

**Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) curriculum: Implementation, strategies,
challenges, and sustainability**

Linabelle D. Feble*

Capiz State University - Main Campus, Roxas City, Capiz, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This qualitative case study investigated teachers' implementation, strategies, and challenges in carrying out the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum in the Division of Roxas City during School Year 2024–2025. It also identified considerations necessary for the curriculum's sustainability. Data were gathered through in-depth interviews and a focus group discussion involving 14 teacher-participants and seven school heads from selected public elementary schools. Thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework was employed to analyze the data. Findings revealed that teachers implemented the curriculum through five approaches: ensuring curriculum alignment with learning standards, fostering professional collaboration and shared responsibility, embracing innovative and learner-centered instructional strategies, strengthening teacher capacity through continuous training and preparation, and contextualizing curriculum implementation across subject areas. Teachers employed twelve instructional strategies, including collaborative learning, differentiated instruction, learning by doing, storytelling and role-playing, technology integration, values education, contextualization and localization, scaffolding, activity-based strategies, project-based learning, resourcefulness, and teacher collaboration. Nine challenges were identified: curriculum transition and adjustment, resource limitations, teacher workload and preparation, limited parental involvement, learner diversity, assessment and grading constraints, insufficient training and professional development, time constraints, and administrative burden. To sustain effective implementation, teachers emphasized six key considerations: teacher commitment and professionalism, instructional improvement, collaboration and support systems, provision of resources, capacity building and training, and policy and systemic support. The study concludes that sustaining the MATATAG Curriculum requires a multi-dimensional support framework that addresses both classroom-level realities and systemic institutional needs.

Keywords: MATATAG Curriculum, curriculum implementation, instructional strategies, curriculum challenges, curriculum sustainability

Date Submitted: April 6, 2026

Date Accepted: April 8, 2026

Date Published: April 16, 2026

*Corresponding author/ Email: linabelle.feble001@deped.gov.ph
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0502972>

Recommended citation:

Feble, L. D. (2026). Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) curriculum: Implementation, strategies, challenges, and sustainability. *Pantao (The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (2), 1187-1212.
<http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0502972>

INTRODUCTION

The Philippine education system has undergone significant reforms over the past decade, most notably with the implementation of the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Republic Act No. 10533), which established the K to 12 Basic Education Program. This reform extended the basic education cycle from 10 to 12 years, aiming to align the country's education system with international standards and improve the quality of Filipino graduates (Philippine Information Agency).

Despite these efforts, challenges persisted in the curriculum's implementation, including issues of content congestion, overlapping competencies, and inadequate focus on foundational skills. These concerns were highlighted by the country's performance in international assessments, such as the 2018 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), where Filipino students ranked lowest in Reading and second to the last in Mathematics and Science among 79 participating countries.

In response to these challenges, (Department of Education, 2023) initiated a comprehensive review of the K to 12 curriculum, culminating in the development of the MATATAG Curriculum. Launched in August 2023, the MATATAG Curriculum aims to decongest the existing curriculum by reducing the number of competencies from over 11,000 to approximately 3,600, focusing on essential learning areas and foundational skills such as literacy, numeracy, and socio-emotional development.

The MATATAG Curriculum also emphasizes the integration of values education, peace competencies, and 21st-century skills to produce job-ready, active, and responsible citizens. Its phased implementation is scheduled to begin in School Year 2024–2025, starting with Kindergarten, Grades 1, 4, and 7, and will continue in subsequent years for other grade levels.

The Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum, introduced as part of the Philippines' revised K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum, was launched under the leadership of Vice President and Education Secretary Sara Duterte to address persistent challenges in the education system. Officially unveiled on August 10, 2023. It aims to strengthen learners' foundational skills, particularly in literacy, numeracy, and values education, while promoting 21st-century competencies to prepare students for real-world challenges and align with global standards. Unlike the 2012 K to 12 Curriculum, which expanded basic education and introduced innovations such as the spiral progression approach and Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE), the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum focuses on simplifying content, emphasizing depth over breadth, and integrating relevant themes such as climate action and digital literacy. These reforms address gaps highlighted by international assessments like the 2018 PISA results, which revealed the need for a more focused and targeted approach to improve student performance. (Department of Education DM 54, s. 2023).

While the curriculum offers a streamlined and progressive framework, its implementation poses challenges for teachers, who play a critical role in its success. Adapting to new pedagogical approaches, managing updated assessment methods, and navigating increased workloads are significant hurdles. Additionally, resource constraints such as limited training opportunities, inadequate instructional materials, and insufficient classroom facilities further complicate implementation. Teachers must also balance student-centered strategies with standardized objectives while addressing diverse learning needs, often leading to heightened stress and pressure. As an aspiring educator and researcher, I am personally interested in examining these challenges because I believe that understanding the real experiences of teachers during this transition is crucial for ensuring that curriculum reforms genuinely improve the quality of education and support both learners and educators alike.

This study sought to explore the experiences of teachers in the Schools Division of Roxas City as they navigate the challenges and opportunities of the Revised K to 12

(MATATAG) Curriculum. By amplifying their voices, the research aims to provide valuable insights for policymakers, school leaders, and education stakeholders, helping to refine training programs, allocate resources effectively, and address systemic barriers. The findings highlight not only the dedication and resilience of teachers but also the practical realities they face in adapting to curriculum reforms. Furthermore, it emphasizes the role of school-based initiatives and leadership in fostering an environment conducive to effective curriculum delivery. Ultimately, the study hopes to contribute to a more supportive and effective educational framework, ensuring the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum fulfills its vision of delivering quality education for all learners, while promoting teacher well-being and professional growth in the process.

Statement of the problem

This study aimed to investigate teachers' implementation, strategies, and challenges in implementing the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum in the Division of Roxas City. It also identified the considerations for the curriculum's sustainability.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. How do teachers implement the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum?
2. What are the instructional strategies applied by teachers in delivering the curriculum?
3. What are the challenges experienced by teachers in implementing the curriculum?
4. What considerations are necessary to sustain the effective implementation of the curriculum?

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative case study design to investigate teachers' implementation strategies and the challenges they encountered in carrying out the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum in the Division of Roxas City, while also identifying key considerations for the curriculum's sustainability. The qualitative approach was selected to allow for an in-depth exploration of teachers' experiences, beliefs, and practices within their natural educational contexts. The case study design enabled a comprehensive examination of a specific group within its real-life setting, providing a detailed understanding of how the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum is interpreted and implemented by teachers in the Division of Roxas City. This approach facilitated the investigation of the phenomenon within its actual context, capturing the multiple factors that influence teachers' practices and experiences. It allowed for the collection of rich, contextualized information that reflects the complexity of curriculum reform implementation, including how such reforms are interpreted, negotiated, and applied in specific educational environments, as supported by Yin (2018). The selection of this design was grounded in its capacity to yield a refined understanding of teachers' subjective experiences, recognizing that implementation strategies and encountered challenges are shaped by professional contexts such as teaching environments, available resources, and personal pedagogical beliefs. Through qualitative methods such as In-Depth Interviews (IDI) and Focus Group Discussions (FGD), the study captured nuanced insights that reflect the complexity of teachers' adaptive strategies and responses to curriculum reform, consistent with Merriam and Tisdell (2016). The inherent flexibility of qualitative research further allowed the study design to adapt to emerging themes and patterns, ensuring responsiveness to participants' evolving perspectives in a dynamic educational landscape. This adaptability was particularly relevant in the context of the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum, where implementation may generate unforeseen challenges and innovative

practices over time. The qualitative case study design was therefore appropriate in generating rich, detailed, and context specific insights that can inform policymakers, school leaders, and educators in refining curriculum implementation strategies. Furthermore, the approach amplified teachers' voices in shaping both practical and policy level responses to curriculum reform, contributing to a grounded understanding of how reforms are enacted and sustained across diverse school contexts, and offering valuable references for other divisions undergoing similar transitions.

The study was conducted in public elementary schools within the Division of Roxas City during the School Year 2024–2025, with public school teachers serving as the primary participants. This period marked the third phase of the MATATAG Curriculum's nationwide implementation, making it a timely context for examining how teachers have adapted to the reforms and identifying the challenges and support systems necessary for sustaining curriculum changes in classroom practice. The investigation was anchored on the perspectives of public school teachers regarding their experiences in implementing the MATATAG Curriculum, the instructional strategies they employed, the challenges they encountered, and the approaches they used to sustain the reforms. In alignment with the qualitative case study design, In Depth Interviews (IDIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) served as the primary data gathering methods. The interview and discussion guides were carefully developed and reviewed by the advisory and examining committee to ensure alignment with the study objectives. Data collection sessions were scheduled at times and locations convenient for the participants to promote comfort, responsiveness, and openness in sharing insights. By focusing on the lived experiences of public school teachers, the study contributed to the expanding body of literature on post pandemic curriculum implementation and generated practical recommendations for policymakers, school leaders, and stakeholders to strengthen MATATAG Curriculum implementation, enhance instructional practices, and establish effective teacher support systems.

