

Challenges and Opportunities in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum Among Key Stage 1 Teachers: Implications For Intervention Program

Marifel C. Alvarez¹, Lilia P. Adrales¹, Virginia S. Ariza²

¹Holy Infant College of Tacloban City, Inc., Tacloban City, Leyte, Philippines

²Eastern Visayas State University Carigara Campus

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800754>

Received: 02 September 2026; Accepted: 07 September 2026; Published: 17 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum and the challenges and opportunities experienced by Key Stage 1 (KS1) teachers. It also examined the relationships among curriculum implementation, challenges, and opportunities, and determined whether teachers' perceptions differed by profile. Using a quantitative descriptive-correlational design, the study surveyed 165 KS1 teachers through a structured questionnaire. The study analyzed data using frequency, percentage, mean, Pearson correlation, independent-samples t-test, and one-way analysis of variance. The findings showed that the curriculum was implemented to a great extent, with assessment and evaluation and instructional delivery receiving the highest ratings. The most pronounced challenges involved teacher workload, learner-related concerns, and inadequate resources. Nevertheless, teachers identified considerable opportunities to improve learner engagement, professional collaboration, and professional growth. Significant relationships were found between curriculum implementation and both perceived challenges and opportunities. Perceived challenges did not differ significantly across the respondents' profile variables. However, perceived opportunities differed significantly according to years of teaching experience and level of relevant training attended. Based on these findings, the study proposed a structured intervention program to strengthen curriculum implementation through enhanced professional development, improved resource support, and sustained instructional supervision.

Keywords: challenges, curriculum implementation, Key Stage 1 teachers, opportunities, Revised K to 10 Curriculum

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum reform is essential to ensure education remains responsive to changing social conditions, economic demands, and the competencies learners need to participate meaningfully in society. In the Philippines, the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum represented a major reform intended to improve the quality and relevance of basic education. Its implementation began in School Year 2012–2013 with the rollout of Grades 1 and 7 and was subsequently expanded to include two years of senior high school. The curriculum sought to develop learners who could communicate effectively, think critically and creatively, make informed decisions, and apply their knowledge and skills to higher education, employment, entrepreneurship, and everyday life (DepEd, 2012).

Despite these goals, implementing the K to 12 curriculum revealed persistent concerns about curriculum congestion, the number of learning competencies, limited instructional time, and learners' insufficient mastery of foundational skills. These concerns became more urgent amid evidence of continuing weaknesses in Philippine educational outcomes. The World Bank (2022) estimated that about 90.9% of late-primary-age Filipino children could not read and understand an age-appropriate text. Similarly, the Programme for International Student Assessment 2022 showed that Philippine students performed below the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development average in mathematics, reading, and science. Only 16% of

Filipino students attained at least Level 2 proficiency in mathematics, compared with the OECD average of 69% (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2023). Although these results cannot be attributed solely to curriculum design, they underscore the need to strengthen foundational learning, instructional coherence, and schools' and teachers' capacity to implement the intended curriculum effectively.

In response to these concerns, DepEd introduced the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, commonly known as the MATATAG Curriculum. DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024 established the curriculum as the prescribed standard for Kindergarten to Grade 10 and provided directions concerning its design and implementation. The reform aims to decongest the curriculum, give teachers and learners sufficient time to achieve mastery, strengthen foundational literacy and numeracy, intensify values and peace education, and improve the articulation of twenty-first-century skills. It also promotes learner-centered, inclusive, and developmentally appropriate instruction (DepEd, 2024). Its phased implementation began with Kindergarten and Grades 1, 4, and 7 in School Year 2024–2025, followed by Grades 2, 3, 5, and 8 in School Year 2025–2026. Consequently, Key Stage 1, which comprises Kindergarten to Grade 3, became one of the earliest stages to experience the transition to the revised curriculum.

However, curriculum quality does not automatically guarantee its successful implementation. Curriculum reform requires teachers to interpret new standards, reorganize lessons, prepare appropriate learning resources, revise assessment procedures, and adjust established classroom practices. Gouëdard et al. (2020) emphasized that teachers are not merely recipients of curriculum policy but are central actors who translate curriculum intentions into classroom experiences. Their review showed that teachers' knowledge, beliefs, self-efficacy, workload, access to resources, professional development, leadership support, and opportunities for collaboration influence curriculum implementation. Curriculum reforms may therefore increase teachers' workload when new requirements are introduced without adequate time and support. Conversely, sustained professional development, professional learning communities, clear implementation guidelines, aligned assessments, and sufficient instructional resources can strengthen teacher capacity and promote ownership of the reform (Gouëdard et al., 2020).

