

The Performance-Based Assessment Practices of the Araling Panlipunan Teachers in the Public Elementary Schools in Labo East and West District, Division of Camarines Norte

Victoria C. Bardon¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:

Published: May 2026

Keywords:

Performance-Based Assessment
 Araling Panlipunan
 Assessment Practices

ABSTRACT

Performance-based assessment has become an important mechanism for evaluating students' ability to apply knowledge, demonstrate skills, and produce authentic learning outputs. In Araling Panlipunan, this assessment orientation is particularly relevant because the subject requires civic reasoning, historical understanding, cultural appreciation, and social analysis. This study examined the performance-based assessment practices of Araling Panlipunan teachers in public elementary schools in Labo East and West Districts, Division of Camarines Norte, for School Year 2023-2024. It focused on assessment format, time allotment, curriculum alignment, feedback mechanisms, implementation challenges, and policy implications. The study was anchored on the premise that assessment must move beyond recall-based measurement and toward authentic demonstrations of learning. Performance tasks in social studies allow learners to interpret community issues, analyze historical and cultural experiences, and communicate evidence-based judgments. The study therefore considered performance-based assessment not merely as a classroom requirement but as a pedagogical practice connected with learner agency and civic formation. This orientation reflects the continuing demand for assessment practices that support 21st-century competencies in Philippine basic education. A descriptive-evaluative-inferential design was employed using a researcher-developed questionnaire. The respondents were 60 Araling Panlipunan teachers from Labo East and West Districts, composed of 35 teachers from Labo West and 25 teachers from Labo East. The instrument measured the extent of performance-based assessment practices and the challenges encountered in their utilization. Weighted mean, rank ordering, frequency, percentage, and the Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney U-test were used to analyze the gathered data. Findings revealed that performance-based assessment practices were generally much practiced, with an overall weighted mean of 4.21. Curriculum alignment obtained the highest mean of 4.29, followed by feedback mechanism with 4.21, time allotment with 4.18, and format with 4.16. These results suggest that teachers generally recognize the importance of aligning performance tasks with curriculum expectations and learning outcomes. The data further indicate that teachers are attempting to use assessment as a learning-oriented process rather than a purely summative requirement. Item-level findings show that the strongest practice under format was designing and constructing performance-based assessments to evaluate higher-order thinking skills. In time allotment, the highest-rated practice was reflecting on the effectiveness of time allocation and making adjustments as needed. In curriculum alignment, the highest-rated indicator was the use of assessments in promoting student learning and understanding. In feedback mechanism, the strongest indicator was incorporating opportunities for learners to revise their work after receiving feedback. The significance test showed no statistically significant difference in the rank orders of performance-based assessment practices between Labo East and Labo West. Probability values for format, time allotment, curriculum alignment, and feedback mechanism were all above the 0.05 level. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted across all practice domains. This finding suggests comparability in the implementation of performance-based assessment practices across the two districts. The study also found that challenges in using performance-based assessment were much encountered, with an overall weighted mean of 4.13. Issues on scoring and interpretation both obtained the highest mean of 4.27, followed by resource constraints with 4.05 and student diversity with 3.91. These findings point to the technical and

professional demands of assessing authentic outputs fairly. They also show that the implementation of performance-based assessment requires more than teacher willingness; it requires assessment literacy, resources, moderation structures, and inclusive classroom support. The significance test on the challenges also indicated no statistically significant difference between Labo East and Labo West. The null hypothesis was accepted for issues on scoring, interpretation, resource constraints, and student diversity. This result suggests that the challenge profile is shared across districts rather than isolated in one setting. Such convergence strengthens the argument for division-wide policy responses rather than school-by-school corrective measures alone. The study concludes that performance-based assessment in Araling Panlipunan is substantially practiced but still requires deeper institutionalization. Strong areas such as curriculum alignment, revision-oriented feedback, and higher-order assessment design must be sustained. Weaker areas such as authentic task design, planning time, timely feedback, resource availability, and support for diverse learners require targeted improvement. The results support the development of district-level guidelines, task banks, rubric calibration systems, and teacher professional development programs. The manuscript contributes to the literature on assessment practice in elementary social studies by documenting how teachers operationalize performance-based assessment in a local Philippine district context. It also identifies the professional and structural challenges that accompany authentic assessment implementation. The findings are useful to teachers, school heads, curriculum writers, DepEd officials, and policy makers seeking to strengthen assessment quality in Araling Panlipunan. Keywords: performance-based assessment; Araling Panlipunan; assessment practices.

