

Curriculum Ideologies among Public School Teachers: A Study in Dogadakedar Rural Municipality, Baitadi, Nepal

Dan Singh Karki,
Lecturer, Shreekot Multiple Campus
dskarki2016@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-3143-7689>

Abstract

Understanding teachers' curriculum ideologies is essential for aligning classroom practices with national educational goals. This study investigates the curriculum ideologies of 200 public school teachers in Dogadakedar Rural Municipality, Baitadi District, Nepal, using Michael Schiro's Curriculum Ideology Survey. The research explores how historical, social, and cultural contexts shape ideological orientations and influence educational delivery in rural Nepal. Employing a descriptive survey design complemented by interpretive analysis, the study categorizes teachers' preferences across four ideologies: Scholar Academic, Social Efficiency, Learner-Centered, and Social Reconstruction. Results reveal a strong inclination toward Learner-Centered and Social Efficiency ideologies, with lesser alignment to Social Reconstruction and Scholar Academic perspectives. These ideological patterns contrast with the priorities of Nepal's National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2019, which emphasizes Social Efficiency and Reconstruction for societal reform and employability. The rationale for this study stems from a critical gap in policy-practice coherence—teachers' pedagogical beliefs are rarely examined, yet they profoundly affect curriculum implementation. In regions like Dogadakedar, where systemic support is limited, understanding ideological preferences is key to designing effective training, localized curriculum adaptations, and responsive educational policy. The study provides empirical evidence to guide more inclusive, ideology-sensitive curriculum reforms that harmonize teacher beliefs with national aspirations.

Keywords: Curriculum ideology, Contextualization of curriculum, Dogadakedar Rural Municipality, Multi-ideological curriculum, National Curriculum Framework

Context and Problem of the Study

The National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2019 of Nepal envisions education as a means to achieve the holistic development of learners, encompassing cognitive, emotional, social, moral, and

physical dimensions (Government of Nepal, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology [MoEST], 2019). It emphasizes the importance of fostering democratic values, critical and creative thinking, problem-solving skills, lifelong

learning habits, and respect for social justice and national diversity. To this vision, the curriculum must be multi-dimensional, inclusive, and context-responsive, integrating both global competencies and local knowledge

(MoEST, 2019). Implementing such an ambitious and transformative vision of education requires teachers not only to be facilitators of learning but also to act as curriculum designers, interpreters, and change agents (Fullan, 2007; Priestley & Biesta, 2013). However, teachers' beliefs about the purpose of education, knowledge, learners, and teaching significantly shape how they understand and deliver curriculum content. These beliefs are best analyzed through the lens of curriculum ideologies.

Michael Stephen Schiro (2013) classifies curriculum ideologies into four categories: Scholar Academic, Social Efficiency, Learner-Centered, and Social Reconstruction. Each ideology presents a different purpose of education—ranging from the transmission of academic knowledge to the development of individual potential and the transformation of society. Teachers' orientations toward these ideologies directly influence their pedagogical practices, curricular decisions, and educational expectations (Schiro,

2013). Despite the critical role of teachers in curriculum implementation, empirical studies in Nepal rarely examine their ideological orientations. Most educational reform efforts focus on structural and policy changes while overlooking the philosophical and ideological beliefs that guide everyday teaching practices (Poudel, 2020). Without understanding the distribution of teachers across different curriculum ideologies, curriculum implementation may remain inconsistent or even contradictory to the holistic ideals envisioned in national policy.

For example, if most teachers unconsciously adopt a Social Efficiency ideology, prioritizing exam results and standardized content, it may hinder creativity, local contextualization, and deeper learning. Conversely, a dominance of Learner-Centered or Social Reconstructionist ideologies could foster critical thinking, inclusive values, and contextual relevance, aligning more closely with the goals of the NCF. Thus, identifying the distribution of teachers' curriculum ideologies is essential to assess the strengths and weaknesses of curriculum implementation, enhance teacher training programs, and support alignment between educational policy and classroom realities. A study was carried out seeking to fill this gap by using