Early Philippine studies on the MATATAG Curriculum demonstrate this dual reality of challenge and opportunity. In a study involving Grade 1, 4, and 7 teachers from selected schools in Misamis Occidental, Lanao del Norte, and Zamboanga del Norte, Yunting et al. (2025) found that teachers generally viewed the curriculum as moderately effective and recognized its emphasis on foundational skills and learner-centered instruction. Nevertheless, they reported concerns involving time management, instructional pacing, and resource availability. Perceptions also differed by school type, age, and teaching experience, suggesting that curriculum implementation may be shaped by the contexts in which teachers work (Yunting et al., 2025).

Comparable findings were reported in Malaybalay City. Prado and Asparin (2025) found that elementary teachers generally viewed the MATATAG Curriculum positively, especially in terms of its relevance and alignment with educational goals. However, the respondents encountered difficulties in addressing diverse learner needs, modifying instructional materials, and managing increased workload and stress. Their results also showed that professional development and access to support and resources were associated with more successful curriculum implementation (Prado & Asparin, 2025). Similarly, Montero and Ducot (2025) identified curriculum adaptation and resource availability as prominent difficulties among Kindergarten, Grade 1, and Grade 4 teachers. Their findings highlighted the need for sustained professional development, stronger administrative support, mentorship, professional learning communities, and access to appropriate teaching materials (Montero & Ducot, 2025).

These studies indicate that the MATATAG Curriculum can create opportunities for teachers to improve their pedagogical skills, develop more focused lessons, employ learner-centered strategies, and collaborate with colleagues. At the same time, these benefits may not be fully realized when teachers experience shortages of instructional materials, inadequate training and mentoring, assessment difficulties, infrastructure limitations, and competing instructional and administrative responsibilities. These concerns are particularly significant in Key Stage 1, where teachers establish the literacy, numeracy, socioemotional, and values-related foundations on which later learning depends. Differences in learner readiness are also highly visible at this

stage, requiring teachers to provide differentiated activities, developmentally appropriate assessment, and sustained instructional scaffolding.

The researcher's experience as a Key Stage 1 teacher further revealed the practical complexity of this transition. The revised competencies opened opportunities to develop more focused and engaging lessons, but they also required substantial adjustments in lesson planning, instructional materials, teaching strategies, assessment tasks, and reporting procedures. Teachers must balance these requirements while responding to learners who enter the classroom with different readiness levels and varying support needs. These experiences motivated the study to investigate whether other Key Stage 1 teachers faced similar conditions and to identify forms of assistance that could make curriculum implementation more manageable and effective.

Despite the growing literature on the MATATAG Curriculum, an important gap remains. Available studies have generally examined mixed groups of teachers from different key stages, selected grade levels, particular subjects, or schools outside Eastern Visayas. Consequently, division-level evidence remains limited, particularly on the collective experiences of Kindergarten to Grade 3 teachers. Available studies have also concentrated largely on teachers' readiness, perceived effectiveness, or implementation problems. Fewer studies have simultaneously examined the challenges and opportunities arising from the reform or investigated how perceptions may vary across central and non-central schools and selected teacher characteristics. More importantly, limited evidence exists on the experiences of Key Stage 1 teachers in the Schools Division of Tacloban City during the first years of the complete key stage transition to the revised curriculum. This geographic, population, and practical gap limits local educational leaders' ability to develop interventions suited to the actual conditions of early-grade teachers.

The study was anchored in Fullan's Theory of Educational Change and Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory. Fullan (2007) explains that educational change is a multidimensional process involving changes in instructional materials, teaching practices, and beliefs. Sustainable reform therefore requires capacity building, shared understanding, teacher commitment, collaboration, and continuing institutional support. This perspective guided the examination of workload and time constraints, resource and infrastructure gaps, training and mentoring, assessment demands, pedagogical development, teacher collaboration, and professional growth. Meanwhile, Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory emphasizes that learning develops through interaction, guided participation, and appropriate scaffolding within the learner's Zone of Proximal Development. This theory supported the analysis of opportunities related to learner engagement, collaborative activities, contextualized instruction, and the curriculum's responsiveness to differences in learner readiness.

Against this background, the study aimed to identify and analyze the challenges and opportunities Key Stage 1 teachers perceived in implementing the Revised K to 10 or MATATAG Curriculum in the Schools Division of Tacloban City during School Year 2025–2026. It also examined whether their perceptions differed according to selected profile and school-related variables. The findings provided the basis for a proposed intervention program intended to address significant implementation barriers, strengthen teacher training and professional support, encourage meaningful collaboration, and maximize the opportunities offered by the revised curriculum. Through this localized investigation, the study sought to contribute to more responsive curriculum implementation and help ensure that the MATATAG Curriculum achieves its goal of providing quality, relevant, inclusive, and developmentally appropriate basic education.

Research Questions

Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the Key Stage 1 teachers in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level handled, and relevant training attended?
2. What is the extent of implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum as perceived by the respondents in terms of assessment and evaluation, curriculum instruction and delivery, learning resources, and support systems?

