multigrade teaching rather than assume that improvement in one will immediately lead to development in the other.

5. Challenges Encountered by Multigrade Teachers

The mean aggregate of 3.58 indicated that multigrade teachers had significant difficulties. Thus, respondents had significant difficulties in carrying out their teaching duties despite being rated very highly for curriculum delivery and instructional strategies.

The highest mean evaluations were in the areas of classroom management, assessment, resources and professional assistance (3.61). The findings suggest that the responders are concerned about the availability of adequate teaching resources and professional support, the management of students from diverse grade levels, and the assessment of their different educational needs.

The multigrade classroom presents unique challenges to classroom management because the teacher has to manage a variety of educational activities within a common classroom. They have to keep things in order, give direction, supervise the individual student work and assist pupils who need help. Assessment is particularly difficult since teachers have to manage a constrained amount of instructional time while monitoring a wide range of learning capacities and performance levels.

The high rating for resources and professional support suggests a need for high-quality instructional materials and ongoing technical support. Teachers need learning materials that are right for the grade levels and the students' needs. They also need opportunities to participate in professional development programs that address the practical issues of multigrade education.

Instructional and curriculum difficulties were also taken very seriously, with a mean of 3.55. This study shows that it is still a daunting task to organize curriculum-related activities and handle learning abilities in different levels of grades. Teachers need to be certain that each group is taught in an appropriate way and the curriculum is delivered in a continuous way.

These findings are in line with the difficulties mentioned in the Introduction concerning multigrade teaching (Ares-Ferreirós et al, 2025; Bunga, 2025; Bunga et al, 2025; Bunglay and Cutab, 2025). The evaluated material provides a framework to understand the instructional, organizational, and resource-related demands experienced by multigrade teachers.

The results also underline the importance of support and capacity building strategies suggested by the Department of Education, UNICEF and SEAMEO INNOTECH (2020). Multigrade education is more than just allocating teachers to multiple

grade levels. “We need proper learning materials and on-going professional support and proper preparation for teaching.

A key finding from the current study is that high reported implementation of instructional techniques and curriculum delivery can coexist with substantial problems, suggesting that teachers are experiencing significant challenges despite their efforts. Thus, teachers are probably doing their best to meet their teaching responsibilities despite the problems with classroom management, assessment, resources, and professional support. The identified issues should therefore be seen as priority areas for intervention, not as an indication of poor teacher commitment.

6. Implications for the Proposed Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program

The results of the study serve as an empirical basis for the Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program (MIEP) for the multigrade teachers of the Kibawe East District. The curriculum presented deals with the areas identified in the results and builds on the teaching approaches that were rated very highly.

First, there is a need to enhance curriculum mapping and collaborative instructional planning to help teachers organize the competencies and learning activities at various grade levels. This factor considers the necessity of methodical preparation and the requirement to guarantee suitable curriculum alignment.

Second, the emphasis should be on varied instruction and autonomous learning practices to allow teachers to respond to the variety of learners’ skills, readiness levels, and learning requirements. Flexible grouping, peer-assisted learning, varied tasks, and guided autonomous activities are examples of professional development activities.

Thirdly, it is necessary to identify practical ways to handle simultaneous learning activities within the framework of classroom structure and instructional time management. This component is especially essential since classroom management and assessment obtained one of the highest challenge ratings, but instructional time management received one of the considerably lower curriculum delivery ratings.

Fourth, there is a need to improve the production and use of contextualized learning resources to address concerns about teaching materials and professional assistance. Teachers can be assisted to prepare, adapt, and share learning resources suitable for the different grade levels they teach.

Fifthly, activities should be organized to increase assessment, feedback, and monitoring of learner progress through the development of assessment instruments, monitoring of competency mastery, provision of relevant feedback, and planning suitable follow-up instruction.

