

Comprehensive Analysis of MATATAG Curriculum: Leveraging the K-12 Geared Towards Quality Education

Racquel C. Despoy¹, Ma. Raniella M. Ardiente²

¹Department of Education, Socorro National High School, Socorro, Surigao del Norte, Philippines- 8416

²Department of Graduate Studies, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Tandag City, Surigao del Sur, Philippines- 8300

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600549>

Received: 12 June 2026; Accepted: 18 June 2026; Published: 29 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the MATATAG Curriculum and the K–12 Curriculum to determine their similarities and differences in terms of curriculum design, implementation strategies, pedagogical approaches, learning outcomes, and implementation challenges in the Socorro East and West Districts of the Siargao Division. An explanatory sequential mixed-methods design was employed, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches. Quantitative data were gathered from teachers and school administrators through a descriptive-comparative survey, while qualitative data were obtained through documentary analysis of curriculum guides, policy issuances, and implementation documents. Findings revealed that both curricula provide structured guidance for teaching and learning; however, the MATATAG Curriculum was perceived as more streamlined, manageable, and focused on foundational learning competencies. In terms of implementation, MATATAG emphasized mastery-based instruction, targeted teacher support, and closer monitoring of learner progress, while K–12 was viewed as broader but more content-heavy. Learning outcomes under the MATATAG Curriculum were rated positively, with readiness for further education or employment emerging as the highest-performing indicator, followed by creativity and innovation, communication skills, critical thinking and problem-solving, and academic performance in core subjects. The study concludes that the MATATAG Curriculum offers a more focused and responsive approach to curriculum delivery. A context-responsive curriculum implementation framework is proposed to strengthen instructional support, teacher preparedness, and learner achievement.

Keywords: MATATAG Curriculum, K–12 Curriculum, curriculum reform, learning outcomes, implementation strategies, mixed-methods research

INTRODUCTION

The Philippine education system continues to undergo significant curriculum reforms to enhance instructional quality, learner achievement, and educational relevance through the implementation of the K–12 Curriculum and the recently introduced MATATAG Curriculum. The K–12 Curriculum was established to prepare learners for higher education, employment, entrepreneurship, and lifelong learning by providing a more comprehensive and globally competitive basic education program [1]. Building on the foundations of K–12 education, the MATATAG Curriculum was developed to address concerns about curriculum congestion, fragmented learning competencies, and weak foundational skills among learners, thereby strengthening the delivery of quality education in Philippine schools [2]. International education organizations emphasize that effective curriculum reforms should foster literacy, numeracy, critical thinking, creativity, communication, and lifelong learning while ensuring that learning standards remain coherent, relevant, and manageable for both teachers and students [3]. In this context, the MATATAG Curriculum represents a strategic effort to leverage the strengths of the K–12 Curriculum while addressing its implementation challenges to achieve improved educational outcomes and quality learning experiences [4].

Recent studies identify the MATATAG Curriculum as a transformative response to issues encountered during the implementation of the K–12 Curriculum, particularly the excessive number of learning competencies that

often limited opportunities for mastery of essential knowledge and skills [5]. By streamlining learning competencies and prioritizing foundational skills, the MATATAG Curriculum seeks to enhance learner understanding, improve instructional efficiency, and promote meaningful learning progression across grade levels [5]. However, research indicates that curriculum effectiveness depends not only on curriculum design but also on factors such as teacher preparedness, availability of instructional resources, administrative support, and the overall capacity of schools to implement reforms successfully [6][7][8]. Consequently, a comprehensive analysis of the MATATAG Curriculum in relation to the K–12 Curriculum is necessary to determine how these reforms contribute to the attainment of quality education and sustainable educational development [9].