3. What challenges do the respondents encounter in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in terms of workload and time constraints, resource gaps, learner-related issues, assessment difficulties, training and support gaps, and infrastructure and classroom constraints?
4. What positive outcomes and opportunities do the respondents experience in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum and the challenges and opportunities experienced by the respondents?
6. Is there a significant difference in the challenges encountered in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when the respondents are grouped according to their demographic profile?
7. Is there a significant difference in the opportunities experienced in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when the respondents are grouped according to their demographic profile?
8. What intervention program may be proposed based on the findings of the study?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study used a quantitative descriptive-comparative-correlational research design. The descriptive component described the profile of Key Stage I teachers and their perceptions of the extent of implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, the challenges encountered, and the opportunities provided by its implementation. The comparative component determined whether teachers differed in their perceptions of challenges and opportunities when grouped according to selected profile variables. The correlational component determined whether the extent of curriculum implementation was significantly related to perceived challenges and opportunities. The study did not manipulate any variable. The design was appropriate because the study examined existing conditions, differences among groups, and relationships among variables as they occurred in the participating schools (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Research Participants

The respondents of the study were Key Stage 1 (KS1) teachers from Grades 1, 2, and 3 in selected elementary schools within the Schools Division of Tacloban City. These teachers were selected because they were directly involved in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum at the foundational stage of basic education. Their experiences and perceptions provided relevant information on the challenges and opportunities associated with curriculum implementation.

A total of 165 teachers participated in the study. The respondents were drawn from 20 selected schools, consisting of five central schools and 15 non-central schools. Each central school contributed five teachers from each grade level, resulting in 75 respondents, while each non-central school contributed two teachers from each grade level, resulting in 90 respondents. Thus, 55 teachers were represented from each of Grades 1, 2, and 3.

The schools were selected through stratified purposive sampling from the 40 elementary schools in the Division. Fifty percent of the schools were selected, comprising five central and 15 non-central schools, to represent different school contexts, particularly relatively resource-rich and resource-constrained settings. Within each selected school, teachers were purposively selected according to grade level, with five teachers per grade level from central schools and two teachers per grade level from non-central schools. This sampling approach ensured representation across the three KS1 grade levels and both school classifications. The resulting sample of 165 teachers was considered adequate for the planned statistical analyses.

Research Instruments

Data were collected using a researcher-developed structured questionnaire based on relevant literature, previous studies, and Department of Education policies concerning the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. Items adapted from previous sources were cited, while changes made to adapted items were limited to wording needed to fit the context of Key Stage I teachers. The final questionnaire contained [insert total number] items divided into four parts.

Part I gathered the participants' profile in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level handled, and relevant training attended. Training information included the number and level of relevant training programs attended during the previous three years.

Part II measured the extent of implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in terms of four dimensions: (1) Assessment and Evaluation, (2) Curriculum Instruction Delivery, (3) Learning Resources, and (4) Support System. This section contained a total of 30 items, consisting of eight items for Assessment and Evaluation, eight items for Curriculum Instruction Delivery, seven items for Learning Resources, and seven items for Support System. Participants rated each statement using a five-point scale in which 5 meant "Very High Extent," 4 meant "High Extent," 3 meant "Moderate Extent," 2 meant "Low Extent," and 1 meant "Very Low Extent."

Part III measured challenges encountered in curriculum implementation. The dimensions covered workload and time constraints, resource gaps, learner-related concerns, assessment difficulties, training and support gaps, and infrastructure and classroom constraints. The items were based on previous literature and policy reports concerning barriers to curriculum implementation (Bernardo et al., 2022; OECD, 2019; Tan et al., 2021). Participants responded using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree).

Part IV measured opportunities provided by the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in terms of curriculum responsiveness, improved teaching skills, collaborative work, learner engagement, and professional growth. The items were based on relevant curriculum policies and literature concerning teacher professional learning and learner-centered instruction (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2015; Trilling & Fadel, 2009). The researchers recorded responses using the same five-point agreement scale.

The questionnaire was adapted and refined from existing literature and official DepEd guidelines and was reviewed by experts in curriculum implementation and teacher professional development to establish content validity. The experts assessed the instrument for clarity, relevance, comprehensiveness, and alignment with the study objectives, and their recommendations were incorporated prior to pilot testing (Haynes et al., 1995).

A pilot test involving 20 Key Stage 1 teachers from a non-sample school was conducted to assess item clarity and internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from 0.702 to 0.963 across the dimensions. The extent of implementation scale demonstrated very high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.952$), while the challenges ($\alpha = 0.866$) and opportunities ($\alpha = 0.963$) scales showed good to excellent reliability. These results confirmed the reliability and suitability of the instrument for the main data collection (Joshi et al., 2015). The open-ended questions were used to obtain supplementary information on teachers' experiences and to contextualize the quantitative findings. A pilot test was conducted among 20 Key Stage I teachers from, who were not included in the final study. The pilot test examined item clarity and internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine reliability, with 0.70 used as the minimum acceptable coefficient (Joshi et al., 2015). Reliability coefficients for the different dimensions ranged from 0.702 to 0.963. The overall coefficient was 0.952 for extent of implementation, 0.866 for challenges, and 0.963 for opportunities, indicating acceptable to excellent internal consistency. The researcher prepared the final questionnaire after reviewing the pilot-test results and participant feedback.