Finally, professional collaboration, mentorship, and coaching should continue providing teachers with ongoing technical assistance. These activities offer teachers a

chance to share excellent methods, debate instructional problems, and develop practical solutions to frequent multigrade teaching challenges.

The suggested curriculum is consistent with the general focus on teacher preparation, instructional improvement, and professional support described in the literature reviewed in the Introduction. The components of the suggested curriculum closely align with the outcomes of the present study, particularly regarding the significant challenges related to classroom management, evaluation, resources, and professional support.

The MIEP is thus presented as a systematic intervention to enhance multigrade instructional practices and curriculum delivery in Kibawe East District. The execution and evaluation of this program can provide useful information on its success in addressing the identified needs of multigrade teachers and in supporting the improvement of instructional delivery in the participating schools.

Conclusions

The outcomes of the study lend support to the following conclusions regarding the research topics.

First, the profile of the 11 multigrade teachers coming from the five participating public elementary schools had a mean age of 32.82 years old, with seven female teachers and four male teachers. The findings indicate the characteristics of the respondents who supplied information about multigrade instructional techniques, curriculum delivery, and the problems faced in implementing multigrade instruction.

Second, the data demonstrated that multigrade teaching techniques were very highly implemented, as revealed by the overall mean of 3.57. The results concerning the five characteristics of instructional practice show that the teachers who participated in the study consistently used strategies to meet the learning needs of pupils who were enrolled in different grades in the same classroom. This research points to the value of intentional instructional planning, proper teaching methodologies, and responsive classroom practices in facilitating multigrade instruction.

Third, the curriculum delivery was judged to be very highly evident, with an overall mean of 3.42 for the five curriculum-delivery criteria. This demonstrates that the teachers who participated in the study had a high level of adoption of strategies that could facilitate the delivery of the curriculum in multigrade classrooms. This study implies that effective delivery of the curriculum in multigrade contexts depends on the teachers' ability to arrange teaching, manage learning activities, and respond to the curricular needs of multiple grade levels within the available instructional time and resources.

Fourth, the relationship between multigrade instructional methods and curriculum delivery was analyzed using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, suggesting a moderate positive relationship. However, the associated p-value was 0.058, which is

more than the 0.05 criterion of significance. The association was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level, and the null hypothesis of no meaningful relationship was not rejected. The results revealed a favorable relationship between the two variables, but the evidence was inadequate to establish a statistically significant relationship among the participating teachers. This conclusion signals a need for caution in interpreting the observed correlation and for evaluating other contextual factors that may influence curriculum delivery in multigrade classrooms.

Fifth, the challenges encountered in the implementation of multigrade education were regarded as grave with an overall mean of 3.58. This conclusion indicates that the participating teachers still faced major challenges in their responses to the instructional and curricular needs of multigrade classrooms. The gravity of these concerns calls for sustained instructional support, adequate teaching and learning materials, professional development opportunities, and school-based activities appropriate to the circumstances of multigrade education.

Sixth, the findings provide an empirical basis for the proposal of a Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program (MIEP). The suggested program is aimed at improving instructional methods, improving the procedures of delivering curricula, and dealing with the severe difficulties mentioned by the participating teachers. Ensuring that professional learning activities, instructional assistance, use of resources, and monitoring methods are aligned to the stated needs may be a realistic framework to improve multigrade teaching and curriculum delivery in the participating schools.

The study concluded that multigrade teachers were implementing instructional methods at a very high level and were also highly effective in delivering the curriculum. At the same time they faced significant obstacles in the performance of duties. Instructional Techniques and Curriculum Delivery. There was a positive moderate relationship between Instructional Techniques and Curriculum Delivery which was not statistically significant at 0.05 level. The findings thus support the establishment of a context-responsive instructional improvement program that tackles the problems faced by multigrade teachers and reinforces the existing classroom practices. The suggested program may offer a framework for school and district efforts to foster more effective delivery of content in multigrade elementary classrooms. But the effectiveness must be demonstrated in later implementation and evaluation.