A total of 21 participants from public elementary schools in the Division of Roxas City were engaged in the study to explore curriculum implementation, instructional strategies, encountered challenges, and sustainability considerations. The participants comprised fourteen (14) teachers and seven (7) school heads, whose varied roles and experiences provided comprehensive perspectives on the curriculum's implementation. Among the teacher participants, five (5) were involved in In Depth Interviews, consisting of four (4) teachers with 10 years or below in service and one (1) with 11 to 20 years of teaching experience. The remaining nine (9) teachers participated in a Focus Group Discussion, including seven (7) with 10 years or below in service, one (1) with 11 to 20 years, and one (1) with 21 years and above. The study intentionally focused on teachers handling Kindergarten, Grade 1, and Grade 4 classes, as these levels were prioritized during the initial stages of the MATATAG Curriculum implementation. To further enrich and validate the findings, seven (7) school heads were interviewed to provide administrative perspectives on leadership practices, policy implementation, and support systems necessary for effective curriculum delivery. The participants' contributions offered nuanced and context specific insights into operational realities, leadership dynamics, and sustainability considerations within public elementary schools. Participant selection followed clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Eligible participants were public school teachers in the Division of Roxas City during School Year 2024–2025 with at least two years of teaching experience, who had attended training sessions or seminars on the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum, and who expressed willingness to participate through informed consent. Teachers from both urban and rural public schools were included. Exclusion criteria applied to those with less than two years of teaching experience, those without training or orientation on the MATATAG Curriculum, those employed in private schools or outside the Division of Roxas City, individuals who declined

participation, and those unable to commit to the data collection process. The study utilized purposive sampling to ensure a diverse range of teaching experiences, professional backgrounds, and school contexts. The distribution of the fourteen (14) teacher participants across schools included Bato Elementary School with 3 participants, Culasi Elementary School with 2 participants, Don Francisco Dinglasan Memorial School with 1 participant, Don Gervacio Diaz Elementary School with 1 participant, Don Ynocencio A. Del Rosario Memorial School with 1 participant, Dona Vicenta P. Hontiveros Memorial School with 2 participants, Don Ynocencio A. Del Rosario Memorial School with 1 participant, Dumulog Elementary School with 1 participant, Paciano Bombaes Elementary School with 1 participant, and Tanza Elementary School with 1 participant, yielding a total of 14 participants. The seven (7) school head participants were distributed across Bato Elementary School with 1 participant, Venancio Alba Elementary School with 1 participant, Marcos Fuentes Integrated School with 1 participant, Olotayan Integrated School with 1 participant, Mongpong Elementary School with 1 participant, Rufina Andrada Santos Memorial School with 1 participant, and Paciano Bombaes Elementary School with 1 participant, yielding a total of 7 participants.

The primary instruments used for data collection were the In-Depth Interview and Focus Group Discussion guides, which were developed based on the study's research questions and aligned with the key themes of curriculum implementation, instructional strategies, encountered challenges, and sustainability measures. These instruments consisted of open-ended questions designed to elicit detailed accounts of participants' experiences, perceptions, and recommendations regarding the implementation of the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum. The In-Depth Interview guide was structured to capture individual teachers' narratives, providing a refined understanding of how they implemented the curriculum, addressed challenges, and accessed support systems. The Focus Group Discussion guide facilitated collective dialogue among teachers, encouraging the exchange of ideas and collaborative reflection across different school contexts, thereby allowing for the identification of shared themes and divergent perspectives. A separate validation interview guide for school heads was developed to corroborate teacher responses and gather administrative insights on curriculum implementation, support mechanisms, and classroom practices. The use of semi structured interviews was supported by Adom et al. (2018), who emphasized their effectiveness in capturing rich and context specific data in educational research. All instruments underwent expert validation by the advisory and examining committee to ensure clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives, and revisions were made accordingly. A total of 12 main questions were utilized, comprising three (3) questions on curriculum implementation, three (3) on instructional strategies, three (3) on challenges, and three (3) on sustainability. These questions were designed to be clear, concise, and open ended, with additional probing and follow up questions prepared to deepen and clarify responses.

Prior to data collection, permission to conduct the study was secured from the Schools Division Superintendent and the Dean of the College of Education of CAPSU, Roxas City Main Campus. Data gathering involved the conduct of In-Depth Interviews, a Focus Group Discussion, and validation interviews with school heads over a period of approximately four months. Interviews were scheduled based on participants' availability, including weekends when necessary, and were conducted in natural, comfortable, and private settings in accordance with Tesch (2013). The Focus Group Discussion was conducted at Aura Condotel, Km. 1, Brgy. 10, Roxas City, Capiz, on March 29, 2025, from 9:00 A.M to 11:30 A.M, involving 9 participants. The researcher facilitated the discussion to ensure balanced participation, managing dominant contributions while encouraging quieter participants to share their views. The session focused on collective experiences related to curriculum implementation, challenges, and adaptive strategies. The proceedings were audio recorded using a mobile

device, with simultaneous field notes taken to capture contextual details, and members of the advisory and examining committee were present to observe the session. School head validation interviews, lasting 30 to 45 minutes, were conducted based on participant preference to gather insights on curriculum implementation, teacher support systems, and classroom practices. Following each session, audio recordings were transcribed verbatim with the assistance of a language teacher. To ensure credibility, transcripts were returned to participants for member checking, allowing them to verify, clarify, and confirm the accuracy of their responses.

Data analysis was conducted using qualitative thematic analysis based on Braun and Clarke's (2006) five phase framework. Transcribed data from In Depth Interviews, the Focus Group Discussion, and school head interviews were thoroughly reviewed to identify initial ideas, patterns, and codes. Notes were recorded throughout the process to capture emerging insights and key impressions. The analysis followed a systematic progression consistent with the framework, enabling the identification, organization, and interpretation of themes within the data. To further ensure credibility and reliability, participant validation through member checking was conducted in line with the recommendations of Forero et al. (2018), allowing participants to review and refine their responses.

The study also acknowledged the subjectivity of the researcher, who is a public elementary school teacher in the Division of Roxas City, the same context in which the study was conducted. This dual role required sustained reflexivity to maintain objectivity throughout the research process. The researcher's familiarity with the curriculum implementation and local educational conditions facilitated rapport building, open communication, and deeper interpretation of participants' experiences. However, this familiarity also posed potential risks of bias. To address this, the study employed strategies such as data triangulation through multiple data sources including In Depth Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and validation interviews with school heads, as well as strict adherence to ethical standards, participant anonymity, and transparent procedures. The researcher maintained a neutral and facilitative stance during data collection, avoiding leading questions and allowing participants to freely express their perspectives. Member checking was also employed to ensure accuracy and authenticity of the data. Through these measures, the study upheld methodological rigor while ensuring that findings authentically reflected participants' lived experiences.

Strict ethical standards were observed throughout the study to safeguard the rights, dignity, and welfare of all participants. Ethical clearance and formal approval were obtained from the Schools Division Office of Roxas City and relevant institutional authorities prior to data collection. Participation was voluntary, and all participants were fully informed about the purpose of the study, procedures involved, potential risks and benefits, and their right to withdraw at any time without consequence. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before participation, including consent for audio recording. Confidentiality was ensured through the use of numerical codes in place of identifying information, and all data including recordings, transcripts, and notes were securely stored and accessed only by the researcher. Data collection was conducted with sensitivity and respect for participants' perspectives, ensuring that no physical, emotional, professional, or psychological harm resulted from participation. Ethical guidance was continuously sought from the research adviser and advisory committee to maintain academic integrity and professional responsibility. Through adherence to these ethical principles, the study ensured both the protection of participants and the credibility and integrity of its findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This qualitative study involved 21 participants, composed of nine discussants coded as D1 to D9, five interviewees coded as I1 to I5, and seven school heads coded as SH1 to SH7. Using focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, and school head responses as data sources, the study examined teachers' implementation experiences in relation to the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum. The gathered qualitative data were analyzed through thematic analysis, consistent with the sampling approach, research instruments, and analytical procedures described in the methodology. The discussion is grounded directly in the data gathered from the participants and is interpreted in relation to the study objectives, particularly the identification of teachers' implementation practices, instructional strategies, challenges, and sustainability considerations in the local context of the Division of Roxas City.