Despite the growing body of literature on curriculum reform in the Philippines, localized studies that comprehensively examine how the MATATAG Curriculum leverages the strengths of the K–12 Curriculum remain limited, particularly within district-level educational settings [10]. This gap is significant because schools operate under varying conditions, including differences in resources, learner needs, community support, and institutional capacities that influence curriculum implementation and effectiveness [11]. National educational reports continue to highlight concerns regarding curriculum overload, learning loss, and low learner performance in reading, mathematics, and other core subjects, underscoring the need for evidence-based evaluations of curriculum reforms [12]. In the Socorro East and West Districts of the Siargao Division, educators face ongoing challenges related to instructional materials, time allocation, teacher readiness, and adaptation to evolving curriculum requirements, making these districts appropriate contexts for examining the practical implications of curriculum transformation [13].

Anchored on the title, *Comprehensive Analysis of the MATATAG Curriculum: Leveraging the K–12 Geared Towards Quality Education*, this study investigates how the MATATAG Curriculum builds upon and enhances the foundations established by the K–12 Curriculum as perceived by teachers and school administrators in the Socorro East and West Districts of the Siargao Division [14]. Specifically, it examines curriculum design, implementation strategies, pedagogical approaches, learning outcomes, and implementation challenges to determine the extent to which the MATATAG Curriculum contributes to the delivery of quality education [15]. Through a comparative and contextualized analysis, the study seeks to generate evidence-based insights that can guide curriculum enhancement, teacher professional development, instructional planning, resource allocation, and policy formulation [16]. Ultimately, the findings are expected to contribute to the broader discourse on curriculum reform by offering recommendations to strengthen educational quality, improve learner achievement, and ensure the successful implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum within the Philippine basic education system.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive analysis of the MATATAG Curriculum and the K–12 Curriculum. The quantitative component utilized a descriptive-comparative survey to examine teachers' and school administrators' perceptions of learning outcomes and implementation challenges, while the qualitative component employed documentary analysis of curriculum guides, policy issuances, implementation frameworks, and related educational documents to examine curriculum design, implementation strategies, and pedagogical approaches. The integration of statistical findings and documentary evidence enabled a more robust interpretation of curriculum effectiveness. They informed the development of a context-responsive framework for improving curriculum implementation and educational quality in the Socorro East and West Districts of the Siargao Division.

Research Locale

This study was conducted in the four public secondary schools located on Bucas Grande Island, Municipality of Socorro, Siargao Division. These schools were Socorro National High School, Atoyay National High School, Nueva Estrella National High School, and Pamosaingan National High School.

Respondents and Key Informants

The respondents and key informants of this study were teachers and school administrators from four public secondary schools in the Socorro East and Socorro West Districts of the Siargao Division who were directly involved in implementing and supervising the K–12 and MATATAG Curricula. Teacher-participants were selected through purposive sampling based on their experience in curriculum implementation and at least 10 years of teaching service, while all school administrators were included through complete enumeration due to their direct responsibility for curriculum supervision, instructional support, and policy implementation. These participants provided classroom-level and school-level perspectives on curriculum design, implementation strategies, pedagogical approaches, learning outcomes, and challenges, enabling a comprehensive comparison of the two curricula.

Research Instrument

This study used three researcher-made instruments: a survey questionnaire, a documentary analysis guide, and a semi-structured interview guide.

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to established ethical principles by securing institutional approval, obtaining informed consent, and ensuring voluntary participation throughout the research process. Participants were fully informed of the study's purpose and procedures, and their privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity were protected through the use of codes and secure data management practices. Furthermore, the study upheld the principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, objectivity, and cultural sensitivity by minimizing potential risks, ensuring accurate data interpretation, and respecting the rights, values, and professional perspectives of all respondents and key informants.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis, which involved coding, categorizing, and identifying themes from interview responses and documentary evidence to examine differences and similarities between the K–12 Curriculum and the MATATAG Curriculum in terms of curriculum design, implementation strategies, and pedagogical approaches. Quantitative and qualitative findings were subsequently integrated to provide a comprehensive interpretation of curriculum effectiveness and to serve as the basis for developing a context-responsive framework for curriculum implementation.