Data Gathering Procedure

Before data collection, the researcher obtained ethical approval. The researcher then obtained administrative permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of Tacloban City, and the school heads of the participating schools. After permission was granted, the researcher coordinated with the school heads to identify suitable schedules for administering the questionnaire without disrupting regular classes. Data were collected from December 10, 2025 to December 17, 2025. Eligible teachers were invited to participate and received an informed consent form explaining the study's purpose, procedures, expected time to complete the questionnaire, possible risks and benefits, confidentiality measures, the voluntary nature of participation, and their right to withdraw without penalty.

The questionnaires were personally distributed and administered by the researcher. Participants were given approximately 30-45 minutes to complete the questionnaire. They answered the questionnaire individually and returned the completed forms as personally retrieved by the researcher. Teachers who were unavailable during the first distribution were given another opportunity to participate, but no teacher was required or pressured to complete the survey. After collection, we checked questionnaires for completeness. Responses were coded. The encoded data were checked against the original questionnaires before statistical analysis to reduce data-entry errors.

Data Analysis

Frequency counts and percentages summarized participants' age, sex, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level handled, and relevant training attended. Mean scores were calculated to describe the extent of implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum and the perceived challenges and opportunities. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between the extent of curriculum implementation and perceived challenges and between the extent of implementation and perceived opportunities. The assumptions for Pearson correlation, including linearity and the absence of serious outliers, were checked before analysis.

An independent-samples t-test compared groups for profile variables with two categories, while one-way analysis of variance was used for profile variables with three or more categories. Before conducting these tests, the assumptions of independence, normality, and equality of variances were examined. When a significant ANOVA result was obtained. When a significant ANOVA result was obtained, a post hoc test (such as Tukey's HSD) was conducted to perform pairwise comparisons between the groups to identify specifically which group means differed significantly. If the assumptions for the planned parametric tests were not met, we used the corresponding non-parametric tests. All inferential tests were evaluated at the 0.05 level of significance.

Ethical Considerations

The study was reviewed and approved by the internal institutional review committee of Holy Infant College Tacloban City Incorporated under Protocol No. 2025-002 before data collection began. Administrative approval from the school and Division authorities was obtained separately from the ethics approval. Participation was voluntary. Before completing the questionnaire, each teacher received an informed consent form explaining the study's purpose and procedures, possible risks and benefits, confidentiality measures, and the right to refuse or withdraw at any time without penalty. Teachers were also informed that their decision to participate or not participate would not affect their employment, performance evaluation, professional standing, or relationship with their school or the Department of Education.

The questionnaire did not collect names or other direct personal identifiers. Each questionnaire was assigned a code for data processing. We did not disclose individual responses to school heads or other teachers. Findings were reported in grouped form to reduce the possibility of identifying individual participants. Because the methodology named the participating schools, no school-level findings that could identify individual teachers were reported unless proper permission had been obtained.

The study involved minimal risk because participants were asked only about their professional experiences and perceptions concerning curriculum implementation. The researcher protected participants from possible professional discomfort or pressure by allowing them to answer privately and by making it clear that participation was voluntary. The study followed the ethical principles of respect for persons, beneficence, justice, privacy, and confidentiality throughout the research process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Teachers

Table 1 presents the demographic and professional characteristics of the 165 Key Stage 1 teachers included in this study. Most respondents were aged 40–49 years (43.0%), followed by those aged 50–59 years

(26.1%) and 30–39 years (25.5%), indicating that the teaching workforce was largely composed of mid- and late-career educators. This pattern aligned with their teaching experience, as 26.7% had served at least 20 years, 25.5% for 10–14 years, and 21.2% for 15–19 years. Their extensive experience may provide practical knowledge, classroom management skills, and professional judgment that support curriculum implementation; however, experienced teachers still need continuous professional development to adapt to curricular, pedagogical, and technological changes (OECD, 2020).