The findings revealed that teachers in the Division of Roxas City implemented the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum through five major themes: Ensuring Curriculum Alignment with Learning Standards, Fostering Professional Collaboration and Shared Responsibility, Embracing Innovative and Learner-Centered Instructional Strategies, Strengthening Teacher Capacity through Continuous Training and Preparation, and Contextualizing Curriculum Implementation across Subject Areas. These themes show that teachers approached curriculum implementation as a flexible, adaptive, and collaborative process shaped by the demands of the new curriculum and the varied needs of learners. Under Ensuring Curriculum Alignment with Learning Standards, four subthemes emerged: Lesson Planning Based on Simplified Competencies, Use of Updated Guides and MELCs, Integration of Foundational Skills, and Contextualization of Content. Lesson Planning Based on Simplified Competencies was identified by D1 and D2, with a frequency of 2. D1 stated, "We implemented the MATATAG curriculum first in our lesson plan," while D2 added, "We unpacked... competencies... By aligning our lesson plan to be simplified by the MATATAG curriculum..." These statements show that teachers began implementation by unpacking learning goals, simplifying competencies, preparing contextualized and improvised materials, and applying differentiated instruction. This finding supports Almazan et al. (2020), who emphasized that alignment among competencies, pedagogy, and learning materials enhances instructional coherence and learner progress. It also agrees with Cabansag (2016), who noted that unpacking competencies helps teachers understand content scope and sequence, and with Malipot (2019), who found that simplified and aligned lesson objectives help students meet expected performance standards.

The Use of Updated Guides and MELCs was identified by I3, with a frequency of 1. I3 stated, "I followed the MATATAG curriculum by using the updated guides and MELCs in planning my lessons." SH3 similarly explained, "We worked on aligning the existing curriculum with the new framework, ensuring that teaching strategies and content met the updated standards." These responses indicate that teachers relied on official curriculum guides and MELCs as structural references for lesson planning, content selection, and activity development. This practice supports Orbe and De Guzman (2020), who emphasized that standardized guides such as MELCs promote consistency across grade levels and help teachers focus on essential competencies within a simplified curriculum framework. The Integration of Foundational Skills was identified by I1, with a frequency of 1. I1 stated, "I made sure that lessons were structured to maximize learning time while integrating localized and contextualized materials." This shows that teachers embedded literacy, numeracy, values, and life skills into daily lessons to support holistic learner development, consistent with Reyes' (2019) finding that foundational skills across subjects improve readiness and performance, especially in the early grades. Contextualization of Content was identified by I4, with a frequency of 1. I4 shared, "We adapted teaching strategies to the diverse learning needs of our learners." This reflects teachers' efforts to make lessons meaningful by connecting content to

learners' experiences, supporting Tupas and Martin (2017), who stated that contextualized instruction strengthens engagement and understanding by linking lessons to real-life situations.

The second major theme, Fostering Professional Collaboration and Shared Responsibility, showed that implementation was strengthened through coordinated teacher efforts, shared resources, collective problem-solving, and professional support systems. Two subthemes emerged: Coordination Among Grade-Level Teachers and LAC Sessions. Coordination Among Grade-Level Teachers was identified by D5, with a frequency of 1. D5 shared, "There were four of us teaching Grade 1, so we collaborated closely." SH1 added that the school conducted collaborative meetings introducing teaching strategies for diverse learning styles and encouraged creativity and flexibility in lesson planning. SH2 also stated that regular departmental and grade-level meetings served as platforms for lesson planning, sharing best practices, and peer mentoring. These findings support Llego (2020), who emphasized that teacher collaboration improves instructional planning, strengthens professional support, and enhances the implementation of curriculum reforms. LAC Sessions were identified by D7, D1, and D6, with a frequency of 3. D7 stated, "We provided professional development and ongoing support for colleagues like SLAC sessions," while SH1, SH2, SH3, SH5, and SH7 also emphasized LAC sessions, peer mentoring, and grade-level meetings. SH1 stated, "Regular follow-ups and peer mentoring programs were established, allowing teachers to share best practices," while SH7 described the training cascade beginning with RTPs or Regional Trainer Personnel, followed by Division Trainer Personnel, Division Training of Teachers led by school heads, and school-based reinforcement through SLAC. This indicates that LAC sessions functioned as collaborative spaces for mentoring, reflective practice, and instructional improvement. The finding agrees with Manlangit et al. (2016), who asserted that LAC sessions strengthen instructional capacity, reflective teaching, collaborative leadership, and curriculum reform sustainability.

The third major theme, Embracing Innovative and Learner-Centered Instructional Strategies, reflected teachers' use of varied, inclusive, and active approaches consistent with the MATATAG framework. Three subthemes emerged: Use of the 21st Century Skills and Strategies, Interactive and Real-life Activities, and Integration Across Subjects. Use of the 21st Century Skills and Strategies was identified by D1, with a frequency of 1. D1 stated, "We incorporated the 21st century skills..." and added, "We tackled all about the different teaching strategies..." This demonstrates that teachers embedded critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity into instruction, consistent with Trilling and Fadel (2015), who argued that 21st-century skills prepare learners for real-world challenges through adaptability, deeper understanding, and lifelong learning. Interactive and Real-life Activities were identified by I3, with a frequency of 1. I3 shared, "I made learning activities engaging, meaningful, and connected to real life." SH4 also noted that teachers of Kindergarten, Grade 1, Grade 4, and Grade 7 attended the first batch of training focused on the new curriculum framework, pedagogical approaches, and assessment methods. These findings support Anderson and Krathwohl (2016), who emphasized that real-world connections deepen understanding and promote higher-order thinking. Integration Across Subjects was identified by D5, with a frequency of 1. D5 noted, "We needed to integrate Art, Health, and other components." This interdisciplinary approach allowed learners to connect ideas across disciplines and apply knowledge in varied contexts, consistent with Drake and Reid (2018), who emphasized that integrated instruction enhances engagement, understanding, critical thinking, and authentic application.

The fourth major theme, Strengthening Teacher Capacity through Continuous Training and Preparation, showed that teachers relied on training, workshops, INSETs, and self-directed preparation to understand and deliver the curriculum effectively. The only subtheme was Division-led and School-Based Training, identified by D1, D6, I1, I2, I3, I4, and I5, with a

frequency of 7. Participants stated, “We had our training on the division...,” “Yes, the division-led 1-week seminar...,” and “INSETs were conducted...” SH1, SH2, SH4, and SH5 also confirmed that teachers attended MATATAG and DepEd-led orientation sessions. SH1 explained, “Our Kindergarten, Grade 1, and Grade 4 teachers undertook MATATAG training facilitated by the Schools Division, aimed at equipping teachers with the necessary skills and knowledge.” SH2 added that teachers participated in in-service training programs focused on student-centered teaching, effective assessment methods, and the integration of 21st-century skills. However, SH6 identified a continuing gap, stating, “We needed to give more time on training teachers about the changes in the curriculum... We needed experts for the teachers who would train about the competencies and strategies required to cater to the needs of our learners.” These findings indicate that although training provided foundational knowledge, participants still needed more sustained, expert-led, and subject-specific capacity building. This supports Delos Santos and Ochoa (2020), who stressed that ongoing professional development tailored to curriculum changes enhances teacher confidence and effectiveness, and Mateo and Domingo (2022), who found that long-term, needs-based training improves teachers’ ability to implement new curriculum standards when paired with mentoring and classroom-based support.

The fifth major theme, Contextualizing Curriculum Implementation Across Subject Areas, showed that teachers adapted the MATATAG Curriculum according to the specific demands of their subject areas. Two subthemes emerged: Math as a More Structured Subject and English as a Difficult Subject. Math as a More Structured Subject was identified by D3 and D5, with a frequency of 2. D3 and D5 stated, “Math now is actually okay because the objectives are more specific...” and “Lessons are structured and aligned progressively from the easiest topics to the most difficult ones.” These responses show that teachers viewed Mathematics as more systematic, sequential, and manageable under the MATATAG Curriculum. This finding supports Baroody et al. (2016), who emphasized that well-sequenced Mathematics instruction improves conceptual understanding, problem-solving, and confidence. It also aligns with Padilla and Mercado (2021), who found that structured Mathematics curricula support scaffolded learning, reduce learner anxiety, and promote achievement. English as a Difficult Subject was identified by D4 and D5, with a frequency of 2. D4 and D5 shared, “Teaching English has become particularly difficult...” and “English is extremely demanding... I felt so lost...” These responses point to challenges in early-grade English instruction, particularly where learners are still developing foundational language skills and where resources are inadequate. This supports Tupas (2018), who emphasized that multilingual contexts require targeted training and adequate resources, and Ramos and Santiago (2020), who found that insufficient support in language teaching may lead to inconsistent learning outcomes and teacher burnout.