1. Introduction

Assessment is central to the improvement of teaching and learning because it defines what counts as evidence of student growth. In contemporary education, assessment is no longer confined to the measurement of recall or factual recognition. Schools are increasingly expected to document whether learners can use knowledge in meaningful, contextualized, and socially relevant situations. This shift is especially important in a curriculum that aims to produce learners who can think critically, communicate effectively, and participate responsibly in civic life.

Performance-based assessment responds to this demand by requiring learners to demonstrate competencies through observable products, processes, or performances. It differs from traditional paper-and-pencil testing because it asks students to construct responses, solve problems, prepare outputs, explain positions, or perform tasks. The emphasis is not simply on selecting a correct answer but on showing understanding through application. Such assessment is therefore well aligned with the development of complex competencies that are difficult to capture through objective tests alone.

In the 21st-century classroom, authentic assessment practices have become increasingly significant. Learners are expected to analyze information, evaluate evidence, work collaboratively, and produce outputs that approximate real-life tasks. Performance-based assessment provides teachers with a way to observe these competencies in action. It also allows students to experience assessment as part of learning rather than as a separate terminal event.

The Philippine basic education system has likewise emphasized learner-centered and outcomes-based education. National curriculum reforms, including the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum, require teachers to align assessment tasks with learning standards and competencies. In this context, performance-based assessment provides a mechanism for translating curriculum goals into classroom evidence. It enables teachers to evaluate not only what learners remember but also what they can do with what they know.

Araling Panlipunan is a subject where performance-based assessment is particularly appropriate. The subject develops historical consciousness, geographic understanding, civic responsibility, cultural sensitivity, and social inquiry. These learning goals require interpretation, argumentation, reflection, and application to community and national life. Consequently, assessment in Araling Panlipunan must go beyond memorization of dates, names, places, or definitions.

Performance tasks in Araling Panlipunan may include presentations, debates, community mapping, historical role-play, policy analysis, document interpretation, civic action proposals, and cultural exhibitions. These formats allow learners to show understanding through communication, collaboration, creativity, and critical reasoning. They also help connect subject content with learners' social realities. Such connections can make social studies more meaningful and relevant to young learners.

The literature cited in the source manuscript emphasizes the importance of curriculum alignment in performance-based assessment. When performance tasks are clearly connected to learning standards, students are more likely to demonstrate the intended competencies. Alignment also helps teachers avoid assessment activities that are engaging but disconnected from curriculum expectations. In this regard, curriculum alignment is both a technical requirement and a quality assurance mechanism.

Another important dimension of performance-based assessment is format. Assessment format determines how learners will demonstrate understanding and what kind of evidence teachers will evaluate. A well-designed format encourages authentic application, higher-order thinking, and learner participation. Conversely, poorly designed formats may reduce performance assessment to routine activities without sufficient cognitive demand.

Time allotment is also crucial because performance-based assessment often requires planning, task completion, feedback, revision, and scoring. Teachers need adequate time to design tasks, prepare rubrics, orient learners, monitor progress, and evaluate outputs.

Learners likewise need sufficient time to understand expectations and produce meaningful work. Without thoughtful time allocation, performance tasks may become burdensome or superficial.

Feedback mechanism is another defining feature of effective performance-based assessment. Feedback allows students to understand their strengths, identify areas for improvement, and revise their work. High-quality feedback is timely, specific, constructive, and linked to clear criteria. In social studies, feedback is especially important because students often need support in strengthening reasoning, evidence use, communication, and civic interpretation.

Despite these benefits, performance-based assessment is challenging to implement. Teachers often encounter issues related to scoring consistency, interpretation of varied outputs, resource limitations, and learner diversity. These challenges are intensified when rubrics are unclear, tasks are insufficiently aligned, or teachers have limited opportunities for moderation and professional learning. The practical demands of assessment implementation therefore require institutional support.