Table 1 Characteristic Profile of Key Stage 1 Teachers

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
20 – 29	9	5.50
30 – 39	42	25.5
40 – 49	71	43.0
50 – 59	43	26.1
Sex		
Male	8	4.80
Female	157	95.2
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor’s Degree	87	52.7
Master’s Degree in Progress	60	36.4
Master’s Degree	18	10.9
Teaching Experience		
0 – 3 years	13	7.90
4 – 6 years	7	4.20
7 – 9 years	24	14.5
10 – 14 years	42	25.5
15 – 19 years	35	21.2
20 years and above	44	26.7
Grade Level Taught		
Grade 1	55	33.3
Grade 2	54	32.7
Grade 3	56	33.9
Relevant Trainings Attended		
None	2	1.20
1 – 2 Trainings	98	59.4
3 – 4 Training	43	26.1
5 Trainings	22	13.3
Level of Training		
School Level	16	9.70
District Level	4	2.40
Division Level	44	26.7
Regional Level	3	1.80
National Level	1	0.60
Combination of 2 or more Levels	97	58.8
Total	165	100.0

The respondents were predominantly female (95.2%), reflecting the wider pattern of female representation in primary education (UNESCO, 2023). Regarding educational attainment, 52.7% held bachelor’s degrees, 36.4% were pursuing master’s degrees, and 10.9% had completed master’s degrees, suggesting considerable engagement in professional advancement consistent with the Department of Education’s emphasis on continuing professional development and career progression (Department of Education, 2023). Representation across grade levels was also balanced, with 33.3% teaching Grade 1, 32.7% teaching Grade 2, and 33.9% teaching Grade 3. This distribution allowed the study to capture perspectives across Key Stage

1, where teachers play an essential role in developing learners' foundational literacy, numeracy, and socioemotional skills (Torrefiel et al., 2025).

Most respondents had participated in curriculum-related professional development, with 59.4% attending one or two training programs, 26.1% attending three or four, and 13.3% attending five, while only 1.2% had attended none. Moreover, 58.8% had attended training at two or more levels, whereas 26.7% had participated primarily in division-level training. These findings indicate that the respondents had substantial exposure to professional learning activities, although the number and level of training opportunities varied. Training is essential during curriculum reform because it equips teachers with the knowledge, pedagogical skills, and instructional strategies needed to translate new standards into classroom practice (Department of Education, 2024; Prudente et al., 2024). Overall, the respondents constituted an experienced and professionally engaged teaching workforce that could support the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. Nevertheless, the limited number of training programs many respondents attended and the proportion who had not completed graduate education indicate the need for sustained, accessible, and curriculum-focused professional development. Strengthening school- and division-level training, supporting graduate education, and providing continuing instructional assistance may further enhance teachers' readiness to address the changing demands of early-grade curriculum implementation.

Extent of Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Table 2 presents the extent of implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in the Schools Division of Tacloban City across four dimensions: assessment and evaluation, curriculum and instructional delivery, learning resources, and support systems. The overall mean ($M=4.17$), interpreted as a great extent of implementation, indicates that Key Stage 1 teachers have substantially integrated the revised curriculum into classroom practice. This finding suggests that teachers generally apply the prescribed instructional, assessment, and resource-use practices, although implementation has not reached a uniformly very high level across all dimensions. The results reflect how teachers translate curriculum standards into classroom instruction, manage learning resources, and assess learner progress, which are central components of curriculum implementation identified by the Department of Education (DepEd, 2023). This pattern also aligns with the MATATAG Curriculum guidelines, which emphasize that effective implementation depends not only on the availability of curriculum guides but also on teacher capacity, relevant instructional materials, and sustained institutional support (DepEd, 2024a, 2024b). Similarly, Malinao and Miano (2025) found that teachers remained committed to implementing the revised curriculum despite limitations in resources and professional support. Thus, the findings provide an empirical basis for strengthening areas with comparatively lower implementation and developing interventions that address the instructional, resource, and support needs of Key Stage 1 teachers.

Table 2 Extent of Implementation of the Revised K to 10 across four dimensions

Indicators	M	Interpretation
Assessment and Evaluation		
1. Assessment tasks are aligned with the learning competencies.	4.49	Very High
2. I use varied assessment tools (formative, summative, performance).	4.49	Very High
3. Assessment results guide my instructional decisions.	4.39	Very High
4. I provide timely and constructive feedback to learners.	4.41	Very High
5. Classroom assessments reflect learners' mastery of competencies.	4.49	Very High
6. I conduct assessments that promote higher-order thinking skills.	4.33	Very High
7. Assessment procedures are clearly communicated to learners/parents.	4.45	Very High
8. Assessment records are consistently and accurately maintained.	4.55	Very High
Section Mean	4.45	Very High
Curriculum and Instruction Delivery		
1. Lessons follow the competency-based standards of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	4.49	Very High
2. I use varied instructional strategies suitable for KS1 learners.	4.39	Very High
3. Learning activities are learner-centered and encourage participation.	4.53	Very High