Recommendations

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

1. For Heads of Schools and School Administrators. School leaders and administrators may improve instructional supervision and technical assistance to teachers of multigrade classes. Regular classroom observations, instructional conferences and mentoring sessions can help teachers improve their curriculum preparation, differentiated instruction, classroom organization,

assessment procedures, and effective use of instructional time. School administrators might also take into account the specific challenges that teachers have reported when they are creating school improvement strategies and when they are providing instructional resources.

2. For Multigrade Teachers. Teachers can continue to use their current instructional approaches and, at the same time, improve strategies that address the different grade levels and learning needs in a single classroom on an ongoing basis. They are encouraged to enhance differentiated instruction, construct age-appropriate learning activities, optimize the use of contextualized and locally available teaching resources, and create efficient classroom procedures. Multigrade teachers might also be encouraged to collaborate in preparing lessons and exchanging teaching resources.
3. Schools Division Office and District Education Officers. Sustained professional development for multigrade teachers may also be considered by the Schools Division Office and district education authorities. Capacity building may include implementation of multigrade curriculum, diversified teaching practices, classroom management, formative assessment and development of contextualized teaching materials. Resources for teaching and learning might also be given priority, particularly for schools that face challenges with resources.
4. Proposed For the Implementation of the Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program (MIEP) The suggested MIEP shall be adopted and implemented in the participating schools subject to approval and availability of resources of the appropriate education authorities. The program can serve as a structured intervention to enhance teachers' competencies by way of collaborative curriculum planning, differentiated instruction, classroom organization and instructional time management, contextualized learning resources, assessment and feedback, and ongoing coaching and mentoring. Its implementation should be monitored for relevance, feasibility, and contribution to improving multigrade instructional practices and curriculum delivery.
5. Future Work. A larger sample of more districts or school divisions could examine multi-grade instructional practices and curriculum delivery to determine if similar results occur in other educational contexts. Researchers may also apply mixed-methods or qualitative methodologies such as interviews, classroom observations, and focus group discussions to acquire a better understanding of the problems faced by multigrade teachers. Further, the moderate positive but statistically nonsignificant link identified in this study should be further explored with bigger samples and other pertinent variables. Future researchers may also assess the performance of the proposed MIEP through an implementation study to identify its actual impact on teachers' instructional practices and curriculum delivery.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The researchers observed ethical guidelines in conducting the study to preserve the rights, dignity, privacy, and welfare of the participants. Research integrity was

promoted and transparency was ensured and misbehavior was avoided and ethical issues during the research process were handled by taking necessary actions. The researchers respected the rights of the participants, their professional duties, personal values, and voluntary decisions. Particular care was taken in getting the relevant permits, in the administration and collection of the study questionnaires, and in handling the information obtained. Participants were told about the objective and methods of the study, the nature of their involvement, the possible risks and benefits, and the precautions to maintain the confidentiality of their responses. Participation was voluntary and the information collected was utilized solely for research purposes.

A. Risk-Benefit Assessment

This study investigated multigrade teaching strategies and delivery of curriculum in selected public elementary schools in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon. This involved 11 teachers handling multigrade courses who were participants by entire enumeration. The data were acquired by a standardized questionnaire prepared by the researcher. The study was meant to find out about current teaching strategies, curriculum delivery and the issues faced by multigrade teachers. During data collection, no experimental treatment or direct intervention was applied to the subjects. The findings provided the basis for the development of the proposed Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program (MIEP), which was not implemented in this study. The researchers sought to minimize any potential discomfort, inconvenience, embarrassment, pressure or professional worries that might be associated with participation. The findings were examined and reported in a brief form to protect the identity of the respondents.