The second area of findings focused on the instructional strategies applied by teachers in delivering the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum. Thematic analysis revealed twelve instructional strategies: Collaborative Learning, Differentiated Instruction, Learning by Doing, Storytelling and Role-Playing, Use of Technology and Visual Aids, Values Integration (GMRC), Contextualization and Localization, Assessment and Scaffolding, Activity-Based Strategies, Project-Based Learning (PBL), Resourcefulness, and Collaboration with Teachers. Collaborative Learning was represented by the subtheme Group Activities and Peer Sharing, identified by D4, D9, and I2, with a frequency of 3. D4 shared, “Students really enjoy group activities where they can share ideas,” while D9 added, “Pupil-to-pupil activity helps learners express ideas and learn from one another.” SH2 affirmed that collaborative learning was widely practiced through group activities that allowed students to learn from one another. This finding supports Gillies (2016), who found that structured cooperative learning improves academic and

social outcomes, and Cabigao (2019), who emphasized that collaborative learning increases engagement and deeper learning.

Differentiated Instruction was represented by the subtheme Based on Skills and Interests, identified by D1, D4, and I1, with a frequency of 3. D1 stated, “If a child was good at singing, we grouped them in the music group... based on their talents,” while I1 said, “I gave my learner with disability separate activities based on their pace.” SH1 stated that differentiated instruction tailored lessons to meet diverse student needs, SH4 noted that lessons were adjusted according to learning styles, abilities, and needs, and SH6 explained that teachers used different strategies in combination with differentiated instruction. This indicates that teachers responded to learner diversity by adapting content, activities, and learning pathways. The finding supports Tomlinson and Murphy (2015), who concluded that effective differentiation fosters student growth by honoring learner differences and encouraging academic success and self-confidence. Learning by Doing was represented by the subtheme Hands-On and Experiential Strategies, identified by D5, D7, and I5, with a frequency of 3. D5 stated that “students enjoy activities like role-playing and building with shapes,” while I5 shared that “the tackle game teaches progressively from simple to complex.” These findings show that hands-on and experiential activities made concepts more concrete and promoted active participation. This supports Kolb and Kolb (2017), who asserted that purposeful concrete tasks enhance retention, critical thinking, and meaningful learning.

Storytelling and Role-Playing was represented by the subtheme Interactive and Imaginative Learning, identified by D2, D8, I3, and I5, with a frequency of 4. D2 explained, “We use storytelling in parts, then let students predict and relate it to real life,” while I3 remarked, “Role-playing strengthens self-confidence and understanding of values.” This strategy promoted engagement, empathy, values formation, and reflective thinking. It supports Ismail and Yusof (2018), who described storytelling and dramatization as effective tools for enhancing moral reasoning and learner engagement. Use of Technology and Visual Aids was represented by the subtheme Multimedia Integration, identified by D5, D6, and D7, with a frequency of 3. D5 shared, “We prepare colourful PowerPoint presentations and YouTube videos,” while D7 noted, “Using TV and videos for dance steps makes lessons easier and more effective.” SH1 observed the use of Smart TVs, educational apps such as Slido, and online resources, while SH2 emphasized Google Classroom, educational apps, and multimedia resources. SH6 added, “The use of technology is very effective and interactive to the learners.” These findings support Tezci (2016), who asserted that multimedia integration increases learner motivation, attention, and retention.

Values Integration (GMRC) was represented by the subtheme Across All Subjects, identified by D5 and I4, with a frequency of 2. D5 shared, “I make sure to incorporate values in every subject I teach, even in Math,” while I4 added, “Role-playing helps teach respect and good manners.” This shows that teachers integrated good manners and right conduct across academic instruction to support character formation. This finding supports Corpuz and Lucido (2018), who found that embedding values in daily lessons reinforces moral development and social-emotional competence. Contextualization and Localization was represented by the subtheme Use of Real-Life Examples, identified by D4, I2, and I4, with a frequency of 3. D4 shared, “I used real-life situations familiar to the students, especially in AP,” while I4 added, “Contextualized lessons make learning more relatable.” These responses indicate that teachers used learners’ lived experiences to improve comprehension and engagement. This aligns with Castro (2016), who argued that contextualized teaching enhances engagement, comprehension, and retention by linking content to real-world experiences.

Assessment and Scaffolding was represented by the subtheme Formative Assessment and Support, identified by I1 and I2, with a frequency of 2. I1 stated, “I integrated scaffolded activities to help learners grasp key concepts,” while I2 shared, “I used formative assessments

to adjust my approach based on learner needs.” SH1 emphasized that formative assessments enabled teachers to gauge learner understanding and adjust instruction. This finding supports Heritage (2018), who stated that formative assessment combined with scaffolding promotes active learning and helps teachers close learning gaps. Activity-Based Strategies was represented by the subtheme Play-Based and Engaging Activities, identified by D5, I3, and I5, with a frequency of 3. D5 shared, “Alphabet Treasure Hunt helped reinforce letter recognition in a fun way.” Interviewees 3 and 5 also affirmed the use of songs and classroom games. These findings support Whitebread and O’Sullivan (2017), who emphasized that play-based learning contributes to cognitive and social development by making learning engaging, memorable, and developmentally appropriate.

Project-Based Learning (PBL) was represented by the subtheme Integration Across Subjects, identified by I1, with a frequency of 1. I1 shared, “The Histomap project for DRRM helped students connect lessons to real life.” SH2 noted the use of inquiry and project-based learning, while SH3 and SH5 added strategies such as Differentiated Instruction, Play-Based Learning, Technology Integration, and Formative Assessment. This finding supports Larmer et al. (2015), who found that Project-Based Learning enhances engagement and real-world understanding through authentic tasks. Resourcefulness was represented by the subtheme Self-Made and Borrowed Materials, identified by D5, D6, I1, and I3, with a frequency of 4. D5 and D6 stated, “We photocopy, create, and download materials ourselves due to a lack of resources.” This indicates that teachers personally created, adapted, or borrowed instructional materials to address resource shortages. The finding aligns with Pascual and Rico (2020), who stated that teacher-developed materials enhance relevance and adaptability in resource-constrained classrooms. Collaboration with Teachers was represented by the subtheme LAC Sessions and Team Planning, identified by D3, D5, I1, I2, I3, I4, and I5, with a frequency of 7. D3 shared, “We collaborate in group chats, LAC sessions, and team lesson planning,” while I1, I2, I3, I4, and I5 agreed that “Sharing resources helps unify teaching across sections.” SH1 also emphasized Collaborative Expertise sessions held every Monday and Friday. This finding supports Hargreaves and O’Connor (2018), who emphasized that sustained collaboration improves instructional quality, professional growth, and collective responsibility for student learning.

The third area of findings focused on the challenges experienced by teachers in implementing the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum. Thematic analysis identified nine challenges: Curriculum Transition and Adjustment, Resource Limitations, Teacher Workload and Preparation, Parental Involvement and Support, Learner Diversity, Assessment and Grading Constraints, Training and Professional Development, Time Constraints, and Administrative Burden. Curriculum Transition and Adjustment was represented by the subtheme Rapid Curriculum Shift and Adjustment Challenges, identified by D4, D5, D9, I1, I2, and I3, with a frequency of 6. D4 shared, “We’re still adjusting because it’s a completely new set of competencies,” while D5 added, “The implementation was so fast, we barely had time to prepare.” SH4 noted that “adaptation to curriculum changes is a big challenge,” while SH3 identified “lack of training and support” as a barrier. These responses show that rapid implementation created uncertainty, reduced teacher confidence, and challenged instructional consistency. This supports Ball and Tyson (2019), who noted that sudden curriculum changes without adequate preparation may produce confusion and inconsistent delivery.