Scoring is one of the most persistent issues in performance-based assessment. Authentic outputs are often complex, multidimensional, and open to interpretation. Teachers must judge quality using criteria that balance holistic understanding with analytic precision. Without scoring calibration, the risk of inconsistency and subjectivity increases.

Interpretation is another challenge because performance evidence may take different forms across learners. Teachers must determine what a product, presentation, or process reveals about learner mastery. This requires assessment literacy and familiarity with the competencies being measured. Interpretation becomes even more complex when learners differ in language proficiency, resources, confidence, and prior knowledge.

Resource constraints also shape the implementation of performance-based assessment. Authentic tasks may require materials, technology, printing, reference sources, time, or collaborative spaces. In resource-limited contexts, teachers may simplify tasks or rely on familiar formats. This may reduce the authenticity and richness of the assessment experience.

Learner diversity further requires teachers to design assessments that are fair, inclusive, and flexible. Students differ in learning styles, linguistic backgrounds, cultural contexts, abilities, and access to support. Performance-based assessment must therefore allow multiple ways of demonstrating learning while maintaining the same core standards. Inclusive assessment design is essential if performance tasks are to promote equity rather than reproduce disadvantage.

Given these considerations, the present study is significant because it examines how Araling Panlipunan teachers practice performance-based assessment in two public elementary districts. It documents the level of practice in format, time allotment, curriculum alignment, and feedback mechanism. It also identifies challenges related to scoring, interpretation, resource constraints, and student diversity. By converting the thesis findings into a journal manuscript, the study offers an evidence-based basis for improving assessment policy, professional development, and instructional support in the local context.

2. Methodology

The study employed a descriptive-evaluative-inferential research design. The descriptive component was used to determine the level of performance-based assessment practices among Araling Panlipunan teachers. The evaluative component allowed the researcher to judge the extent to which such practices were evident across identified domains. The inferential component was used to test whether the rank orders differed significantly between Labo East and Labo West Districts.

The locale of the study was Labo East and West Districts in the Division of Camarines Norte. These districts were selected because they provided a relevant context for examining assessment practices in public elementary schools. Both districts operate within the same division and curriculum policy environment. Their comparison allowed the study to determine whether the observed practices and challenges were district-specific or generally shared.

The respondents were 60 Araling Panlipunan teachers from public elementary schools. The respondent distribution consisted of 35 teachers from Labo West District, representing 58 percent of the respondents, and 25 teachers from Labo East District, representing 42 percent. Total enumeration was used for the identified teacher respondents. Purposive sampling was employed in the selection of the districts.

The main instrument was a researcher-developed survey questionnaire. The first part measured the level of performance-based assessment practices in terms of format, time allotment, curriculum alignment, and feedback mechanism. The second part measured challenges encountered by teachers in using performance-based assessment. These challenge domains included issues on scoring, interpretation, resource constraints, and student diversity.

The response scale for assessment practices used the descriptors Very Much Practiced, Much Practiced, Practiced, Fairly Practiced, and Not at All. The corresponding numerical values ranged from 5 to 1. For the challenge indicators, the descriptors were Very Much Evident, Much Evident, Evident, Fairly Evident, and Not at All. These scales allowed the computation of weighted means and rank orders for each indicator and domain.

Instrument validation was conducted before administration. The source manuscript indicates that validation included attention to face validity and content validity through review by experts. The questionnaire was checked for clarity, relevance, and alignment with the constructs being measured. Reliability procedures were also indicated in the source methodology through the use of Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 and related significance testing.

The data-gathering procedure followed the standard thesis process. The proposal was presented to the thesis committee, and suggested revisions were reflected in the instrument and manuscript. Permission to conduct the study was secured from the proper school authorities. The questionnaires were then administered, retrieved, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted.

The statistical tools used included frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, rank ordering, and the Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney U-test. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the respondents by district. Weighted mean and rank were used to determine the extent of practices and challenges. The Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney U-test was applied to determine whether rank-order differences between districts were statistically significant.

The level of significance was set at 0.05. The null hypotheses stated that there were no significant differences in the rank orders of performance-based assessment practices and challenges between the districts. The results were then organized into journal-style tables and discussed in relation to assessment quality, instructional practice, and policy implications.