Benefit

The study may provide important information as regards the deployment of multigrade teaching practices and curriculum delivery in public elementary schools. These included instructional planning and preparation, differentiated instruction, classroom organization and management, use of instructional materials and learning tools, and evaluation and monitoring of learner development. It also looked at curriculum planning and alignment, the implementation of learning competencies, instructional techniques and learning activities, management of instructional time, and assessment and feedback. The findings can assist multigrade teachers in reflecting on their present educational techniques and pinpointing opportunities for further improvement. The findings may also provide school heads, district authorities and other education stakeholders with research-based information that can influence instructional supervision, professional development, resource allocation and technological help for teachers conducting multigrade courses.

The survey also addressed the obstacles encountered by multigrade teachers, specifically with instruction and curriculum delivery, classroom management and assessment, and resources and professional support. The findings might offer a basis for establishing suitable interventions and support mechanisms responsive to the needs of multigrade classrooms. The proposed Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program

may also offer a structured framework for building teachers' capacity through collaborative planning, differentiated instruction, classroom organization, contextualized learning resources, assessment strategies and coaching and mentoring. There was no expectation that participants would get any immediate monetary or material rewards from participation. Their efforts may, however, help in generating information that may contribute to the enhancement of multigrade education in the participating schools and the district.

Risk

There were no foreseen dangers in the study since involvement was only in answering a research questionnaire. Some participants might have experienced a momentary annoyance or mild discomfort when assessing their own teaching practices and recognizing difficulties faced in their professional duties. To avoid these potential dangers, the researchers gave adequate instructions and acceptable time for answering the questionnaire. Respondents were treated appropriately and their specific responses were kept anonymous. Their involvement was not related to their employment evaluation, performance rating, promotion, or professional status. The researchers also assured that the results would not be disclosed in such a way that would put individual respondents at unnecessary risk of embarrassment, discrimination or professional disadvantage.

Content, Comprehension and Documentation of Informed Consent

Informed consent was sought from all participants before the research questionnaire was administered so as to protect the right and welfare of the participants. The researchers were informed about the study objectives, procedures, required commitment, potential risks and benefits and measures to ensure confidentiality. Participants were provided with sufficient information to make an informed and free decision on participation. When giving informed permission, the following provisions were taken into account:

1. Participant Status

The participants were informed that they were invited to engage in a research study on multigrade teaching techniques and curriculum delivery in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon. The study featured 11 public elementary school teachers teaching multigrade classes from five schools, namely, Silahis Elementary School, Kisurang Elementary School, Bagong Silang Elementary School, Mascarinas Elementary School, and Kisawa Elementary School. Respondents were told that the information they supplied would be used for academic and research purposes and that their specific responses would be kept anonymous.

2. Study Goals

The general purpose of the study was to determine the multigrade teaching methods and curriculum delivery in the selected public elementary schools in Kibawe East District as a basis for the development of an instructional enhancement program.

The study specifically focused on:

1. Determine the demographic and professional profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, years of multigrade teaching experience, and current multigrade class assignment.
2. Determine the extent of implementation of multigrade instructional practices in terms of planning and preparation, differentiated instruction, classroom organization and management, utilization of instructional materials and learning resources, and assessment and monitoring of learner progress.
3. Determine the extent to which curriculum delivery is evident in terms of curriculum planning and alignment, implementation of learning competencies, instructional strategies and learning activities, management of instructional time, and assessment and provision of feedback.
4. Determine whether a significant relationship exists between multigrade instructional practices and curriculum delivery.
5. Identify the challenges encountered by multigrade teachers in terms of instructional and curriculum-related concerns, classroom management and assessment, and resources and professional support.
6. Develop a proposed Multigrade Instructional Enhancement Program based on the findings of the study.

3. Type of Data

The primary data were gathered through a structured, researcher-made questionnaire. The instrument consisted of sections designed to obtain information about the respondents' demographic and professional profiles, multigrade instructional practices, curriculum delivery, and challenges encountered.

The questionnaire covered the following areas:

Part I. Demographic and Professional Profile

This section gathered information about the respondents' age, sex, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, years of multigrade teaching experience, and current multigrade class assignment.