Schiro's ideological framework to analyze teachers' beliefs in the context of the NCF 2019. The findings will offer important insights into how educational goals are interpreted on the ground and contribute to more informed, ideology-sensitive policy and practice. The study aimed to identify the dominant curriculum ideologies held by public school teachers by taking a field of Dogadakedar Rural Municipality by selecting 100 teachers purposively and collecting their curriculum ideologies with the help of a questionnaire developed by Schiro (2013, Appendix, p. 263.); and draw out implications for curriculum development, teacher training, and educational policy in rural settings. Curriculum ideology studies provide a framework to understand how educators interpret and implement curricular goals. In regions like Dogadakedar, teachers are often the most influential agents of curriculum, particularly when systemic support is lacking. Exploring teachers' curriculum ideologies allows stakeholders to: (a) Align curriculum reform with teachers' beliefs and capacities. (b) Design teacher training that addresses ideological diversity. (c) Develop context-sensitive curricula rooted in local needs. Moreover, the study contributes to the limited body of literature on curriculum studies in Nepal, particularly from rural, non-mainstream perspectives.

Review of Literature

The concept of curriculum ideology provides a critical framework to understand how educators interpret and implement curricular goals. According to Schiro (2013), curriculum ideologies represent educators' beliefs about what knowledge is of most worth, what learners should become, and what the role of teachers and schools should be. Schiro identifies four major ideological orientations: Scholar Academic, which values disciplinary knowledge and intellectual rigor; Social Efficiency, which focuses on preparing students for societal roles through measurable outcomes; Learner-Centered, which prioritizes individual growth and learning experiences; and Social Reconstruction, which aims to address social inequalities through education.

Several international studies have shown that the ideological orientations of teachers have significant implications for curriculum delivery, assessment methods, student engagement, and educational outcomes (Graham, 2003; Cotti & Schiro, 2004). For instance, teachers with a social efficiency orientation often prefer direct instruction and standardized testing, while those with a learner-centered orientation are more likely to adopt project-based and student-driven learning. Moreover,

teachers who embrace the social reconstruction ideology tend to emphasize critical pedagogy, democratic participation, and social justice (Schiro, 2013; Zeichner, 2008).

In the context of Nepal, the National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2019 advocates for an integrated and holistic education that is inclusive, competency-based, and locally relevant (MoEST, 2019). The framework promotes values such as critical thinking, democratic participation, social cohesion, respect for diversity, and environmental responsibility. These goals are more aligned with the learner-centered and social reconstructionist ideologies. However, classroom practices in Nepal are often dominated by rote learning, textbook dependency, exam-oriented teaching, and lack of contextual adaptation (Mathema, 2007; Poudel, 2020), which resonate more with social efficiency and scholar academic orientations. Studies conducted in Nepal have highlighted the disconnect between curriculum policy and classroom implementation, indicating a lack of ideological coherence among educators (Bhattarai, 2017; Poudel, 2020). While educational reforms have emphasized constructivist and inclusive pedagogy, teacher training has not adequately addressed underlying philosophical beliefs

and value systems. Consequently, teachers may unknowingly resist reforms or reinterpret curriculum goals through their own ideological lenses (Koirala, 2011). Research on curriculum ideologies among Nepali teachers remains limited. Most existing studies focus on content delivery, examination results, or infrastructural challenges, rather than examining teachers' deep-seated beliefs and curriculum thinking. Identifying the distribution of teachers across Schiro's four ideological types can therefore offer crucial insights into how education policies, like the NCF 2019, are being enacted in schools. Such analysis is necessary for diagnosing systemic mismatches, strengthening professional development, and guiding context-sensitive curriculum reform.

This literature review supports the need for the present study, which aims to explore the ideological orientations of public school teachers in Nepal and assess how these orientations align or diverge from the holistic goals outlined in the NCF 2019.