4. I differentiate instruction to address diverse learning needs.	4.39	Very High
5. DLLs/LAS are aligned with required curriculum competencies.	4.33	Very High
6. Lesson pacing is appropriate for KS1 learners' developmental level.	4.28	Very High
7. Remediation and enrichment activities are regularly provided.	4.38	Very High
8. Instruction integrates values and real-world contexts.	4.52	Very High
Section Mean	4.42	Very High
Learning Resources		
1. Learners' materials/textbooks are available and curriculum-aligned.	3.53	High
2. Supplementary resources (modules/workbooks/manipulatives) are adequate.	3.79	High
3. ICT-based/digital materials are accessible when needed.	3.70	High
4. Classroom resources support effective learning delivery.	4.01	High
5. Curriculum guides and updated teacher references are available.	4.01	High
6. Resources are appropriate to KS1 developmental needs.	3.91	High
7. The school addresses shortages of learning resources when needed.	3.59	High
Section Mean	3.79	High
Support System		
1. Administrators provide adequate instructional supervision.	4.23	Very High
2. Technical assistance is provided when curriculum challenges arise.	4.15	High
3. Relevant trainings/professional development are regularly provided.	4.25	Very High
4. Collaboration among grade-level teachers is encouraged and supported.	4.47	Very High
5. Parents and stakeholders support learners' academic activities.	4.06	High
6. Policies and guidelines on curriculum implementation are clearly communicated.	4.20	High
7. Support systems address the diverse needs of KS1 learners.	4.05	High
Section Mean	4.20	High
Overall Mean	4.17	High
Note. Scores were interpreted using the following scale: 4.21-5.00=Very High Extent; 3.41-4.20=High Extent; 2.61-3.40=Moderate Extent; 1.81-2.60=Low Extent; 1.00-1.80=Very Low Extent. M=mean.		

Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment and evaluation obtained the highest section mean ($M = 4.45$), indicating a very high extent of implementation. The highest-rated practices were the consistent and accurate maintenance of assessment records ($M = 4.55$), alignment of assessment tasks with learning competencies ($M = 4.49$), use of varied assessment tools ($M = 4.49$), and assessment of learners' mastery of competencies ($M = 4.49$). Teachers also reported providing timely and constructive feedback ($M = 4.41$) and using assessment results to guide instructional decisions ($M = 4.39$). These findings suggest that teachers integrated assessment into instruction and used it to monitor learner progress rather than conduct it solely for compliance. This interpretation is consistent with Veugen et al. (2021), who emphasized that effective formative assessment involves clarifying learning expectations, eliciting and interpreting learner responses, providing feedback, and adjusting instruction based on assessment evidence. Although assessment and evaluation emerged as the strongest dimension, the Schools Division of Tacloban City may further strengthen teachers' assessment literacy through training in authentic assessment, higher-order questioning, feedback strategies, and data-informed remediation planning.

Curriculum and Instructional Delivery

Curriculum and instructional delivery obtained the second-highest section mean ($M = 4.42$), indicating a very high extent of implementation. The highest-rated indicators were the use of learner-centered activities that encourage participation ($M = 4.53$), integration of values and real-world contexts into instruction ($M = 4.52$), and alignment of lessons with the competency-based standards of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum ($M = 4.49$). Teachers also reported implementing differentiated instruction ($M = 4.39$), remediation and enrichment activities ($M = 4.38$), and lesson pacing suited to Key Stage 1 learners ($M = 4.28$). These findings indicate that teachers generally translated curriculum standards into active, contextualized, and

developmentally appropriate classroom practices. The Department of Education (DepEd, 2024a) identifies competency-based instruction, contextualization, and developmentally appropriate teaching as essential features of the MATATAG Curriculum. Similarly, the World Bank (2024) emphasizes differentiated instruction, literacy and numeracy integration, and instructional material development in supporting early-grade teachers. Considering the diverse developmental and learning needs of Key Stage 1 learners (Baterna, 2024; Malinao & Miano, 2025), instructional delivery may be further strengthened through lesson study, coaching, and classroom-based technical assistance focused on differentiation, remediation, and appropriate lesson pacing.

Learning Resources

Learning resources obtained the lowest section mean among the four dimensions ($M = 3.79$), although the result still indicated a high extent of implementation. The lowest-rated indicators concerned the availability of curriculum-aligned learner materials and textbooks ($M = 3.53$), the school's response to resource shortages ($M = 3.59$), and access to information and communication technology-based or digital materials ($M = 3.70$). These findings suggest that the school implemented adequacy, accessibility, and timely provision of learning resources less strongly than assessment and instructional practices. Malinao and Miano (2025) similarly identified resource and infrastructure limitations as continuing barriers to MATATAG Curriculum implementation. Although DepEd (2024b) has made curriculum guides publicly available and supported phased implementation, access to curriculum guides does not necessarily address shortages of textbooks, manipulatives, workbooks, classroom tools, and digital resources. The World Bank (2024) likewise recognizes that effective curriculum implementation requires the deliberate development and distribution of learning resource packages. Therefore, the proposed intervention program should include resource mapping, timely distribution of curriculum-aligned materials, development of low-cost and contextualized instructional resources, and improved access to digital technologies for Key Stage 1 classrooms.