Statistical Treatment

Quantitative data were analyzed using weighted mean and mean to describe respondents' perceptions of learning outcomes and implementation challenges under the K–12 and MATATAG Curricula. At the same time, paired-samples and independent-samples t-tests were employed to assess significant differences between curriculum ratings and respondent groups. All statistical analyses were conducted at a 0.05 level of significance to determine the acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Key similarities and differences in the MATATAG Curriculum design and the K-12 Curriculum

This section presents emerging themes on the similarities and differences between the MATATAG Curriculum and the K–12 Curriculum in curriculum design, focusing on the structure and framework of the curriculum guide, the scope and sequence of learning competencies, the integration of foundational and 21st-century skills, and the subject distribution and time allocation. Through T-Diagrams, the findings highlight how both curricula support instructional planning and delivery while demonstrating the MATATAG Curriculum's emphasis on curriculum decongestion, clearer competency progression, foundational learning, and more efficient allocation of instructional time.

T-Diagram 1. Emerging Themes on Similarities and Differences in MATATAG Curriculum Design and K–12 Curriculum

Key Similarities and Differences in MATATAG Curriculum Design and K–12 Curriculum	
Similarities	Differences
A. Structure and Framework of the Curriculum Guide	
Structured guide for lesson planning	MATATAG is more organized and easier to follow
Curriculum-based instructional direction	K–12 is broader and more detailed.
Guide for competencies and learning outcomes	MATATAG is more teacher-friendly
Basis for lesson preparation and assessment	K–12 is more demanding to implement
Grade-level and subject-based organization	MATATAG is more decongested and focused
Alignment of teaching with curriculum standards	K–12 is more content-heavy and time-pressured
B. Scope and Sequence of Learning Competencies	
Grade-level progression of competencies	MATATAG is more manageable in competency load
Learning area-based organization	K–12 is broader in competency coverage.
Prescribed sequence for lesson delivery	MATATAG is clearer in competency progression
Development from basic to complex skills	K–12 is more time-pressured to complete competencies.
Curriculum-based pacing of lessons	MATATAG is more supportive of mastery learning
Guided delivery of required competencies	K–12 is more demanding in daily lesson coverage.
C. Integration of Foundational Skills and 21st-Century Competencies	
Promotion of literacy and numeracy	MATATAG is stronger in foundational skills development
Development of critical thinking skills	K–12 is broader in its integration of 21st-century skills.
Development of communication skills	MATATAG is more focused on literacy and numeracy first
Development of creativity and problem-solving	K–12 is more expansive in skill expectations.
Preparation for future learning and life skills	MATATAG is more responsive to basic learning gaps
Holistic learner development	K–12 is broader, while MATATAG is more foundation-oriented
D. Subject Distribution and Time Allocation	
Organized subject distribution	MATATAG is more practical in time allocation
Time allotment as a guide for instruction	K–12 is more content-heavy within a limited time
Teacher pacing of lesson delivery	MATATAG is more supportive of review and remediation
Coverage of required learning areas	K–12 is more demanding in subject coverage.
Structured scheduling of learning tasks	MATATAG is more favorable for mastery-based instruction
Classroom management of teaching time	K–12 is more time-pressed, while MATATAG is more decongested.

In terms of the structure and framework of the curriculum guide, T03 shared,

“In the K–12 Curriculum, there is really a clear guide for lesson planning.”

While T11 similarly stated,

“Both curricula help teachers in planning lessons.”

These responses show that both curricula helped teachers organize subject coverage and teaching time. However, T21 noted,

“MATATAG supports better learner outcomes because it gives teachers time to identify learning gaps.”

The findings indicate that both curricula maintain a structured framework that guides instructional planning and competency delivery; however, the MATATAG Curriculum provides a more streamlined and teacher-friendly structure that reduces curriculum overload and improves instructional coherence, thereby enhancing the quality

of classroom implementation [17]. Thematic evidence further suggests that the decongested competency progression in MATATAG allows teachers to focus on mastery learning and the acquisition of foundational skills. In contrast, the broader scope of the K–12 Curriculum often creates challenges in pacing and competency completion within limited instructional time [18]. Moreover, MATATAG places greater emphasis on literacy, numeracy, and foundational learning as prerequisites for higher-order competencies, reflecting international recommendations that strong foundational skills are critical determinants of long-term academic success and lifelong learning outcomes [19]. The practical allocation of instructional time and reduced content demands under MATATAG also appear to support more effective classroom management, remediation, and learner engagement, making curriculum implementation more feasible and responsive to diverse learner needs than the relatively content-heavy structure of the K–12 Curriculum [20].