As posited by Schiro (1008), a curriculum worker—whether a developer, implementer, manager, evaluator, or participant—makes decisions, plans, and actions based on their personal beliefs, values, and assumptions. He states: “A person's ideology—whether conscious or

unconscious, emotional or cognitive, systematic or fragmented, implicit or explicit—guides how he or she thinks about the curriculum." The ability of an individual to construct a philosophical perspective on fundamental questions like why, what, and how to teach is a minimal yet significant requirement for ensuring quality. When curriculum designers (leaders or scholars), administrators (directors, officers, head teachers), and implementers (teachers) have a clear understanding of ideological perspectives, it brings several benefits:

- a) Understanding ideological diversity, differences, and preferences allows one to locate their own position and define curriculum and teaching objectives more clearly.
- b) It helps coworkers understand each other's preferences and disagreements, making it easier to work collaboratively rather than confrontationally.
- c) Recognizing that ideologies influence language, methods, and styles helps reduce and misunderstandings, fostering ease in interaction.
- d) Understanding ideological diversity makes it easier to express one's standpoint in public debates.
- e) Clarity about the societal, institutional, or individual preference for a particular ideology allows for unity or differentiation

without necessarily having to remain in a state of confusion or dissatisfaction.

According to Walker (1971), there are four types of curriculum development approaches: the procedural approach that emphasizes technical-product orientation, the descriptive approach that focuses on events and decision-making processes, the conceptual approach that stresses the stages of planning, and the critical approach which aims for the empowerment of learners. Schiro (2013) organized curriculum theories into four ideological perspectives: Scholar-Academic Ideology – emphasizes subject matter and seeks to transmit the knowledge produced by scholars and intellectuals. The teacher acts as a mediator to make students future scholars. According to Schiro, scholar-academic ideology emphasizes transmitting the organized and validated knowledge of disciplines to the next generation. The curriculum is subject-centered, and teachers help students understand core academic content. Social Efficiency Ideology – emphasizes producing skilled individuals according to societal needs. It aims to prepare good citizens who are economically productive and socially responsible. The return on investment in education is measured by the extent to which individuals become economically

productive and fulfill civic duties. Curriculum efficiency is judged by input-output ratios, and this approach focuses on maximizing functional efficiency in education systems. Learner-centered ideology – emphasizes the holistic development of children, nurturing their natural characteristics and humanity. The teacher's role is to facilitate and support the child's growth. According to Schiro, this ideology sees the curriculum as a means to develop the child's inherent potential by respecting their individuality and nurturing creativity, curiosity, and humanity.

Social Reconstruction Ideology – emphasizes educating individuals who can work toward justice and equality in society. It criticizes existing education systems for reinforcing inequality and failing to address issues like poverty, discrimination, and environmental degradation. The curriculum under this ideology aims to create critical citizens who actively participate in social transformation.

The review above suggests a few themes in the context of school curriculum in Pluralism reflects democratic and multicultural societies. In heterogeneous societies like Nepal, India, the United States, and South Africa, schools are

Nepal. Curriculum ideology in Nepal is a multi-ideological orientation. It is more effective if coherently managed. A curriculum rooted in multiple ideological perspectives, aligned with national context, and implemented with systemic coherence offers the most promise for preparing well-rounded, competent, and responsible citizens. This is especially crucial in complex societies like Nepal where economic development, cultural diversity, political restructuring, and social transformation must all be addressed.

Harmonization of curriculum orientations in a single school setting is possible. In the evolving landscape of education, schools increasingly face the challenge of accommodating diverse ideologies. Rather than isolating orientations into different schools or insisting on ideological purity, a complementary multi-ideological curriculum within a single school presents the most effective model. Such pluralism not only reflects the complex realities of modern, democratic societies but also better prepares students to navigate multiple worldviews with critical awareness, empathy, and adaptability.

expected to serve students from varied linguistic, cultural, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds. A curriculum that reflects only a single ideology risks

alienating groups and reinforcing exclusion. As Eisner (2002) argues, the curriculum must be broad enough to "prepare children for the complexity and diversity of modern life." A multi-ideological curriculum enables inclusion by offering diverse perspectives—academic, ethical, spiritual, and pragmatic—thus fulfilling the aims of democratic education (Dewey, 1916).

Complementarity strengthens holistic development. Different ideologies emphasize different aspects of human development. For instance: Academic Rationalism develops cognitive rigor and disciplinary knowledge. Progressivism fosters creativity, autonomy, and problem-solving. Social Reconstructionism cultivates critical consciousness and ethical citizenship. Cultural traditionalism anchors identity and values through heritage.