Resource Limitations was represented by the subtheme Insufficient Learning Resources, identified by D1, D5, D6, D7, D8, I1, I2, I3, I4, and I5, with a frequency of 10. D1 shared, “We only have one textbook for an entire class,” while D5 added, “Visuals are outdated or unavailable, and we often have to improvise.” I2 noted, “There are no Learning Activity Sheets for some topics,” and I4 emphasized, “We lack even the basic digital tools like a TV or

a functional computer.” SH1 further noted that the school did not have its own lot and building and that classrooms were not ideal or conducive to effective learning. SH2 and SH6 cited limited resources, including offline tools and local materials. These findings show that resource scarcity was the most frequently reported challenge and affected lesson delivery, learner engagement, and teacher workload. This supports Bernardo and Sevilla (2019), who emphasized that limited resources in public schools hinder curriculum reform implementation and place additional strain on teachers.

Teacher Workload and Preparation was represented by the subtheme Heavy Workload and Unclear Instructional Guidelines, identified by D4, D5, D6, I1, and I2, with a frequency of 5. D5 stated, “We still have to unpack the curriculum ourselves,” while D6 added, “Every day we’re adjusting lessons—it’s tiring.” SH1 observed that teachers used free online resources, collaborated with colleagues, and sought grants and donations, while SH7 noted that “the creativity of the teachers cannot be underestimated, for the best visual aid is the teacher herself.” These findings show that unclear instructional guidance and additional preparation demands intensified teacher workload. This aligns with Magno and Madrigal (2020), who found that excessive workload tied to curriculum reform contributes to burnout, reduced instructional quality, and declining job satisfaction. Parental Involvement and Support was represented by the subtheme Limited Parental Support and Engagement, identified by D4, D5, D9, I1, I2, I3, and I4, with a frequency of 7. D4 shared, “Parents rarely help their kids with learning at home,” while D5 added, “Everything is on the teacher, even behavior issues.” This indicates that weak home support transferred academic and behavioral responsibilities to teachers. The finding supports Medina and Gonzales (2019), who concluded that active parental involvement improves student outcomes, while its absence hinders learning continuity.

Learner Diversity was represented by the subtheme Diverse Learner Readiness and Behaviour, identified by D1, D4, I1, I2, I3, I4, and I5, with a frequency of 7. D1 said, “Some kids can’t even read yet while others are way ahead,” while I2 added, “It’s hard managing all their needs in one lesson.” These statements show that wide differences in readiness, skills, attention span, and behavior made instruction more complex. This supports Tomlinson (2017), who emphasized that differentiated instruction is essential for learner diversity but requires strong planning and adequate support. Assessment and Grading Constraints was represented by the subtheme Limited Assessment Flexibility, identified by D5 and D9, with a frequency of 2. D5 stated, “Even if they don’t perform, we’re still pressured to pass them,” while D9 added, “We don’t have time to give remediation anymore.” These responses show that pressure to promote learners and limited time for remediation may compromise authentic assessment. This finding reflects Flores and De Guzman’s (2018) conclusion that institutional pressure to maintain passing rates may undermine assessment integrity and meaningful remediation.

Training and Professional Development was represented by the subtheme Insufficient Teacher Training and Support, identified by D7 and I3, with a frequency of 2. D7 remarked, “We only had one training—just one time. It’s not enough,” while I3 added, “We need continuous support, not just one-time workshops.” SH2 and SH6 also reported that teachers participated in workshops and peer mentoring to improve competence. These findings indicate that one-time training was insufficient for the depth of change required by the MATATAG Curriculum. This supports Salandanan and Ibarra (2021), who emphasized that sustained and context-specific professional development enhances teacher competence, confidence, and instructional quality during curriculum transitions. Time Constraints was represented by the subtheme Inadequate Time for Teaching and Planning, identified by D1, D4, D5, I3, I4, and I5, with a frequency of 6. D4 remarked, “Forty-five minutes per subject is not enough,” while I4 added, “There’s barely time to teach, let alone prepare.” These responses show that shortened subject periods limited meaningful teaching, reflection, formative assessment, and

preparation. This mirrors Almonte-Acosta (2016), who argued that shortened instructional periods restrict deeper content exploration, learner-centered activities, and skill development. Administrative Burden was represented by the subtheme Excessive Paperwork Reducing Teaching Time, identified by D4, D5, I3, I4, and I5, with a frequency of 5. D4 remarked, “Too many forms and reports. It takes away time from real teaching.” This shows that paperwork reduced time for lesson preparation and student engagement. The finding supports Manuel and Medallon (2020), who found that excessive paperwork increases teacher stress and lowers instructional quality.

The fourth area of findings focused on considerations necessary to sustain the effective implementation of the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum. Six major considerations emerged: Teacher Commitment and Professionalism, Instructional Improvement, Collaboration and Support Systems, Provision of Resources, Capacity Building and Training, and Policy and Systemic Support. Teacher Commitment and Professionalism included five subthemes: Acceptance of Role and Responsibility, Perseverance and Adaptability, Resourcefulness, Self-care and Stress Management, and Self-Assessment and Reflection. Acceptance of Role and Responsibility was identified by D5, D6, and D7, with a frequency of 3. They stated, “We are willing to embrace changes for the benefit of learners.” SH1 also emphasized that well-defined and needs-based training would empower teachers to adapt strategies and methodologies. This supports Inocian and Baldico (2020), who found that teacher willingness to adapt and take ownership of reforms is critical to successful curriculum innovation. Perseverance and Adaptability was identified by D3, D5, and D6, with a frequency of 3. They affirmed, “We keep adjusting and doing our best despite the daily challenges.” This supports Navarro and Santos (2021), who found that adaptability and perseverance help teachers sustain instructional quality amid reform and limited support. Resourcefulness was identified by D1, D5, and I3, with a frequency of 3. They shared, “I often make my own materials or improvise when resources are lacking.” This supports Francisco and Nuñez (2019), who emphasized the role of teacher resourcefulness in sustaining lesson continuity and learner engagement in low-resource settings.

Self-care and Stress Management was identified by D4, with a frequency of 1. D4 shared, “We also need to take care of our mental health to keep going.” This finding supports Labrague and Ballad (2021), who found that self-care and emotional resilience help teachers manage stress, prevent burnout, and sustain effectiveness. Self-Assessment and Reflection was identified by D4, D6, D9, I1, I3, and I5, with a frequency of 6. They shared, “We reflect on each lesson to improve the next one.” This indicates that reflective practice helped teachers identify areas for improvement and refine instruction. This supports Roldan and Santiago (2020), who emphasized that reflective teaching promotes professional growth and improves instructional responsiveness during curriculum transitions.

Instructional Improvement included four subthemes: Use of Diverse Pedagogical Strategies, Contextualized/Localized Teaching, Development and Use of Instructional Materials, and Innovation and Best Practices Sharing. Use of Diverse Pedagogical Strategies was identified by D7, I1, I2, and I3, with a frequency of 4. Participants shared, “We try different approaches group work, storytelling, games.” This supports Gonzales and Penuela (2018), who found that varied pedagogical strategies improve learner engagement and inclusivity. Contextualized/Localized Teaching was identified by D8 and I4, with a frequency of 2. They stated, “We use local examples so they can relate better.” This supports Castro (2016), who asserted that contextualization strengthens engagement and comprehension by linking lessons to students’ real-life experiences and cultural backgrounds. Development and Use of Instructional Materials was identified by D9, I1, and I3, with a frequency of 3. They shared, “We design our own worksheets and visuals when needed.” This supports Francisco and Nuñez

(2019), who found that teacher-created materials enhance relevance and adaptability in resource-constrained environments. Innovation and Best Practices Sharing was identified by I1, I3, and I5, with a frequency of 3. They agreed, “We share strategies in our group chat and during meetings.” This aligns with Hargreaves and O’Connor (2018), who asserted that collaborative exchange fosters professional learning communities, innovation, and instructional quality.