Part II. Multigrade Instructional Practices
This section contained 20 statements covering five dimensions:

1. Planning and Preparation;
2. Differentiated Instruction;

3. Classroom Organization and Management;
4. Utilization of Instructional Materials and Learning Resources; and
5. Assessment and Monitoring of Learner Progress.

Part III. Curriculum Delivery
This section contained 15 statements covering five dimensions:

1. Curriculum Planning and Alignment;
2. Implementation of Learning Competencies;
3. Instructional Strategies and Learning Activities;
4. Management and Allocation of Instructional Time; and
5. Assessment and Provision of Feedback.

Part IV. Challenges Encountered by Multigrade Teachers
This section contained 10 statements covering three dimensions:

1. Instructional and Curriculum-Related Challenges;
2. Classroom Management and Assessment Challenges; and
3. Resources and Professional Support Challenges.

The questionnaire used four-point rating scales appropriate to the indicators being assessed. The collected information was used to address the research questions and develop the proposed instructional enhancement program.

4. Procedures

Before starting the trial, the researchers made sure they were ready. Research questionnaire was designed and validated by experts to ensure its suitability and relevance to the aims of the inquiry. Before the data-gathering activities, the relevant permits were obtained from the proper education authorities and school officials concerned. The researchers worked together with the schools in the administration and collection of the questionnaires. Participants were told about the goal of the study, the nature of their involvement, and the procedures in place to ensure their rights and the confidentiality of their responses before they responded to the instrument. Informed agreement was obtained from all participants before the surveys were distributed. The surveys were delivered and collected by the researchers themselves. The responses were verified, categorized and tagged for appropriate statistical treatments after their collection. The data collected were examined and interpreted in accordance with the research questions. Results were given overall without undue identification of individual participants.

5. Nature of the Commitment

The study participation involved responding the research questionnaire. The researchers worked with the school officials to ensure that the data-gathering activities were conducted at an appropriate time and in a manner that minimized disturbance to the participants' regular teaching responsibilities. Participants were allowed sufficient time to

complete the questionnaire. No extra research activity or interventions were required beyond those described in the informed consent process.

6. Sponsorship

The study was conducted for the goal of academic and research. No external funding or support was found in the research information submitted for this paper. The researchers met any costs related to the preparation and execution of the study subject to final confirmation of the funding arrangements.

7. Participant Selection

The respondents were the eleven teachers who handled the multigrade courses in Kibawe East District, Schools Division of Bukidnon. The study used total enumeration since it covered the whole recognized population of eligible multigrade teachers in the district. The respondents were the five public elementary schools participants, namely, Silahis Elementary School, Kisurang Elementary School, Bagong Silang Elementary School, Mascarinas Elementary School, and Kisawa Elementary School. The choice was made based on the real responsibility of the respondents in conducting multigrade classrooms. The personal relationships, gender, educational attainment and other variables not linked to the research aims did not affect participation. All eligible participants were invited to join on a voluntary basis.

8. Potential Risk

The study was mostly based on completion of a questionnaire and no severe physical risks were expected. However, some respondents might have experienced some inconvenience, tiredness or minor discomfort when answering questions related to instructional techniques and professional concerns. Researchers tried to minimize these potential dangers by giving clear instructions, allowing ample time to finish, and keeping responses anonymous. The participants' answers were not utilized to assess their professional performance or employment.

9. Potential Benefits

The study can aid multigrade teachers by giving information to help them reflect on their teaching approaches and find areas for professional development. The findings can be a guide to school heads and administrators in crafting instructional supervision, mentorship activities and supply of appropriate teaching and learning tools. The findings may also be useful to district and division education officials in planning professional development activities and support mechanisms for multigrade schools. The suggested MIEP might also serve as the basis for structured capacity building efforts to boost multigrade instruction and curriculum delivery. The completion and publication of the research may also benefit the researchers intellectually and professionally.