When blended thoughtfully, these orientations do not necessarily conflict but complement each other. For example, a learner-centered classroom (progressivism) that incorporates civic engagement (reconstructionism) and deep disciplinary inquiry (academic orientation) offers a rich and integrated educational experience. This resonates with Tyler's (1949) idea of

curriculum as a set of educational purposes that must address multiple dimensions of learners. Evidence from international models supports this view. In Finland, which consistently ranks high in global education indices, schools integrate academic excellence with social equity, arts, ethics, and project-based learning—a clear blend of ideologies (Sahlberg, 2011). Similarly, Nepal's new Secondary Education Curriculum (2019) incorporates life skills, local knowledge, spirituality, critical thinking, and national values, suggesting an intent to reconcile diverse ideological positions within a unified national framework

The multi-ideological curriculum demands the role of teacher professionalism and dialogue critics argue that conflicting ideologies confuse teachers and dilute educational goals. While this is a valid concern, the solution lies not in ideological segregation but in empowering teachers through continuous professional development and reflective dialogue. Freire (1970) emphasized education as a dialogical process; by engaging in critical reflection, teachers can reconcile tensions and construct pedagogical coherence. When teachers are viewed as curriculum thinkers rather than mere implementers (Schwab, 1973), they are capable of

negotiating ideological diversity into meaningful practice.

Ideological pluralism is "A Tapestry, Not a Tug-of-War". The curriculum should not be a battlefield of ideologies but a tapestry where different threads are woven to enrich the learner's life. While ideological conflicts can arise, the key lies in open dialogue, collaborative planning, and context-sensitive integration. A single school with multiple complementary curriculum orientations is not only possible—it is preferable for developing critically aware, ethically grounded, and intellectually versatile citizens. Segregating schools based on ideology may lead to echo chambers and social fragmentation. In contrast, pluralistic schools reflect and strengthen the democratic ideals of coexistence, empathy, and collective growth.

The review of literature has helped me recognize the critical role that teachers' curriculum ideologies play in shaping educational practices, especially in rural municipalities like Dogadakedar. It became clear that despite progressive national policies such as the NCF 2019, teachers' underlying beliefs often remain rooted in traditional orientations, creating a gap between policy and classroom reality. This understanding highlights the importance of surveying teachers'

ideological positions to identify mismatches, foster reflective practice, and inform more context-sensitive professional development. By doing so, we can move toward a more coherent and inclusive curriculum implementation that honors both national goals and local needs.

Research Methodology

This study is grounded in a subjectivist ontology, recognizing that the reality of curriculum ideology is not fixed but socially constructed through individual teachers' beliefs, experiences, and perceptions (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Curriculum ideology, therefore, exists as multiple, context-dependent realities rather than a single objective truth. Epistemologically, the research adopts a constructivist and interpretive stance, understanding that knowledge about teachers' curriculum priorities is co-created through their self-reported opinions and rankings (Crotty, 1998; Creswell & Poth, 2017). This approach acknowledges that the researcher's access to knowledge is mediated by participants' subjective understandings, shaped by their cultural and institutional contexts. The use of accidental (convenience) sampling, selecting participants based on accessibility rather than randomization, aligns with pragmatic axiology, emphasizing feasibility and inclusiveness

over representativeness (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). This sampling approach reflects the study's commitment to respecting the local context and valuing the voices of all available teachers, despite the limitations in generalizability. Methodologically, the study employs a descriptive survey design using a priority ranking questionnaire to systematically gather and analyze teachers' curriculum ideology preferences (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2019). The combination of quantitative data with contextual interpretation allows for an insightful exploration of the ideological distribution among teachers, supporting the goals of curriculum reform as outlined in Nepal's National Curriculum Framework (MoEST, 2019).