3. Results and Discussion

The discussion is organized according to the study objectives: the level of performance-based assessment practices, the test of significant difference on those practices, the challenges encountered, the test of significant difference on the challenges, and the policy implications derived from the results. The tables retain the key weighted means, interpretations, ranks, computed z-values, and probability values reported in the source manuscript. Analytical discussion follows each table to explain the educational meaning of the numerical findings.

Table 1. Summary of the Level of Performance-Based Assessment Practices in Araling Panlipunan

Domain	Labo West WM	Int.	Labo East WM	Int.	Average WM	Int.	Rank
Format	4.20	MP	4.11	MP	4.16	MP	4
Time Allotment	4.12	MP	4.26	MP	4.18	MP	3
Curriculum Alignment	4.26	MP	4.34	MP	4.29	MP	1
Feedback Mechanism	4.19	MP	4.23	MP	4.21	MP	2
Overall Weighted Average	4.19	MP	4.24	MP	4.21	MP	

Table 1 shows that performance-based assessment practices in Araling Panlipunan were generally much practiced, with an overall weighted mean of 4.21. This indicates that teachers in both Labo East and Labo West have incorporated performance-based assessment into their classroom routines. The highest domain was curriculum alignment with a mean of 4.29, suggesting that teachers give priority to ensuring that performance tasks are connected to learning expectations. The result affirms the central role of alignment in maintaining the instructional validity of assessment.

Feedback mechanism ranked second with a mean of 4.21, indicating that teachers recognize feedback as part of the assessment process. This is important because performance-based assessment is strengthened when learners receive guidance on how to improve their outputs. The data suggest that teachers are not only assigning performance tasks but are also using assessment to support learning. However, the moderate variation across domains indicates that feedback quality and consistency still require institutional support.

Time allotment ranked third with a mean of 4.18, showing that teachers substantially practice time management in performance-based assessment. This is expected because performance tasks require planning, preparation, completion, monitoring, and scoring. The result also suggests that teachers are aware of the need to match assessment duration with task complexity. Nevertheless, the lower rank of time allotment compared with curriculum alignment implies that scheduling and planning systems may still be strengthened.

Format ranked fourth with a mean of 4.16, but it remained within the much practiced range. This suggests that teachers use different formats such as rubrics, applications of knowledge, group projects, and presentations. However, as the lowest-ranked domain, format may require deeper attention to task authenticity, diversity, and cognitive demand. Improving task format can help ensure that performance-based assessment in Araling Panlipunan truly reflects real-world civic, historical, and cultural learning.

Table 2. Highest and Lowest Indicators by Performance-Based Assessment Practice Domain

Domain	Highest Indicator	WM	Int.	Lowest Indicator	WM	Int.
Format	Designing and constructing performance-based assessments to evaluate higher-order thinking skills	4.56	VMP	Design of authentic tasks that mirror real-world situations	3.64	MP
Time Allotment	Reflecting on the effectiveness of time allocation and making adjustments as needed	4.57	VMP	Allocating sufficient time for planning performance-based assessments	3.50	MP
Curriculum Alignment	Assessments in promoting student learning and understanding	4.89	VMP	Performance-based assessments are aligned with the objectives	3.51	MP
Feedback Mechanism	Incorporating opportunities for learners to revise	4.73	VMP	Providing timely feedback to learners on their performance-based assessments	3.51	MP

Table 2 presents the highest and lowest indicators within each practice domain, revealing important differences beneath the domain averages. In format, the strongest indicator was designing and constructing assessments to evaluate higher-order thinking skills, with a mean of 4.56. This suggests that teachers value tasks that move learners beyond factual recall. The lowest indicator, however, was the design of authentic tasks that mirror real-world situations, with a mean of 3.64.

The contrast in the format domain is meaningful because higher-order thinking and authenticity should ideally reinforce each other. Teachers may be designing cognitively demanding tasks, but these tasks may not always be situated in real-life or community-based contexts. In Araling Panlipunan, authenticity is essential because the subject deals with citizenship, culture,

history, economics, and social realities. This indicates the need to support teachers in transforming higher-order tasks into authentic civic and community-oriented performances.