Collaboration and Support Systems included Teacher Collaboration and Mentoring, Participation in LAC Sessions, Support from Administration and Peers, and Active Parental Involvement. Teacher Collaboration and Mentoring was identified by D9, I1, I2, I3, and I5, with a frequency of 5. Participants stated, “We guide each other, especially new teachers.” SH1, SH2, SH3, SH4, and SH5 also raised the lack of adequate funding and updated instructional materials as a concern, while one school head stated, “Adequate funding is paramount. The successful rollout of the Revised K to 12 MATATAG Curriculum demands investment in teaching materials and technology.” SH1, SH2, SH3, SH6, and SH7 further stressed the importance of community and stakeholder engagement. SH1 shared, “Our school actively engages parents and community members in the educational process, creating a shared responsibility for student success.” These findings support Laguardo (2016), who found that mentoring and peer collaboration strengthen professional competence, build confidence, and promote consistent instructional implementation. Participation in LAC Sessions was identified by I1, I2, and I5, with a frequency of 3. They shared, “LAC sessions help us align strategies and solve issues together.” This supports Manlangit et al. (2016), who found that LAC sessions promote professional learning, instructional coherence, and shared reflection. Support from Administration and Peers was identified by I1, I2, and I3, with a frequency of 3. They stated, “Our head is supportive, and peers help when we’re overloaded.” SH1 also emphasized the need for mental and emotional support systems, stating, “This holistic approach to education acknowledges that learning is not solely an academic endeavor but also a personal and emotional journey.” This aligns with Calleja (2019), who emphasized that administrative support and collegial relationships strengthen teacher morale and sustain school-based initiatives. Active Parental Involvement was identified by D7 and I3, with a frequency of 2. They observed that “Parents attending meetings and checking assignments is a big help.” SH7 emphasized teamwork among school heads, teachers, parents, and stakeholders, and stated that “The constant support and harmonious relationship of the stakeholders to the vision, mission, and goals of the school is vital.” This supports Alampay and Jocson (2019), who found that parental involvement enhances motivation, academic performance, and the home-school connection.

Provision of Resources included SPED and Differentiated Instruction Support, Availability of Teaching Materials and Books, Timely Distribution of Materials, Clear and Unpacked Curriculum with Lesson Plans, and Access to Digital Tools and Technology. SPED and Differentiated Instruction Support was identified by D7, with a frequency of 1. D7 stated, “We need more materials for SPED learners.” This supports Reyes and Valencia (2020), who emphasized that effective SPED implementation requires differentiated instruction, specialized materials, and teacher training. Availability of Teaching Materials and Books was identified by D1, D3, D5, D7, I1, I2, I3, and I5, with a frequency of 8. Participants stated, “Books are not enough for all students, and many are outdated.” SH1, SH2, SH3, and SH6 also emphasized the need for technology and reliable digital platforms, with SH6 noting that “Access to technology and reliable platforms to be used in teaching” was crucial. This supports Boado (2019), who highlighted that insufficient and obsolete teaching materials hinder curriculum delivery. Timely Distribution of Materials was identified by D7 and I1, with a frequency of 2. They said, “We sometimes receive materials halfway through the quarter.” This aligns with Javier and Altea (2018), who found that delayed resource distribution disrupts implementation

and forces teachers to improvise. Clear and Unpacked Curriculum with Lesson Plans was identified by D1, D2, and D5, with a frequency of 3. They shared, “We need clearer guides aligned with the curriculum.” This supports Almario and Padua (2021), who emphasized that clear competencies and aligned lesson planning tools reduce confusion during educational transitions. Access to Digital Tools and Technology was identified by D9, with a frequency of 1. D9 stated, “We still lack basic equipment like laptops and projectors.” This supports Tuliao and Magno (2020), who found that limited ICT access restricts technology integration, teaching efficiency, and learner engagement.

Capacity Building and Training included Continuous and In-Depth Professional Development, Specialized Training for Curriculum Understanding and Application, and Government and DepEd Support. Continuous and In-Depth Professional Development was identified by D7, D9, I1, I2, I3, and I5, with a frequency of 6. Participants shared, “We need regular training to keep up with changes.” This supports Delos Santos and Ochoa (2020), who stated that ongoing and structured professional development enhances teacher capacity and curriculum reform sustainability. Specialized Training for Curriculum Understanding and Application was identified by D4, I1, and I2, with a frequency of 3. They shared, “We should be trained not just on content, but on how to teach it effectively.” SH3 and SH5 also cited collaboration and mentoring, with SH5 stating, “Teacher collaboration and mentoring also count.” This aligns with Mateo and Domingo (2022), who found that training focused on both content and pedagogy helps teachers translate competencies into meaningful instruction. Government and DepEd Support was identified by D1, D5, D6, and D7, with a frequency of 4. Participants stressed, “DepEd must give consistent support, not just mandates.” This supports Navarro and Santos (2021), who highlighted that institutional support through resources, monitoring, and responsive leadership is vital for sustainable curriculum reform.

Policy and Systemic Support included Salary and Well-Being Advocacy and Reduced Administrative Workload. Salary and Well-Being Advocacy was identified by D3, with a frequency of 1. D3 stated, “A better salary motivates teachers to stay and do more.” This supports Bernardo and Mendoza (2020), who found that fair compensation and teacher well-being positively influence job satisfaction, retention, and commitment to reforms. Reduced Administrative Workload was identified by I5, with a frequency of 1. I5 stated, “Less paperwork means more time for lesson preparation.” This aligns with Manuel and Medallon (2020), who found that reducing administrative workload improves teacher productivity, reduces stress, and allows more time for lesson planning and learner support. Across the sustainability findings, school heads consistently emphasized adequate funding, updated instructional materials, reliable technology, continuous professional development, collaboration, peer mentoring, parental involvement, and stakeholder support. SH1 stated, “Adequate funding is paramount. The successful rollout of the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG Curriculum) demands investment in teaching materials and technology.” SH1 also emphasized that “Ongoing training programs that are well-defined and tailored to meet the specific needs of our teachers will empower them to adapt their teaching strategies and methodologies.” SH5 added, “Teacher collaboration and mentoring also count,” while SH1 highlighted community engagement by stating, “Our school actively engages parents and community members in the educational process, creating a shared responsibility for student success.” SH7 further emphasized that “There should be teamwork on the part of the school head, teachers, parents, and stakeholders in a particular school,” and that “The constant support and harmonious relationship of the stakeholders to the vision, mission, and goals of the school is vital.”

Overall, the findings demonstrate that the implementation of the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum in the Division of Roxas City was shaped by teachers’ curriculum alignment practices, collaborative professional culture, learner-centered strategies, training

experiences, and contextual adaptation across subject areas. The instructional strategies identified in the study show that teachers actively used collaboration, differentiation, experiential learning, storytelling, technology, values integration, contextualization, formative assessment, play-based activities, project-based learning, resourcefulness, and team planning to support curriculum delivery. However, the challenges reported by participants reveal that rapid transition, resource limitations, heavy workload, limited parental support, learner diversity, assessment constraints, insufficient training, time limitations, and administrative burden affected implementation quality. The sustainability findings further indicate that effective implementation requires teacher commitment, instructional improvement, collaboration, sufficient resources, continuous capacity building, government and DepEd support, teacher well-being, and reduced administrative workload. Taken together, these results address the study objectives by showing both the strengths and constraints of MATATAG Curriculum implementation and by identifying the practical, professional, and systemic conditions necessary to sustain curriculum reform. These findings contribute to curriculum implementation literature by highlighting how teachers and school leaders negotiate policy reforms within real school contexts, thereby providing a basis for the succeeding chapter or section, particularly in formulating conclusions, recommendations, and possible intervention measures.

CONCLUSION

The present study provides a comprehensive synthesis of the implementation, instructional strategies, challenges, and sustainability considerations of the Revised K to 12 MATATAG Curriculum in the Division of Roxas City, grounded in qualitative data gathered from fourteen teacher participants and seven school heads through in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. The findings reveal that teachers implement the curriculum through deliberate alignment with learning standards, active professional collaboration, and the adoption of innovative and learner centered approaches. These practices demonstrate a strong commitment to ensuring that classroom instruction reflects the intended goals of the curriculum while remaining responsive to contextual realities across subject areas. The integration of continuous preparation and capacity building further highlights the adaptive and reflective nature of teachers in navigating curricular reforms.

The study further establishes that teachers employ a wide range of pedagogical strategies that collectively reinforce a learner centered orientation in instruction. These include collaborative learning, differentiated instruction, experiential learning, storytelling and role playing, the integration of technology and visual aids, values formation, contextualization and localization, scaffolding, activity-based approaches, project-based learning, and resourcefulness in instructional delivery. Such diversity in strategies indicates that teachers are not only responsive to varied learner needs but are also proactive in creating meaningful and engaging learning experiences. These approaches contribute to the effective realization of curriculum competencies and underscore the importance of pedagogical flexibility in contemporary educational settings.

Despite these strengths, the study also highlights persistent and multifaceted challenges that constrain effective implementation. Teachers encounter difficulties related to curriculum transition and adjustment, limited availability of instructional resources, increased workload and preparation demands, inconsistent parental involvement, and the complexities of addressing learner diversity. Additional constraints arise from assessment and grading systems, gaps in professional development, time limitations, and administrative responsibilities. These interconnected challenges emphasize the need for systemic and institutional responses that address both structural and instructional concerns. The findings suggest that without adequate

support, the burden placed on teachers may hinder the full realization of the curriculum's intended outcomes.