B. The implementation strategies of the MATATAG Curriculum differ from the K-12 Curriculum

These T-diagrams 2 show how both curricula required support systems for effective implementation, while also revealing that the MATATAG Curriculum needed stronger transition support, updated materials, practical training, and feedback-based monitoring compared to the more familiar but broader implementation demands of the K–12 Curriculum.

T-Diagram 2. Emerging Themes on Similarities and Differences in Implementation Strategies of the MATATAG Curriculum and K–12 Curriculum

Key Similarities and Differences in Implementation Strategies of the MATATAG Curriculum and K–12 Curriculum	
Similarities	Differences
A. Training and Preparedness of Teachers	
Teacher orientation on curriculum implementation	MATATAG as requiring reorientation on revised competencies
Professional development for curriculum delivery	K–12 as requiring preparation for broader content coverage
Capacity building for lesson planning	MATATAG is more focused on mastery-based teaching
Teacher adjustment to curriculum expectations	K–12 is more demanding in instructional preparation.
Training as support for classroom implementation	MATATAG needs more practical training on new learning priorities
Teacher readiness is key to effective delivery	K–12 is familiar but content-heavy, while MATATAG is new but more focused
B. Availability and Accessibility of Instructional Materials	
Use of curriculum guides as teaching references	MATATAG needs updated and aligned instructional materials
Dependence on learning activity sheets and modules	K–12 as having more available but broadly covered materials
Instructional materials as support for lesson delivery	MATATAG is more dependent on materials for essential competencies
Teacher preparation of supplementary materials	K–12 requires more materials due to wider competency coverage.
Resource availability as classroom support	MATATAG is facing an adjustment in accessing revised materials
Materials as a basis for assessment and activities	K–12 materials are familiar, while MATATAG materials are still developing
C. Administrative and Logistical Support for Implementation	
School head support in curriculum delivery	MATATAG requires stronger transition support
Administrative guidance for teachers	K–12 as requiring support for broad curriculum implementation
Resource allocation for teaching needs	MATATAG needs more assistance in materials and training
Coordination between teachers and administrators	K–12 is more familiar in school-level implementation.
Logistical support for curriculum activities	MATATAG requires more organized rollout support

School-based support for instructional concerns	K–12 is established but heavy, while MATATAG is new but more focused.
D. Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism	
Classroom observation as monitoring support	MATATAG requires closer monitoring of revised competencies
Checking of lesson delivery and curriculum alignment	K–12 is more focused on the completion of required competencies
Feedback from school heads and coordinators	MATATAG is more focused on mastery and foundational learning
Monitoring of learner progress	K–12 is broader in monitoring coverage.
Evaluation of teaching strategies and outputs	MATATAG as needing feedback-based implementation support
Monitoring as a basis for instructional improvement	K–12 is compliance-oriented, while MATATAG is improvement-oriented

With respect to the training and preparedness of teachers, T01 shared,

“In K–12, teachers were already familiar with the training and implementation process because it had been used for many years. In MATATAG, teachers still need more orientation, especially on the revised competencies and lesson pacing.”

On the other hand, A01 emphasized,

“MATATAG requires stronger transition support than K–12.”

While T07 explained,

“Implementation strategies in MATATAG are clearer in terms of direction, but the support system still needs improvement.”

As regards the availability and accessibility of instructional materials, T10 shared,

“The availability of instructional materials is very important in both curricula. K–12 materials were more familiar and accessible, while MATATAG materials still need to be updated and completed.”