In time allotment, the highest indicator was reflecting on the effectiveness of time allocation and making adjustments as needed, with a mean of 4.57. This shows that teachers demonstrate responsiveness after implementing performance tasks. The lowest indicator was allocating sufficient time for planning performance-based assessments, with a mean of 3.50. The result implies that teachers may be more active in adjusting during implementation than in allocating protected time for initial assessment design.

In curriculum alignment and feedback mechanism, the strongest items were assessments in promoting learning and opportunities for learner revision. These findings suggest that teachers understand the formative value of performance-based assessment. However, the lowest items were objective alignment and timely feedback, both at 3.51. This points to two practical improvement areas: strengthening explicit alignment with competencies and ensuring that feedback reaches learners while revision is still possible.

Table 3. Test of Significant Difference on the Rank Orders of Performance-Based Assessment Practices

Indicator	Format	Time Allotment	Curriculum Alignment	Feedback Mechanism
Summation of rank of Labo West	64.50	58	87.50	69
Summation of rank of Labo East	71.50	47	83.50	67
Total Number of Cases	16	14	18	14
Computed Z	-0.32	-0.64	-0.11	-0.05
Probability Associated with Z	0.374484	0.261086	0.456205	0.480061
Decision on H0	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance Difference	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Table 3 reports the Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney U-test results for rank-order differences in assessment practices. The probability values for format, time allotment, curriculum alignment, and feedback mechanism were all greater than the 0.05 level. The null hypothesis was accepted across all four domains. This means that the rank orders of the assessment practices did not significantly differ between Labo East and Labo West.

The absence of significant difference suggests a comparable pattern of performance-based assessment practice across the two districts. Teachers appear to operate under similar expectations, professional norms, or curriculum guidance. This may reflect division-level consistency in how assessment is understood and implemented. It may also indicate that strengths and weaknesses are not isolated in one district but are shared across the local system.

From a policy perspective, this finding supports district-wide interventions rather than separate district-specific responses. Since the practice patterns are statistically comparable, professional development, calibration activities, and task-bank development may be implemented across Labo East and West. A shared intervention model could improve coherence and reduce duplication. It may also encourage cross-district collaboration among Araling Panlipunan teachers.

The non-significant results should not be interpreted as evidence that improvement is unnecessary. They simply indicate that differences between the districts were not statistically meaningful. Domain and item means still show areas that require strengthening, particularly authentic task design, planning time, and timely feedback. The test results therefore point to uniformity of need rather than absence of need.

Table 4. Summary of Challenges Met in the Utilization of Performance-Based Assessment Practices

Challenge Domain	Labo West WM	Int.	Labo East WM	Int.	Average WM	Int.	Rank
Issues on Scoring	4.25	ME	4.30	ME	4.27	ME	1.5
Interpretation	4.23	ME	4.31	ME	4.27	ME	1.5
Resource Constraints	4.03	ME	4.08	ME	4.05	ME	3
Student Diversity	3.82	ME	4.02	ME	3.91	ME	4
Overall Weighted Average	4.08	ME	4.18	ME	4.13	ME	

Table 4 shows that challenges in using performance-based assessment were much encountered, with an overall weighted mean of 4.13. The highest challenge domains were issues on scoring and interpretation, both with means of 4.27. This indicates that the most difficult aspects of performance-based assessment are technical and judgment-based. Teachers must evaluate complex outputs while maintaining fairness, consistency, and clarity.

Issues on scoring are expected in performance-based assessment because student outputs may vary widely in form and quality. Unlike objective tests, performance tasks require criteria-based judgment. Teachers must balance holistic understanding with analytic scoring. Without clear rubrics and calibration processes, scoring may become inconsistent or overly subjective.

Interpretation also emerged as a major challenge because performance evidence is often multidimensional. Teachers need to determine what a performance reveals about mastery, reasoning, communication, and content understanding. This requires assessment literacy and professional judgment. The high mean for interpretation suggests that teachers need more support in reading, documenting, and explaining performance evidence.

Resource constraints and student diversity were also much encountered, although they ranked lower than scoring and interpretation. These challenges show that performance-based assessment is not only a methodological issue but also an equity

issue. Teachers need materials, time, facilities, examples, and differentiated options to make performance assessment feasible for diverse learners. Without such support, authentic assessment may become uneven across classrooms.