In response to these challenges, the study underscores that the sustained and effective implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum depends on the establishment of a comprehensive and multi-dimensional support system. This system must include strengthened teacher commitment and professionalism, continuous enhancement of instructional practices, active collaboration among educators, adequate provision of teaching and learning resources, sustained capacity building initiatives, and coherent policy support across different levels of the education system. Context sensitive approaches that consider the unique conditions of both urban and rural schools are essential, alongside strong instructional leadership from school heads and division offices. Furthermore, the engagement of stakeholders, including parents, local government units, and community partners, is critical in fostering shared responsibility and reinforcing support for curriculum implementation.

Drawing from these conclusions, several integrated recommendations emerge to strengthen both current practice and long-term sustainability. The Department of Education and school administrators are encouraged to prioritize clear curriculum alignment with learning standards through the provision of structured guidelines, exemplar lesson plans, and consistent monitoring mechanisms. Continuous and needs based professional development programs must be institutionalized to equip teachers with updated pedagogical competencies and content knowledge, while also ensuring access to diverse instructional resources and opportunities for collaborative learning through professional learning communities. Teachers, in turn, are encouraged to sustain the alignment of instructional practices with curriculum standards, diversify their teaching strategies to meet learner needs, and actively engage in peer collaboration and reflective practice.

At the institutional level, school leaders are advised to streamline administrative processes to reduce teacher workload, ensure equitable distribution of responsibilities, and prioritize the provision of adequate instructional materials and improved school infrastructure. Mechanisms that strengthen parental involvement and communication should also be institutionalized to promote a supportive learning environment. Teachers are further encouraged to practice effective time and resource management and to maintain open communication with school leadership to facilitate collaborative problem solving. At the policy level, the institutionalization of a multi-level support framework that integrates policy coherence, sufficient budget allocation, data driven planning, and school-based support systems is essential. The inclusion of teachers' perspectives in policy development is particularly important to ensure that reforms remain grounded in classroom realities.

Moreover, schools are encouraged to cultivate a culture of collaboration through team teaching, mentoring programs, and joint planning initiatives, while also strengthening partnerships with parents, local government units, and other stakeholders to enhance educational support systems. Teachers must continue to engage in professional development and uphold a strong sense of commitment and professionalism in implementing the curriculum. Learners are likewise expected to actively participate in learning activities, utilize resources responsibly, and develop self-discipline and resilience, while parents are encouraged to maintain active communication with teachers and provide a supportive home learning environment. Finally, future research is recommended to extend this inquiry across different geographical contexts and to incorporate the perspectives of additional stakeholders such as students, parents, and administrators, thereby generating a more comprehensive understanding of the MATATAG Curriculum's implementation and impact.

REFERENCES

Adom, D., Hussein, E. K., & Agyem, J. A. (2018). Theoretical and conceptual framework: Mandatory ingredients of a quality research. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 7(1), 438–441.

Aguilar, T. (2019). Aligning teaching methods with curriculum content for effective learning outcomes. *Philippine Educational Insights*, 33(3), 63–78.

Aldunate, R., & Nussbaum, M. (2020). Teacher adoption of technology: Factors and mindsets. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 106, 105893. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.106232>

Almazan, J. S., Dela Cruz, F. A., & Ponce, M. C. (2020). Aligning teaching strategies with learning competencies: A key to effective instruction. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 98(2), 45–60.

Almonte-Acosta, S. A. (2016). The problem of time: A barrier to meaningful learning in Philippine classrooms. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 95(2), 20–30.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2016). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Pearson Education.

Anderson, S. E. (1997). Understanding teacher change: Revisiting the concerns-based adoption model. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 27(3), 331–367.

Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 10–20.

Baker, E. L., O'Neil, H. F., & Linn, R. L. (2022). Measuring educational quality: A holistic approach to curriculum evaluation. *Educational Measurement Journal*, 40(3), 210–228. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654322110001>

Baker, R. S., Zhang, Y., Wang, Y., & Paquette, L. (2022). Learning analytics to support student engagement and skill development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 114(3), 453–471. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000672>

Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (2015). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 3–32). Jossey-Bass.

Ball, D. L., & Tyson, K. (2019). Teacher learning and curriculum reform: Managing complexity and change. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 51(4), 511–529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2018.1557640>

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.

Baroody, A. J., Lai, M.-L., & Mix, K. S. (2016). The role of conceptual knowledge in mathematics learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 51(3–4), 229–243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1207539>

Batas Pambansa Blg. 232. (1982). An act providing for the establishment and maintenance of an integrated system of education.

Bautista, M. C., & Villanueva, R. L. (2021). Infrastructure gaps and their effect on public school implementation of K to 12 reforms. *Philippine Journal of Education and Development*, 45(2), 88–105.

Bautista, M. C. R., & Tan, C. P. (2019). Challenges in the Philippine education system: A review of structural issues. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 91(2), 56–72.

Bernardo, A. B. I., & Sevilla, D. R. (2019). Barriers to curriculum reform in Philippine public schools: Perspectives from educators. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 20(2), 257–269. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-019-09586-5>

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., & Brown, P. (2002). Teaching effectiveness and students' behavior in small and large classes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(2), 385–398.

Boser, U. (2019). The Common Core and student achievement: Narrowing gaps and raising standards. Center for American Progress. <https://www.americanprogress.org>

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

Cabansag, M. G. (2016). Unpacking competencies for better learning outcomes in the K to 12 curriculum. *Asian Journal of Education*, 11(2), 34–46.

Cabigao, J. G. (2019). Collaborative learning strategies in Philippine education. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 96(2), 45–52.

Calleja, M. B. (2019). Leadership and teacher support in educational reforms. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Practice*, 11(2), 59–70.

Castro, E. R. (2016). Contextualized teaching in Philippine basic education: Making learning relevant. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(2), 62–68.

Castro, R. A. (2016). Contextualized learning: Enhancing curriculum relevance through localization. *Journal of Philippine Education Studies*, 21(1), 13–23.

Cochran, W. G. (2008). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Collie, R. J., Martin, A. J., & Granziera, H. (2018). Teachers' self-efficacy and its links to professional learning and implementation of curriculum reforms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 74, 291–302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.009>

Cordero, S., Aguilar, T., & Lopez, M. (2020). Pedagogical strategies in the implementation of new curricula: A student-centered approach. *International Journal of Educational Innovation*, 45(4), 225–240.

Corpuz, B. B., & Lucido, P. I. (2018). *Educational foundations*. Lorimar Publishing.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Cruz, A. P., Delos Reyes, J. T., & Salazar, M. N. (2021). Professional development practices for competency-based curriculum: Evidence from the Philippines. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(4), 367–383.

Cruz, L. J., & Reyes, A. M. (2024). Evaluating the Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum: Early insights and implementation outcomes. *Journal of Philippine Education Reform*, 16(1), 12–30.

Cruz, R. M., Santos, J. F., & Valerio, K. L. (2024). Curriculum responsiveness: Feedback mechanisms in MATATAG implementation. *Philippine Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22(1), 44–59.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*.

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org>

David, C. C., & Albert, J. R. G. (2021). Challenges and prospects of the K-12 program in the Philippines. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies*.

Delos Santos, C. A., & Ochoa, J. A. (2020). Sustaining curriculum reforms through professional development: Lessons from the K to 12 experience. *Education Quarterly*, 77(1), 21–38.

Delos Santos, M. R., & Ochoa, J. P. (2020). Teacher development in times of reform: Insights from the K to 12 transition. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 17(3), 89–103.

Department of Education (DepEd). (2022). *Curriculum guide for the MATATAG K to 12 Basic Education Program*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education (DepEd). (2023). *Revised K to 12 (MATATAG) Curriculum framework*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Department of Education. (2023). *MATATAG curriculum: Reforming basic education in the Philippines*. Department of Education.

DepEd. (2022). *Implementation review of the K to 12 curriculum*. Department of Education, Philippines. <https://deped.gov.ph>

Desimone, L. M. (2019). The role of professional learning communities in teacher development. *Educational Researcher*, 48(5), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19838950>

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. Macmillan.

Dizon, M. C., Santos, R. P., & Fernando, A. J. (2024). Enhancing teacher preparedness: Insights from MATATAG curriculum rollout. *Teacher Development Quarterly*, 18(2), 67–85.

Doolittle, P. E., & Hicks, D. (2015). Resource equity in Common Core implementation. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 9(1), 34–50.

Drake, S. M., & Reid, J. L. (2018). Integrated curriculum as an effective approach to teaching and learning. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 52(1), 1–15.