10. Alternatives

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational research methodology. A structured questionnaire was used as the major data gathering instrument. No experimental treatment, alternative intervention or therapeutic approach was used. The study was participated on voluntary basis. No teacher who did not choose to participate was forced to do so, and no punishment or adverse consequence was to follow from a decision not to participate.

11. Compensation

No payment or material incentive was provided to the participants for their participation in the study. Participation was voluntary and not considered part of their employment responsibilities, performance evaluation or professional assessment.

12. Confidentiality

The researchers protected the anonymity of the information obtained from the individuals. The results were presented anonymously. Questionnaire responses were organized and coded by appropriate coding processes. To avoid unnecessary identification of individual responders, the results were presented in summary or aggregated form. The study information was only accessible to the researchers and approved academic officials when needed for research supervision and verification. Responses of individuals were not disclosed to unauthorized persons or utilized for reasons other than the study.

13. Voluntary Consent

Participation in the study was voluntary. The participants were explained about the purpose and methods of the research before consenting to participate. No coercion, undue influence or pressure was employed to obtain their involvement. They had the option to participate or not, and there were no negative implications for either choice.

14. Right to Withdraw and Withhold Information

The participants were informed about the right to refuse participation and not to answer the questions they did not want to answer, under the standards of informed consent. They were also notified of their right to withdraw from the study in accordance with the conditions and stage of data processing that applied. There would be no penalty, loss of benefits or adverse professional consequence for refusal or withdrawal.

15. Contact Information

Participants were given the opportunity to ask any questions or express any concerns they might have regarding the research. The researchers, research adviser and concerned academic or research office may be contacted for information about the study,

its methods and the rights of the participants. The final informed consent document should contain the official contact information of the corresponding researcher and the applicable institutional official or research ethics office.

B. Authorization to Access Private Information

Researchers obtained only the information needed to meet study objectives. The questionnaire was designed to gather information on the demographic and professional profiles of the respondents, their multigrade teaching techniques, curriculum delivery, and obstacles in managing multigrade classrooms. No extraneous private or sensitive personal information was asked from the participants. Respondents were told about the reason for which the information was gathered and how their responses will be treated. The information gained was used solely for the research. Any information that could potentially identify a participant was treated with adequate secrecy and not provided to unauthorized parties. The findings were presented in terms of group results, not individual responses.

C. Confidentiality Procedure

During the entire research process, the researchers took proper steps to ensure the anonymity and privacy of the participants. The answers of the questionnaire and encoded data were structured with appropriate identifying codes rather than displaying the names of the respondents in the paper of the research. The assembled study materials were only available to the researchers and approved academic professionals who requested the information for legitimate research-related objectives. The data were used only for the purposes of the study and were not transmitted to unauthorized persons. Statistical results were reported in aggregate to avoid risk of identifying individual individuals. The physical research documents and electronic files were to be stored in a secure manner and maintained in compliance with the relevant institutional data-retention policies. Research materials would be disposed of, as appropriate, by suitable document shredding or secure electronic deletion, in accordance with institutional regulations, after the retention period specified in the policy.

D. Debriefing Communications and Referrals

Once the data-gathering procedures were over, the researchers were available to answer questions and concerns the participants had about the study. Participants were able to contact the researchers or authorized academic authorities for clarification about research objectives, methodology or use of information obtained. The study was questionnaire-based, and did not entail an experimental intervention or procedure that would likely cause participants serious physical or psychological harm; and therefore no specialized debriefing or clinical referral procedure was envisaged. However, any unforeseen problem originating from involvement would be dealt with appropriately and communicated to the concerned authority if needed.

E. Incentives and Compensation

The participants received no monetary remuneration, material prize or other inducement for completing the research questionnaire. Participation was optional and not tied to any employment perk, performance rating, promotion or professional benefit. The researchers expressed their gratitude for the participants for their time and cooperation and did not employ any type of compensation or inducement which may unfairly affect their decision to participate or the responses they supplied.