Table 5. Highest and Lowest Challenge Indicators by Domain

Challenge Domain	Highest Indicator	WM	Int.	Lowest Indicator	WM	Int.
Issues on Scoring	Balancing the need for holistic assessment with the precision required	4.80	ME	Grappling with the fairness of scoring across various assessment tasks	3.69	ME
Interpretation	Dealing with the complexity of evidence to assess learners' attainment of specific competencies	4.86	VME	Struggling to interpret complex assessment rubrics and align them	3.55	ME
Resource Constraints	Managing constraints in facilities suitable for conducting performance-based assessments	4.44	ME	Struggling to access sufficient materials and resources for designing varied assessments	3.61	ME
Student Diversity	Wrestling with the interpretation of assessment evidence from diverse learners	4.08	ME	Coping with challenges in support to address individual needs of diverse learners	3.55	ME

Table 5 identifies the highest and lowest challenge indicators by domain. In issues on scoring, the strongest challenge was balancing holistic assessment with the precision required, with a mean of 4.80. This captures the central difficulty of evaluating complex learning products. Teachers must respect the richness of learner performance while still assigning fair and defensible scores.

In interpretation, the strongest challenge was dealing with the complexity of evidence to assess learners' attainment of specific competencies, with a mean of 4.86. This indicates that teachers find it difficult to translate varied learner outputs into clear judgments about competency attainment. The challenge is particularly relevant in Araling Panlipunan, where outputs may involve explanation, argumentation, historical interpretation, cultural insight, and civic reasoning. These forms of evidence require interpretive depth.

In resource constraints, managing constraints in facilities suitable for conducting performance-based assessments obtained the highest mean of 4.44. This means that even when teachers understand performance-based assessment, implementation may be limited by the availability of space, materials, and logistical support. Authentic tasks often require collaboration, presentations, displays, or community-related materials. Resource support is therefore necessary to sustain high-quality implementation.

In student diversity, the strongest challenge was interpreting assessment evidence from diverse learners, with a mean of 4.08. The lowest challenge in the same domain involved support for individual learner needs, with a mean of 3.55, but it remained much encountered. This suggests that diversity-related challenges are present but may be less visible than scoring and interpretation issues. Policy responses should therefore include inclusive assessment design, differentiated performance options, and rubrics that recognize multiple ways of demonstrating the same competency.

Table 6. Test of Significant Difference on the Rank Orders of Challenges Encountered

Indicator	Issues on Scoring	Interpretation	Resource Constraints	Student Diversity
Summation of rank of Labo West	64.50	58	87.50	69
Summation of rank of Labo East	71.50	47	83.50	67
Total Number of Cases	16	14	18	14
Computed Z	-0.37	-0.38	-0.22	-0.97
Probability Associated with Z	0.355691	0.351973	0.412936	0.166023
Decision on H0	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance Difference	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Table 6 shows that the rank orders of challenges did not significantly differ between Labo East and Labo West. Probability values for issues on scoring, interpretation, resource constraints, and student diversity were all greater than 0.05. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted for all challenge domains. This means that the two districts experience broadly comparable implementation challenges.

The similarity of challenge patterns indicates that performance-based assessment difficulties are systemic rather than localized. Teachers in both districts encounter similar concerns in scoring, interpreting evidence, securing resources, and responding to learner diversity. This supports the need for coordinated division-level assessment support. Isolated school-based solutions may not be sufficient for challenges that are shared across districts.

The results also suggest that professional development should focus on the common technical core of performance-based assessment. Training should include task design, competency alignment, rubric construction, scoring calibration, feedback writing, and interpretation of performance evidence. These areas directly address the highest challenge domains. Moreover, teachers would benefit from collaborative examination of sample outputs and common rubrics.

The non-significant differences also imply that monitoring mechanisms should be standardized. If both districts show similar patterns, a common monitoring and technical assistance framework can be adopted. Such a framework may include classroom

observation indicators, assessment artifact review, portfolio checks, and teacher reflection logs. These tools can help transform the study findings into continuous quality improvement.