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design with a quantitative orientation, supplemented by qualitative insights for interpretation. The descriptive design was appropriate as the primary objective was to explore and map the ideological orientations of school teachers in Dogadakedar Rural Municipality based on Schiro's (2013) four curriculum ideologies: Scholar Academic, Social Efficiency, Learner-Centered, and Social Reconstruction. The design allowed the researcher to collect factual information from a target population and describe the

existing patterns, tendencies, and variations in teachers' curriculum beliefs. Given the transformative aspirations of the National Curriculum Framework (MoEST, 2019) and the need to align classroom practice with these goals, this design supports evidence-based reflection and policy recommendations for curriculum implementation in local schools. The study employed a purposive sampling method to select the participants. As the Chief of a Campus located in the same municipality, the researcher had access to institutional networks and local schools, which facilitated effective data collection. A total of 100 teachers from all public schools within Dogadakedar Rural Municipality were selected. These participants represented diverse teaching levels (primary, lower secondary, and secondary) and included both male and female teachers with varied educational and professional backgrounds.

The teachers selected were directly involved in implementing the national curriculum and thus held curriculum beliefs that influenced educational practice in the region. As a local educational leader, the researcher had legitimate access and rapport with the participants, ensuring cooperation and authenticity of responses. Although non-random, the sample covered a wide range of teaching contexts within

the rural municipality, thereby offering meaningful insights into the local implementation of national curriculum ideals.

The primary tool for data collection was the Curriculum Ideology Questionnaire developed by Michael Schiro (2013), which was adapted slightly for the Nepali context without altering the core constructs. The questionnaire included statements related to beliefs about teaching, learning, students, knowledge, and society, with items corresponding to the four ideologies. Teachers were asked to rate their agreement using a Likert scale.

Findings and Discussion

During the curriculum reform process, feedback from 100 teachers involved in teaching was collected through a structured questionnaire and in-depth interviews. The final draft was prepared based on an analysis of the collected data regarding their perceptions and expectations.

Perspective toward Curriculum

Teacher's perspectives on the meaning of curriculum have been found distributed as

Table 1.

Table 1
Teachers' ideological views on the meaning of curriculum

		Priority					
		1	2	3	4	N	
	Social	f	35	30	23	12	100
	Reconstruction	%	32.1	30	24	12	
School	Social	f	14	33	37	16	100
	Efficiency	%	12.8	33	39	16	
	Scholar	f	7	21	25	47	100
	Academic	%	6.4	21	26	48	
Centre	Student	f	53	15	10	22	100
	Centre	%	48.6	15	11	23	

Perspective toward Teachers

The opinions of teachers on the role of the teacher in the process of education have been found in Table 2.

Table 2
Distribution of Teachers' opinions on the role of the teachers education process

		Priority					
		1	2	3	4	N	
	Social	f	47	20	21	12	100
	Reconstruction	%	49.5	22	21	10	
Teacher	Social	f	11	28	29	32	100
	Efficiency	%	11.6	30	30	28	
	Scholar	f	14	18	22	46	100
	Academic	%	14.7	20	22	40	
Centre	Student	f	23	26	26	25	100
	Centre	%	24.2	28	27	22	

Perspective toward Teaching

The opinions of teachers on the role of teaching in the process of education have been found in Table 3

Table 3

Teachers' opinions on the role of teaching

		Priority					
		1	2	3	4	N	
Teaching	Social	f	21	19	22	38	100
	Reconstruction	%	21.6	21	23	33	
	Social	f	31	29	22	18	100
	Efficiency	%	32	32	23	16	
	Scholar	f	23	15	26	36	100
	Academic	%	23.7	16	27	31	
	Student	f	22	29	25	24	100
	Centre	%	22.7	32	26	21	

Perspective toward Knowledge

The opinions of teachers on the role of teaching in the process of education have been found in Table 4.

Table 4
Distribution of Perspectives toward Knowledge

		Priority					
		1	2	3	4	N	
Knowledge	Social	f	10	16	40	34	100
	Reconstruction	%	10.1	16	39	34	
	Social	f	41	34	19	6	100
	Efficiency	%	41.1	34	18	6	
	Scholar	f	14	13	27	46	100
	Academic	%	14.1	13	26	46	
	Student	f	24	36	17	13	100
	Centre	%	24.3	36	17	13	

Perspective toward Childhood

The opinions of teachers on the view toward childhood have been found in Table 5.