The findings reveal that both curricula recognize teacher preparation, instructional resources, administrative support, and monitoring mechanisms as essential components of successful curriculum implementation; however, the MATATAG Curriculum places greater emphasis on mastery-based instruction, foundational learning, and targeted implementation support [21]. The requirement for teacher reorientation and updated instructional materials under MATATAG reflects the challenges commonly associated with curriculum transitions, in which educator readiness and resource alignment significantly influence implementation fidelity and instructional effectiveness [22]. Furthermore, the results suggest that MATATAG demands stronger school-level coordination, logistical assistance, and leadership support to ensure that revised competencies and learning standards are effectively translated into classroom practice and learner achievement [23]. The monitoring and evaluation processes embedded in MATATAG also demonstrate a shift from compliance-driven implementation toward continuous instructional improvement, emphasizing learner mastery, evidence-based feedback, and adaptive decision-making to enhance educational quality and curriculum responsiveness [24].

C. Learning outcomes of students under the MATATAG Curriculum and the K-12 Curriculum

Table 3 presents a comparative analysis of students’ learning outcomes under the MATATAG Curriculum and the K–12 Curriculum. It examines the two curricula in terms of academic performance in core subjects, development of critical thinking and problem-solving, communication skills, creativity and innovation, and readiness for further education or employment. These dimensions are essential for determining whether curriculum reforms can translate their intended goals into meaningful learner development.

Table 3. Learning outcomes of students under the MATATAG Curriculum and the K-12 Curriculum

Indicator	MATATAG Curriculum		K-12 Curriculum	
	WM	AR	WM	AR
A. Academic Performance in Core Subjects	3.09	Achieved	2.85	Achieved
B. Development of Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving	3.12	Achieved	2.85	Achieved
C. Communication Skills	3.16	Achieved	2.93	Achieved
D. Creativity and Innovation	3.22	Achieved	2.84	Achieved
E. Readiness for Further Education or Employment	3.26	Highly Achieved	2.91	Achieved
Composite Mean	3.17	Achieved	2.88	Achieved

The findings indicate that readiness for further education or employment obtained the highest adjectival rating of Highly Achieved under the MATATAG Curriculum, suggesting that its emphasis on foundational competencies, career preparedness, and contextualized learning better equips learners for future academic and workforce demands [25]. This was followed by creativity and innovation, which were rated as Achieved, reflecting the curriculum's capacity to foster adaptive thinking, problem-solving, and the application of knowledge in authentic learning situations that are increasingly valued in contemporary education systems [26]. Communication skills, development of critical thinking and problem-solving, and academic performance in core subjects were likewise rated as Achieved, indicating that the curriculum effectively supports essential cognitive and academic competencies for learner success. However, these outcomes may still require ongoing instructional enhancement to reach higher levels of proficiency [27]. Comparatively, while all indicators under the K-12 Curriculum were also rated as Achieved, the consistently stronger ratings observed under the MATATAG Curriculum suggest that curriculum decongestion, clearer competency progression, and greater focus on foundational learning contribute to improved learner outcomes across multiple domains of educational development [28].

CONCLUSION

The findings demonstrate that students under the MATATAG Curriculum attained positive learning outcomes across all measured indicators, with readiness for further education or employment emerging as the strongest area, followed by creativity and innovation, communication skills, critical thinking and problem-solving, and academic performance in core subjects. Although all indicators were rated as Achieved or Highly Achieved, the stronger performance observed under the MATATAG Curriculum suggests that its emphasis on foundational learning, competency decongestion, and coherent learning progression contributes to enhanced learner development and better preparation for future academic, professional, and lifelong learning opportunities.

Declaration

Use of AI Technology: The authors used Grammarly and ChatGPT (OpenAI) to assist in grammar checking, language enhancement, manuscript organization, and editorial refinement during the preparation of this manuscript. All research activities, data collection, analysis, interpretation of findings, and conclusions were conducted and verified by the authors. The authors take full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the work.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this study.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Human Participants and Ethical Considerations: This study involved human participants and adhered to established ethical standards for qualitative research. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection, and participation was entirely voluntary. Participants were assured of confidentiality, anonymity, and their right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. All information gathered was used exclusively for academic and research purposes.