Support System

The support-system dimension obtained a section mean of $M = 4.20$, indicating a high extent of implementation. Collaboration among grade-level teachers received the highest rating ($M = 4.47$), followed by the regular provision of relevant training and professional development ($M = 4.25$) and adequate instructional supervision from administrators ($M = 4.23$). These findings indicate that collegial collaboration, professional learning, and administrative supervision supported implementation of the revised curriculum. The OECD (2020) emphasized that professional collaboration enables teachers to share expertise, learn from one another, and improve instructional practice. However, ratings were comparatively lower for technical assistance when curriculum-related difficulties arise ($M = 4.15$), parent and stakeholder support ($M = 4.06$), support for addressing diverse learner needs ($M = 4.05$), and clear communication of policies and guidelines ($M = 4.20$). These results suggest that existing support may not yet be sufficiently consistent, targeted, or responsive to varied classroom conditions. This interpretation aligns with Malinao and Miano (2025), who reported that teachers appreciated available assistance but still experienced limited training depth and follow-through. Accordingly, schools can strengthen support systems through school-based coaching, timely technical assistance, stronger parent engagement, clearer policy communication, and problem-focused professional learning communities.

Challenges Experienced by Teachers in Implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Table 3 shows the challenges Key Stage I teachers encountered in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in the Schools Division of Tacloban City. The challenges are organized into six dimensions: workload and time constraints, resource gaps, learner-related issues, assessment difficulties, training and support gaps, and infrastructure and classroom constraints. Examining these dimensions helps identify the areas that most strongly affect teachers' ability to implement the curriculum effectively and provides evidence for developing targeted intervention measures.

Workload and Time Constraints

Workload and time constraints obtained the highest section mean ($M = 4.13$), indicating a high level of challenge and identifying this dimension as the most pronounced difficulty experienced by Key Stage 1 teachers. The most highly rated concern was the substantial time required to prepare lessons and instructional materials ($M = 4.42$), followed by paperwork and reporting requirements that reduced lesson-preparation time ($M = 4.08$) and insufficient time to accomplish curriculum-related tasks ($M = 4.03$). These findings indicate that teachers must balance instructional preparation with administrative and documentation requirements while adapting to the revised curriculum. Zerna (2025) similarly found that competing instructional and administrative responsibilities limited teachers' preparation time and attention to classroom instruction. The OECD (2020) further recognized workload as a major concern during curriculum reform because new standards typically require additional planning, documentation, assessment, and material development. Excessive workload may restrict opportunities for reflective planning and instructional innovation. Thus, reporting procedures should be reviewed and streamlined, while administrative and technical assistance should be strengthened to allow teachers to devote more time to lesson preparation, instruction, and learner support.

Table 3 Extent of Challenges Experienced by Teachers in Implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Indicators	M	Interpretation
Dimension 1: Workload and Time Constraint		
1. I spend a significant amount of time preparing lessons and instructional materials.	4.42	Very High
2. Paperwork and reporting requirements reduce my time for actual lesson preparation.	4.08	High
3. I find it challenging to balance classroom teaching and administrative/ancillary tasks.	3.99	High
4. Time allotted for accomplishing curriculum-related tasks is not sufficient.	4.03	High
Section Mean	4.13	High
Dimension 2: Resource Gaps		
1. Teacher's guides (TG) and learner's materials (LM) are not always adequate or available.	3.82	High
2. I lack access to supplementary instructional materials for enrichment or remediation.	3.69	High
3. Learning materials provided do not fully match the needs of my learners.	3.47	High
4. I spend personal money to produce additional teaching and learning resources.	4.21	Very High
Section Mean	3.80	High
Dimension 3: Learner-Related Issues		
1. Many of my pupils lack the prerequisite skills for their grade level.	3.73	High
2. Some pupils have poor attendance which affects their learning progress.	3.98	High
3. Parents/guardians do not consistently support learners in their assignments or projects.	4.04	High
4. Learner behavioral issues disrupt teaching and learning.	4.12	High
Section Mean	3.97	High
Dimension 4: Assessment Difficulties		
1. Designing performance-based tasks is challenging.	3.95	High
2. Checking and rating outputs of pupils takes too much time.	3.82	High
3. Interpreting and recording assessment results is difficult and time-consuming.	3.62	High

4. I find it challenging to provide timely feedback to all learners.	3.73	High
Section Mean	3.78	High
Dimension 5: Training and Support Gaps		
1. I have not received enough training on the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	2.95	Moderate
2. Coaching and mentoring support from school or district leaders is limited.	3.12	Moderate
3. There are few opportunities to share best practices with fellow teachers.	3.11	Moderate
4. Technical assistance provided does not fully address my classroom needs.	2.93	Moderate
Section Mean	3.03	Moderate
Dimension 6: Infrastructure and Classroom Constraints		
1. My classroom is too small or overcrowded for effective learning.	3.01	Moderate
2. The school lacks adequate facilities (e.g., toilets, handwashing areas, electricity).	2.94	Moderate
3. There is limited access to ICT equipment and Internet connection for instruction.	3.41	Moderate
4. The physical condition of the classroom (lighting, ventilation, seating) hinders learning.	3.00	Moderate
Section Mean	3.09	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.63	Moderate
Note. Scores were interpreted using the following scale: 4.21-5.00=Very High Challenge; 3.41-4.20=High Challenge; 2.61-3.40=Moderate Challenge; 1.81-2.60=Low Challenge; 1.00 - 1.80=Very Low Challenge. M=mean.		