Table 7. Policy Directions Derived from the Findings

Priority Area	Basis in Findings	Policy Direction
Curriculum alignment	Highest-practiced domain but still uneven at item level	Create a district-level Araling Panlipunan PBA task bank aligned with learning competencies, rubrics, and sample student outputs.
Feedback mechanism	High average but timeliness scored lowest	Adopt feedback protocols requiring specific, timely, actionable, and revision-oriented feedback after every major performance task.
Time allotment	Dynamic adjustment was strong but planning time was weakest	Institutionalize scheduled planning and moderation time in learning action cells for assessment design and calibration.
Format	Higher-order tasks were strong but authentic real-world tasks were lowest	Require at least one authentic, community-based, or civic-oriented task per grading period in Araling Panlipunan.
Scoring and interpretation	Most encountered challenges	Conduct rubric calibration sessions, sample scoring conferences, and documentation of scoring exemplars.
Resource constraints and diversity	Moderate but persistent challenge domains	Provide reusable task templates, differentiated performance options, and inclusive accommodations for learners with varied needs.

Table 7 translates the statistical findings into policy directions. Since curriculum alignment was the strongest domain, the first priority is to preserve this strength through a district-level task bank. Such a task bank should include performance task templates, learning competency links, rubrics, student exemplars, and scoring notes. This would help teachers sustain alignment while reducing individual preparation burden.

The feedback findings suggest a need to formalize feedback protocols. While opportunities for learner revision were highly practiced, timely feedback was among the lowest indicators. Schools should require feedback that is specific, actionable, and delivered early enough for revision. This would reinforce the formative function of performance-based assessment.

The challenge findings point strongly to scoring and interpretation as priority areas for capacity building. Rubric calibration sessions can help teachers establish common expectations and reduce scoring variability. Sample scoring conferences can also help teachers interpret performance evidence more consistently. These practices are particularly useful in Araling Panlipunan because student outputs often include explanation, judgment, reflection, and civic reasoning.

Finally, the findings on resource constraints and student diversity require inclusive and practical assessment support. Teachers need reusable materials, differentiated task options, and guidance on accommodations. School heads and district supervisors should ensure that performance-based assessment is supported by resources, time, and professional collaboration. These policy directions can help move assessment practice from compliance toward meaningful, equitable, and curriculum-aligned learning assessment.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

The study concludes that performance-based assessment practices in Araling Panlipunan are much practiced among public elementary school teachers in Labo East and West Districts. The overall weighted mean of 4.21 indicates substantial implementation across the identified domains. Teachers demonstrate awareness of the value of assessment format, time allotment, curriculum alignment, and feedback mechanism. This suggests that performance-based assessment is already embedded in classroom practice, although its quality remains variable across specific indicators.

Curriculum alignment emerged as the strongest domain of practice. This finding indicates that teachers give significant attention to connecting performance tasks with curriculum content and expectations. Alignment is important because it ensures that assessment activities measure intended competencies rather than unrelated classroom products. The result also implies that teachers understand the instructional role of performance-based assessment in promoting learning and understanding.

Feedback mechanism ranked second and was also much practiced. The strongest feedback-related practice was incorporating opportunities for learners to revise. This indicates that teachers recognize assessment as a process that can lead to improvement. However, lower scores on timely feedback suggest that feedback systems must still be made more immediate and structured.

Time allotment was also much practiced, particularly in terms of reflecting on time allocation and adjusting it based on assessment demands. This conclusion indicates that teachers are responsive to the practical demands of performance tasks. However, the relatively lower rating for planning time shows that assessment design needs more protected time. Teachers cannot sustain quality performance tasks without adequate time for preparation.

Format was much practiced but ranked lowest among the four practice domains. Teachers demonstrated strength in designing assessments for higher-order thinking, group projects, applications of knowledge, and rubrics. However, authentic tasks that mirror real-world situations received a relatively lower rating. This suggests a need to deepen the authenticity and contextual relevance of Araling Panlipunan performance tasks.

There was no significant difference in the rank orders of performance-based assessment practices between Labo East and Labo West. This means that both districts show similar patterns of practice. The finding suggests that the observed strengths and improvement areas are not limited to one district. It also supports the value of coordinated district-wide intervention.