F. Conflict of Interest

The researchers tried to perform the study with objectivity, fairness, transparency, and professional integrity. Every effort was made to avoid any personal relationships, professional responsibilities, or other interests that could have influenced the selection of participants, data collection, statistical treatment, interpretation of results and presentation of findings. Teacher participation was viewed as a research activity distinct from their regular employment responsibilities and professional evaluation. Individual replies should not be used to evaluate teachers' job performance or professional competence. The researchers promised to disclose their findings truthfully and fairly. No data were purposefully manipulated, faked, or selectively reported to support any preconceived conclusion. The association between multigrade instructional techniques and curriculum delivery was interpreted based on actual statistical data, including the fact that the observed positive relationship did not reach statistical significance at the 0.05 level. The researchers also recognized the professional and academic duties involved in carrying out and reporting the study. Any conflict of interest pertinent to the research should be disclosed according to the criteria of the target journal.

REFERENCES

Ares-Ferreirós, M., Álvarez Martínez-Iglesias, J. M., & Bernárdez-Gómez, A. (2025). Challenges and opportunities of multi-grade teaching: A systematic review of recent international studies. Education Sciences, 15(8), Article 1052. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15081052

Bongala, J. V., Bobis, V. B., Castillo, J. P. R., & Marasigan, A. C. (2020). Pedagogical strategies and challenges of multigrade schoolteachers in Albay, Philippines. International Journal of Comparative Education and Development, 22(4), 299–315. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCED-06-2019-0037

Bunglay, L. L. P., & Cutab, G. D. (2025). Teaching multigrade classes in the rural Philippines: Challenges and opportunities. Baileo: Jurnal Sosial Humaniora, 3(1), 227–239. https://doi.org/10.30598/baileofisipvol3iss1pp227-239

Bunga, J. B. (2025). Assessing teacher proficiency in differentiated instruction: Development and validation of a performance appraisal tool for Philippine multigrade classrooms. European Journal of Educational Management, 8(1), 31–47. https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.8.1.31

Bunga, J. B., Olano, M. L. R., & Morga, M. R. (2025). Differentiated instruction in multigrade classrooms: Bridging theory and practice. International Journal of Educational Methodology, 11(3), 377–390. https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.11.3.377

Department of Education. (1997). Policies and guidelines in the organization and operation of multigrade (MG) classes (DepEd Order No. 96, s. 1997).

https://www.deped.gov.ph/1997/11/14/do-96-s-1997-policies-and-guidelines-in-the-organization-and-operation-of-multigrade-mg-classes/

Department of Education. (2009). Strengthening the implementation of multigrade program in Philippine education (DepEd Order No. 81, s. 2009). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2009/07/24/do-81-s-2009-strengthening-the-implementation-of-multigrade-program-in-philippine-education-amended-by/

Department of Education. (2010). Enhancing DepEd Order No. 81, s. 2009, "Strengthening the implementation of the multigrade education program in Philippine education" (DepEd Order No. 63, s. 2010). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2010/05/17/do-63-s-2010-enhancing-deped-order-81-s-2009-strengthening-the-implementation-of-the-multigrade-education-program-in-philippine-education/

Department of Education, United Nations Children's Fund, & Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Center for Educational Innovation and Technology. (2020). Philippine multigrade schools monitoring and evaluation systems handbook. SEAMEO INNOTECH.

Naparan, G. B., & Alinsug, V. G. (2021). Classroom strategies of multigrade teachers. Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 3(1), Article 100109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2021.100109

APA Citation:

Samonte, A. N., Ganapin, I. F., Romero, K. Z., Comaling, J. G., Comaling, S. S., & Comaling, B. A. (2026). MULTIGRADE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM DELIVERY IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: BASIS FOR AN INSTRUCTIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 4(11), 934–963. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24280296

Corresponding author: *alexissamonte13@gmail.com*