Table 5
Distribution of teachers' views toward Childhood.

		Priority					
		1	2	3	4	N	
Childhood	Social	f	16	26	29	29	100
	Reconstruction	%	16.2	26	28	30	
	Social Efficiency	f	23	28	25	24	100
		%	23.2	28	25	24	
	Scholar	f	14	32	29	25	100
	Academic	%	14.1	32	28	26	
	Student	f	46	15	19	20	100
	Centre	%	46.5	15	19	20	

Perspective toward Evaluation

The opinions of teachers on the view toward evaluation have been found in Table 6.

Table 6
Distribution of teachers' Perspective toward Evaluation

		Priority					
		1	2	3	4	N	
Evaluation	Social	f	11	45	28	16	100
	Reconstruction	%	10.7	45	28	17	
	Social	f	17	22	25	36	100
	Efficiency	%	16.5	22	25	38	
	Scholar	f	17	17	23	33	100
	Academic	%	16.5	17	23	34	
	Student	f	58	16	15	11	100
	Centre	%	56.3	16	15	11	

Perspective Toward Educational Slogan

The opinions of teachers on the view toward educational slogans have been found in Table 7.

Table 7
Distribution of teachers on the view toward educational slogan

		Priority					
		1	2	3	4	N	
Education Slogan	Social	f	17	33	17	33	100
	Reconstruction	%	17.2	33	17	32	
	Social	f	44	31	13	12	100
	Efficiency	%	44.4	31	13	12	
	Scholar	f	22	16	37	25	100
	Academic	%	22.2	16	37	25	
	Student	f	16	20	32	32	100
	Centre	%	16.2	20	32	31	

Popularity of Curriculum Ideologies

Based on teachers' opinions, the popularity of four competing curriculum ideological perspectives was compared using the priority given to seven aspects of each ideology. The comparison is presented in

Table 8.

Table 8
Comparison of the Popularity of Curriculum Ideologies

		Aspects of Curriculum Ideology							
		School	Teacher	Teaching	Knowledge	Childhood	Evaluation	Slogan	Average
SR	f	35	47	21	10	16	11	17	22.43
	%	32.1	49.5	21.6	10.1	16.2	10.7	17.2	22.49
SE	f	14	11	31	41	23	17	44	25.86
	%	12.8	11.6	32	41.1	23.2	16.5	44.4	25.94
SA	f	7	14	23	14	14	17	22	15.86
	%	6.4	14.7	23.7	14.1	14.1	16.5	22.2	15.96
SC	f	53	23	22	24	46	58	16	34.57
	%	48.6	24.2	22.7	24.3	46.5	56.3	16.2	34.11

The data in Table 9 compares the popularity of four curriculum ideological perspectives- across seven curricular aspects: School, Teacher, Teaching, Knowledge, Childhood, Evaluation, and Slogan. The table reveals a clear preference for student-centered and socially efficient approaches among teachers surveyed, with less emphasis on traditional academic and critical-transformative ideologies- indicating a pluralistic but uneven ideological landscape in curriculum thinking.

Discussion and Interpretation

The study highlights that teachers hold varied perspectives on curriculum ideologies, reflecting a blend of progressive and traditional educational

philosophies. The structured questionnaire reveals distinct inclinations toward different curriculum orientations based on aspects like the meaning of curriculum, the role of teachers, teaching, knowledge, evaluation, childhood, and educational slogans. Here are some key findings.

Predominant preference is found for Student-Centered Ideology. It emerges as the most favored across the seven domains, receiving the highest first-priority average (34.57%). It particularly dominates in: Curriculum meaning (48.6%); Childhood (46.5%); Evaluation (56.3%). This preference indicates a strong belief among teachers in learner-centered pedagogy, viewing education as a process of personal growth, active participation, and intrinsic motivation. Teachers emphasize the importance of understanding childhood development, authentic assessment practices, and flexible, student-responsive curricula.