The challenges encountered in using performance-based assessment were much encountered, with issues on scoring and interpretation as the highest challenge domains. This conclusion indicates that teachers need stronger support in rubric use, scoring consistency, evidence interpretation, and communication of assessment results. Resource constraints and student diversity also require attention because they affect the feasibility and equity of performance-based assessment. These challenges demonstrate that authentic assessment requires both professional competence and institutional support.

There was no significant difference in the rank orders of challenges between the two districts. This means that challenges are shared across Labo East and West. The findings support the conclusion that improvement measures should be systemic rather than fragmented. Policy recommendations must therefore focus on common teacher needs, shared resources, and consistent assessment quality assurance mechanisms.

4.2 Implications

The findings imply that Araling Panlipunan teachers should be supported in sustaining curriculum-aligned performance-based assessment. Since curriculum alignment was the strongest domain, it can serve as the anchor for improving the other domains. Teachers may use learning competencies as the starting point for designing authentic tasks, rubrics, feedback criteria, and revision opportunities. This alignment can help ensure that performance tasks remain academically meaningful and instructionally purposeful.

For classroom practice, the study implies that assessment format must become more authentic and contextually grounded. Araling Panlipunan is well suited to tasks involving community issues, historical narratives, civic participation, cultural heritage, and social problem-solving. Teachers should therefore move beyond generic projects and design tasks that reflect real social contexts. Such tasks can strengthen learners' civic understanding and make assessment more relevant.

The results imply that time management must be treated as an institutional concern. Teachers need scheduled time for assessment planning, rubric preparation, learner orientation, monitoring, feedback, and scoring moderation. If time is not planned systematically, performance-based assessment may become burdensome and inconsistent. School heads should therefore include assessment planning in learning action cells and instructional supervision programs.

The feedback findings imply that revision must be protected as part of the assessment cycle. It is not enough for learners to submit outputs and receive scores. They should receive specific feedback, revise their work, and understand how their performance connects to the criteria. This process transforms assessment into a learning experience and strengthens learner ownership of improvement.

The high challenge levels in scoring and interpretation imply that teachers need technical assistance in assessment literacy. Rubric construction, analytic scoring, holistic judgment, evidence interpretation, and scoring calibration should be included in professional development. Teachers also need opportunities to compare ratings and discuss sample learner outputs. These processes can reduce subjectivity and strengthen confidence in performance-based assessment.

The resource findings imply that schools and district offices must provide practical support for assessment implementation. Performance tasks may require materials, printed rubrics, technology, presentation spaces, or portfolio systems. Without resources, teachers may simplify tasks in ways that reduce authenticity. Adequate support can help ensure that assessment quality does not depend solely on individual teacher effort.

The student diversity findings imply that performance-based assessment must be inclusive. Teachers should provide varied ways for learners to demonstrate the same competency while maintaining common standards. Differentiated task options, language support, flexible grouping, and culturally responsive rubrics can help address learner differences. Inclusive assessment design is essential to making performance-based assessment equitable.

For policy and supervision, the study implies the need for a district-wide framework for performance-based assessment in Araling Panlipunan. Such a framework should include task design standards, aligned rubrics, feedback protocols, scoring calibration, documentation procedures, and monitoring tools. It should also promote collaboration between Labo East and West teachers. With these supports, performance-based assessment can become a coherent system for improving learning rather than a compliance activity.

References

- [1] Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and learning. *Assessment in Education*, 25(6), 551–575.
- [2] Brookhart, S. M. (2020). *How to create and use rubrics*. ASCD.
- [3] Darling-Hammond, L. (2021). Performance assessment in education. *Educational Policy*, 35(2), 201–230.
- [4] Heritage, M. (2020). *Formative assessment*. Corwin Press.
- [5] McMillan, J. H. (2020). *Classroom assessment*. Pearson.
- [6] Mueller, J. (2019). *Authentic assessment toolbox*.
- [7] Popham, W. J. (2020). *Classroom assessment*. Pearson.
- [8] Stiggins, R. (2020). Assessment for learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 102(2), 32–37.
- [9] Wiggins, G. (2018). *Educative assessment*. Jossey-Bass.
- [10] Andrade, H., & Brookhart, S. (2020). *Classroom assessment as learning*. Routledge.