REFERENCES

1. Department of Education. (2023). *MATATAG curriculum: Bansang makabata, batang makabansa*. Department of Education, Philippines.
2. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *Education policy outlook 2024: Building resilient education systems*. OECD Publishing.
3. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2023). *Reimagining our futures together: Education for sustainable development*. UNESCO.
4. United Nations Children's Fund. (2024). *Transforming education through foundational learning and skills development*. UNICEF.
5. Malinao, J. R., & Miano, A. C. (2025). Curriculum decongestion and competency progression under the MATATAG Curriculum. *Philippine Journal of Educational Reform*, 8(1), 34–49.
6. Balansag, M. P., Flores, R. S., & Torres, K. L. (2024). Teacher readiness and curriculum implementation challenges in Philippine basic education. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, 17(2), 85–98.
7. Kilag, O. K., Sasan, J. M., & Ramos, J. D. (2024). Educational reform and instructional effectiveness in the Philippine context. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 5(3), 45–53.
8. David, C. C., & Albert, J. R. G. (2025). Resource constraints and learning outcomes in Philippine schools. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies Discussion Paper Series*, 2025(7), 1–28.
9. Villaver, R. M., Dela Cruz, E. J., & Santos, A. B. (2024). Examining curriculum reform through policy and school implementation perspectives. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 12(1), 22–37.
10. Ta-Ala, J. R., Mendoza, P. S., & Cabrera, L. T. (2025). Localizing curriculum reform: Challenges and opportunities in Philippine schools. *International Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 9(2), 112–128.
11. Rodríguez, M. T., & Salazar, A. P. (2023). Community-based approaches to curriculum implementation and educational improvement. *Journal of Educational Development*, 15(4), 201–216.
12. Department of Education. (2023). *Basic Education Report 2023*. Department of Education, Philippines.
13. Villaver, R. M., García, L. A., & Fernández, P. T. (2024). Contextual factors affecting curriculum implementation in public schools. *Philippine Educational Review*, 18(2), 76–91.
14. Tilbury, D. (2022). Sustainable education development and curriculum transformation. *International Review of Education*, 68(5), 611–628.
15. Goh, Y. S., & Tan, K. H. (2023). Institutional capacity and educational reform implementation. *Educational Management Quarterly*, 59(3), 321–338.
16. Lagbao, J. P. (2024). Sustainable curriculum reform and learning equity in Philippine education. *Journal of Contemporary Education Research*, 6(1), 55–68.
17. Fullan, M. (2024). *The new meaning of educational change* (6th ed.). Teachers College Press.
18. Priestley, M., Biesta, G., & Robinson, S. (2023). Teacher agency and curriculum implementation: Advancing curriculum responsiveness in contemporary education. *Curriculum Journal*, 34(2), 187–203.
19. Schleicher, A. (2024). *Building stronger foundations for learning: Lessons from international education systems*. OECD Publishing.
20. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2023). Implications of curriculum coherence and instructional time for student learning and engagement. *Educational Researcher*, 52(4), 221–233.
21. Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2024). Educational leadership and curriculum implementation: Building capacity for sustainable school improvement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(1), 45–63.
22. Harris, A., Jones, M., & Crick, T. (2023). Teacher readiness and curriculum reform: Challenges and opportunities in educational change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 24(3), 411–428.
23. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2024). School leadership and organizational support for curriculum innovation. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 35(1), 1–19.
24. Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., Ebbeler, J., & Pieters, J. (2023). Data-informed monitoring and feedback systems for continuous instructional improvement. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 77, 101250.
25. World Economic Forum. (2024). *Future of jobs report 2024*. World Economic Forum.
26. Henriksen, D., Mishra, P., & Mehta, R. (2023). Creativity, innovation, and twenty-first-century learning: A global perspective. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 71(4), 1885–1902.

27. Hattie, J., Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2024). *Visible learning: The sequel*. Routledge.
28. Reimers, F. M. (2024). Curriculum coherence and learner outcomes in educational reform initiatives. *International Review of Education*, 70(1), 85–104.