Moderate preference is found to the Social Efficiency Ideology. It is the second most preferred, with 25.86% average first-priority votes. It dominates in: Knowledge (41.1%); Teaching practices (32%); and educational slogans (44.4%). This reflects a pragmatic orientation where many teachers view education as a tool to equip students with skills necessary for

economic productivity and societal functioning. The high preference in knowledge and teaching domains suggests an emphasis on structured content delivery, measurable outcomes, and functional learning goals.

Lower preference is found in the Social Reconstruction and Scholar Academic Ideologies. The Social Reconstruction (SR) ideology, with a 22.43% average, shows relevance in the role of teachers (49.5%), highlighting the belief that educators should act as agents of social change. However, it is less prioritized in other domains, especially knowledge and evaluation. The Scholar Academic (SA) ideology ranks lowest (15.86%), showing limited endorsement for the traditional, content-heavy, discipline-specific approach to education. Teachers seem less inclined to view themselves or teaching as primary vehicles for transmitting established bodies of knowledge.

NCF (2019) Nepal has given the highest priority to the Social Efficiency ideology, as reflected in its strong emphasis on employment-oriented education, technical and vocational skills, ICT competence, entrepreneurship, and life skills aimed at fostering economic transformation and preparing productive human resources. The second major emphasis is on the

Social Reconstruction ideology, evident in its commitment to national identity, federal democratic values, human and child rights, gender and social equality, sustainable development, peace, and environmental protection—positioning education as a vehicle for societal reform and justice. The scholar-academic ideology is also present, particularly in the structured curriculum design, defined learning competencies, certification procedures, and the integration of global and national knowledge systems to produce competent citizens. While comparatively less prominent, the Learner-Centered ideology finds expression in the integrated and interconnected curriculum design at the early childhood level, with a focus on individual learners' potential and developmentally appropriate practices.

A comparison between the curriculum ideology preferences of teachers and those embedded in the NCF (2019) reveals both alignments and gaps. The most striking mismatch lies in the Learner-Centered ideology, which is the top priority among teachers across all domains—particularly in curriculum meaning, evaluation, and childhood—whereas, in the NCF, this ideology receives relatively limited emphasis, mostly confined to the early childhood level. This suggests a disconnect between teachers' pedagogical

beliefs and the systemic prioritization within the national framework. On the other hand, there is a moderate alignment with the Social Efficiency ideology, which ranks second in teachers' preferences and is the dominant ideology in the NCF. Both value skills, structured learning, and employability, indicating shared ground regarding the role of education in economic productivity. However, the Social Reconstruction ideology, despite being the second most emphasized in the NCF, ranks lower among teachers, except in the domain of teachers' roles, highlighting a partial mismatch in values related to social justice and transformative education. The Scholar Academic ideology, while the least preferred by teachers, holds a more significant role in the NCF, especially in its structural design and competency-based approach—revealing a clear gap between teachers' progressive leanings and the framework's traditional academic structuring. This pattern suggests that for effective curriculum implementation, policy alignment with teachers' pedagogical orientations must be strengthened through professional development, participatory curriculum design, and ongoing dialogue. The gap between teachers' preferred curriculum ideologies and those emphasized in the National Curriculum Framework (NCF) (2019) likely stems

from multiple interrelated factors. One major cause is weak curriculum dissemination. Teachers in rural areas like Dogadakedar often lack adequate exposure to the intent and ideological underpinnings of the curriculum due to insufficient training, unclear guidelines, and limited access to updated curriculum documents (Carless, 1999). This prevents teachers from aligning their practices with national goals.

Another reason is the overlooking of local socio-cultural and educational contexts during curriculum formulation. While the NCF addresses national and global priorities, it may not fully incorporate the lived realities, cultural knowledge systems, and educational needs of regions like Dogadakedar, leading to a disconnect between curriculum expectations and ground-level classroom dynamics (Shrestha & Pant, 2018). Additionally, teachers' philosophical orientations and classroom experiences shape their ideological preferences. These beliefs, often rooted in an experience-based understanding of students' needs, may diverge from the more technocratic and policy-driven ideologies emphasized in the NCF.