Flick, U. (2007). *Managing quality in qualitative research*. SAGE Publications.

Flores, M. A., & De Guzman, A. B. (2018). Authentic assessment challenges and practices in basic education. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 1(1), 30–40.

Forero, R., Nahidi, S., De Costa, J., Mohsin, M., Fitzgerald, G., Gibson, N., & Aboagye-Sarfo, P. (2018). Application of four-dimension criteria to assess rigour of qualitative research in emergency medicine. *BMC Health Services Research*, 18(1), 120. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-2915-2>

Francisco, M. J., & Nuñez, M. P. (2019). Improvisation and innovation: Filipino teachers' responses to resource scarcity. *Philippine Journal of Education and Teaching*, 25(1), 41–56.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2020). *The devil is in the details: System solutions for equity, excellence, and well-being*. Corwin.

Gillies, R. M. (2016). Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n3.3>

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4), 597–607.

Gonzales, J. M., Rivera, E. T., & Lopez, D. A. (2023). Industry-aligned curriculum: Evaluating the responsiveness of MATATAG to labor market trends. *Philippine Education Studies*, 6(1), 22–39.

Gonzales, J. P., & Penuela, R. C. (2018). Inclusive strategies: Diverse pedagogical approaches in Philippine classrooms. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 7(4), 104–119.

- Graham, P. (2020). Curriculum reform and teacher collaboration: Building learning communities. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 29(3), 200–217.
- Granziera, H., & Perera, H. N. (2019). Teachers' self-efficacy, adaptability, and effectiveness in curriculum change. *Educational Psychology*, 39(5), 628–647.
- Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching*, 8(3), 381–391.
- Guskey, T. R. (2014). Planning professional learning. *Educational Leadership*, 71(8), 10–16.
- Guskey, T. R. (2020). *Evaluating professional development* (2nd ed.). Corwin Press.
- Guskey, T. R. (2020). Professional development and curriculum implementation: A review of empirical research. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(2), 1–13.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2015). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Pearson.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2016). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2019). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press.
- Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). *Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all*. Corwin Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Heritage, M. (2018). *Formative assessment in practice: A process of inquiry and action*. Harvard Education Press.
- Herman, J., & Goldstein, J. (2019). Common Core State Standards and learning outcomes in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher*, 48(2), 98–109.
- Huang, Y., & Yang, Y. (2020). Teacher collaboration and curriculum implementation. *Asia-Pacific Education Review*, 21(4), 625–639.
- Hughes, J. E., & Swenson, K. (2021). Technology-rich curricula: Designing for collaboration and digital literacy. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 69(2), 453–472. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-09945-9>
- Inocian, R. B., & Baldico, J. L. (2020). Teacher agency and curriculum change: A Philippine context. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(2), 353–370.

- Ismail, H. N., & Yusof, N. (2018). Storytelling and dramatization: Effective strategies for moral education. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(2), 45–52. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.6n.2p.45>
- Javier, F. L., & Altea, C. D. (2018). Supply chain challenges in educational materials distribution: The Philippine experience. *Journal of Public Sector Logistics*, 10(1), 27–39.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2021). How we learn about teacher learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 91(3), 403–436. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211019109>
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher characteristics and job contexts. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(5), 1059–1069.
- Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2017). Experiential learning theory as a guide for experiential educators in higher education. *Experiential Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 1(1), 7–44.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher-student relationships on achievement and implementation of reforms. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(4), 547–588. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317749728>
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Labrague, L. J., & Ballard, C. A. (2021). Psychological well-being and resilience of Filipino teachers during educational transition. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 54(1), 98–112.
- Laguador, J. M. (2016). Mentoring framework in the Philippines: Building teacher capacity through peer collaboration. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 3(2), 1–7.
- Larmer, J., Mergendoller, J. R., & Boss, S. (2015). *Setting the standard for project-based learning: A proven approach to rigorous classroom instruction*. ASCD.
- Leach, D., Thomas, R., & Mortimore, P. (2021). Reflective practice in teacher development: Impact on curriculum implementation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 109, 101855.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). *Linking leadership to student learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2014). The development and validation of a school leadership framework. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(4), 689–724. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13505761>
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2019). Transformational school leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(3), 485–524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18761347>

- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. Harper & Row.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Llego, M. A. (2020). Collaboration among teachers: A foundation for curriculum innovation in the Philippines. *Philippine Education Review*, 15(3), 87–102.
- Lorenzo, J. C., Torres, E. M., & Dela Cruz, F. P. (2023). Stakeholder collaboration in curriculum reform: The MATATAG experience. *Journal of Philippine Educational Leadership*, 29(3), 101–120.
- Luna, F. D., & Valenzuela, M. A. (2024). Resource equity in MATATAG curriculum implementation. *Journal of Education Equity*, 11(1), 33–47.
- Magno, C., & Madrigal, D. V. (2020). Teacher workload, curriculum change, and burnout: A Philippine case study. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 103, 101602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101602>
- Malipot, M. H. (2019). Curriculum alignment and student performance under K to 12. *Manila Bulletin*. <https://mb.com.ph/2019/03/24/curriculum-alignment-and-student-performance/>
- Manlangit, P., Sison, J. B., & Batoon, R. P. (2016). LAC sessions as a professional learning community model in the Philippines. *Department of Education Policy Brief*, 8(3), 1–10.
- Manuel, M. A., & Medallon, A. A. (2020). Administrative workload and its effect on teachers' instructional time in public schools. *Philippine Social Science Review*, 72(4), 45–63.
- Mateo, C. J., & Domingo, K. M. (2022). Bridging pedagogy and curriculum content through professional development. *Teacher Learning and Development Journal*, 6(2), 68–83.
- Mateo, J. M., & Domingo, M. C. (2022). Teacher training in times of curriculum change: A Filipino case study. *International Journal of Education and Development*, 12(1), 100–116.
- Medina, A. M., & Gonzales, J. R. (2019). Parental involvement in education: Impact on student performance in elementary schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 13(1), 67–82.
- Mendoza, R. (2021). Teachers' perceptions of curriculum relevance and effectiveness. *Philippine Educational Journal*, 18(1), 75–90.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Meyer, L. H., & Lueck, S. A. (2020). Teachers' perceptions of curriculum adoption: The role of teacher beliefs and professional development. *Journal of Educational Change*, 21(3), 305–325. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-020-09365-6>

- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- OECD. (2019). *Education at a glance 2019: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing.
- Orb, A., Eisenhauer, L., & Wynaden, D. (2001). Ethics in qualitative research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 33(1), 93–96.
- Orbe, M. M., & De Guzman, A. B. (2020). Curriculum guide utilization and MELC alignment in Philippine classrooms. *Southeast Asian Journal of Education*, 21(4), 203–219.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2018). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues*. Pearson.
- Padilla, R. J., & Mercado, L. D. (2021). Scaffolded learning in Philippine mathematics education: A response to curriculum reforms. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 41(2), 150–164.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. SAGE Publications.
- Pascual, R. V., & Rico, R. A. (2020). Improvised instructional materials: Creativity in the face of limitations. *Philippine Teacher Education Journal*, 28(1), 55–68.
- Penuel, W. R., Gallagher, D. J., & Sherer, D. (2021). Teachers' perspectives on curriculum adoption: The role of professional experiences in the sense-making process. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 53(2), 189–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2021.1876034>
- Perez, D. (2023). Challenges in curriculum implementation: Class size and resource allocation. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 22(3), 152–170.
- Ramos, G. P., & Santiago, R. L. (2020). Challenges in English language teaching in multilingual settings. *Language and Literacy Education Journal*, 9(2), 112–128.
- Reyes, M. C. (2019). Integrating foundational skills in early childhood classrooms. *Philippine Journal of Early Education*, 7(1), 77–89.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 387–431. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072003387>
- Tezci, E. (2016). Teachers' views on the use of educational technology in classrooms. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 15(2), 53–59.

- Tesch, R. (2013). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. Routledge.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Murphy, M. (2015). *Leading for differentiation: Growing teachers who grow kids*. ASCD.
- Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2015). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*. Jossey-Bass.
- Tupas, R. (2018). Language education and inequality in the Philippines: Multilingual education meets globalization. *Language and Education*, 32(4), 314–328.
- Tupas, R., & Martin, I. P. (2017). Contextualized language learning in the Philippines: Issues and directions. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 48(2), 100–118.
- Vangrieken, K., Dochy, F., Raes, E., & Kyndt, E. (2020). Teacher collaboration and professional development: The impact on curriculum innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 92, 103048. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103048>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.