This ideological gap can indeed weaken curriculum implementation. When teachers perceive a misalignment between

their pedagogical values and the prescribed curriculum, they may resort to selective implementation or superficial compliance, ultimately compromising educational quality and intended reforms (Fullan, 2007).

To address this, inclusive curriculum development that involves local stakeholders—including teachers from remote areas—is crucial. Targeted in-service training, reflective dialogues on curriculum philosophy, and localized curriculum adaptation frameworks can bridge this divide (UNESCO, 2017). Strengthening teacher agency through professional learning communities and enabling them to contextualize curriculum content can also promote more meaningful and coherent implementation.

Conclusion

The analysis reveals a notable gap between teachers' preferred curriculum ideologies and those prioritized by the National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2019 of Nepal. While teachers predominantly favor a learner-centered approach, the NCF places greater emphasis on social efficiency and reconstruction ideologies. This mismatch is likely due to inadequate curriculum dissemination, limited consideration of local contexts such as Dogadakedar, and the persistence of

teachers' personal beliefs and classroom experiences. Such a gap can hinder the effective implementation of the curriculum, resulting in inconsistent educational practices and weakened reform outcomes.

This study draws some recommendations for the different agencies. The gap in the ideology between NCF and teachers demands enhanced curriculum dissemination. Strengthen communication channels through teacher training, clear orientation programs, and continuous professional development to ensure teachers understand the ideological foundations and expectations of the NCF. Meanwhile, the contextualization of the curriculum locally has been realized. It promotes local curriculum adaptation by involving teachers and local stakeholders in the development process, ensuring relevance to community needs and realities. Another is to support teacher agency that encourages reflective practices and establish professional learning communities to help teachers align their values with national curriculum goals while respecting their pedagogical autonomy. Next is policy-practice integration to bridge the policy-practice divide by providing practical implementation tools, contextual teaching materials, and pedagogical guidance that

align with NCF ideologies. Last but not least is ongoing research and feedback. To conduct regular studies to assess ideological alignment and curriculum effectiveness, using findings to inform policy revisions and support systems.

References

- Bhattarai, P. (2017). Teachers' perceptions and practices in implementing the secondary level curriculum. *Educational Tribhuvan Journal*, 35(1), 28–42.
- Carless, D. (1999). Large-scale curriculum change in Hong Kong. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 14(3), 355–371.
- Cotti, R., & Schiro, M. S. (2004). Connecting teacher beliefs to the use of children's literature in the teaching of mathematics. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 7(4), 329–356. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-004-1787-z>.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. SAGE Publications.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. Macmillan.
- Eisner, E. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. Yale University Press.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder & Herder.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. Teachers College Press.
- Graham, P. (2003). Teacher beliefs and their influence on curriculum implementation: A case study from science education. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(4), 435–449. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690210136567>
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). SAGE Publications.
- Koirala, B. N. (2011). Educating teachers for transformation: Nepalese perspectives. *Journal of Education and Research*, 4(1), 1–14.

- Mathema, K. B. (2007). Crisis in education and future challenges for Nepal. Fulbright Alumni Association of Nepal.
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (2019). Secondary level curriculum. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. (2019). National curriculum framework 2076 (2019). Curriculum Development Centre.
- Poudel, L. (2020). Teachers' beliefs and curriculum implementation in Nepal: A critical reflection. *Educational Perspectives Nepal*, 5(1), 45–60.
- Priestley, M., & Biesta, G. (2013). *Reinventing the curriculum: New trends in curriculum policy and practice*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Sahlberg, P. (2011). *Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* Teachers College Press.
- Schiro, M. S. (2013). *Curriculum theory: Conflicting visions and enduring concerns* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. *The School Review*, 81(4), 501–522.
- Shrestha, P. M., & Pant, B. (2018). Curriculum and local context: A case of Nepal. *Journal of Education and Research*, 8(2), 1–18.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
- UNESCO. (2017). *Rethinking curriculum and pedagogy: Developing a curriculum responsive to local contexts in Asia-Pacific*.
- Walker, D. F. (1971). Some basic propositions about curriculum theory and practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*.
- Zeichner, K. (2008). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*. Routledge.