Resource Gaps

Resource gaps obtained a section mean of $M = 3.80$, indicating a high level of challenge. The highest-rated concern was the need for teachers to spend personal funds to produce teaching and learning resources ($M = 4.21$), followed by the inadequate availability of teachers' guides and learners' materials ($M = 3.82$). These findings suggest that teachers frequently compensate for shortages of curriculum-aligned materials by purchasing or developing resources independently. Baterna (2024) likewise reported that limited access to updated instructional materials constrained teachers' ability to implement curriculum requirements effectively. The availability of appropriate learning resources is particularly important in Key Stage 1, where concrete, visual, and developmentally appropriate materials support the acquisition of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Reliance on teachers' personal funds may also create unequal classroom conditions because teachers differ in their financial capacity to produce supplementary materials. Therefore, the Schools Division of Tacloban City should prioritize the timely provision and distribution of curriculum-aligned teachers' guides, textbooks, manipulatives, and digital materials while supporting the collaborative development of low-cost, contextualized instructional resources.

Learner-Related Issues

Learner-related issues obtained the second-highest section mean ($M = 3.97$), indicating a high level of challenge. Behavioral concerns that disrupted teaching and learning received the highest rating ($M = 4.12$), followed by limited parental support for assignments and projects ($M = 4.04$) and irregular learner attendance ($M = 3.98$). These findings indicate that curriculum implementation is influenced not only by teacher practices but also by learner behavior, attendance, readiness, and family involvement. Malinao and Miano (2025) similarly observed that differences in learner readiness and parental support affected instructional pacing and teachers' ability to meet curriculum expectations. These concerns are especially important in Key Stage 1 because learners are still developing foundational academic skills, classroom routines, and self-regulation. Behavioral concerns and inconsistent attendance may disrupt learning continuity, while limited parental involvement may reduce reinforcement of lessons outside the classroom. Accordingly, schools should strengthen learner-support mechanisms, attendance-monitoring procedures, behavior-management programs, and partnerships with parents and community stakeholders to address early-grade learners' academic and socioemotional needs.

Assessment Difficulties

Assessment difficulties obtained a section mean of $M = 3.78$, indicating a high level of challenge. Teachers reported particular difficulty in designing performance-based tasks ($M = 3.95$) and checking and rating learners' outputs ($M = 3.82$). These findings suggest that implementing competency-based assessment requires substantial time, technical knowledge, and careful professional judgment. Performance-based tasks must align with learning competencies, suit learners' developmental levels, and include clear scoring criteria, while evaluating outputs requires time for consistent rating and constructive feedback. Veugen et al. (2021) emphasized that effective formative assessment requires teachers to elicit and interpret learner responses, provide appropriate feedback, and adjust instruction based on assessment evidence. These processes may become difficult when teachers manage large classes, extensive documentation, and competing instructional responsibilities. Therefore, professional development programs should strengthen teachers' assessment literacy, particularly in designing authentic tasks, developing and applying scoring rubrics, interpreting assessment evidence, providing timely feedback, and using efficient assessment strategies to inform remediation and enrichment.

Training and Support Gaps

Training and support gaps recorded the lowest section mean ($M = 3.03$), indicating a moderate level of challenge. Although this dimension was less pronounced than the other challenges, teachers reported limited coaching and mentoring support ($M = 3.12$) and insufficient opportunities to share effective practices ($M = 3.11$). These results suggest that professional development opportunities were available but may not have consistently provided the sustained, classroom-based assistance teachers need to address implementation difficulties. Curriculum reform requires more than initial orientation because teachers need continuing opportunities to clarify curriculum expectations, apply new strategies, receive feedback, and learn from colleagues. Prudente et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of professional learning communities, mentoring, and collaborative professional development in helping teachers adapt to curriculum changes and improve instructional practice. Therefore, the division should strengthen school-based coaching, peer mentoring, lesson study, Learning Action Cells, and structured opportunities for sharing effective practices. These initiatives should focus on teachers' actual classroom concerns and include ongoing follow-up to ensure professional learning translates into improved instruction.

Infrastructure and Classroom Constraints

Infrastructure and classroom constraints obtained a section mean of $M = 3.09$, indicating a moderate level of challenge. The most prominent concern was limited access to information and communication technology equipment and reliable internet connectivity ($M = 3.41$). Although this dimension was rated less challenging than workload, learner-related issues, resource gaps, and assessment demands, the result indicates that some teachers still experienced physical and technological limitations that could restrict curriculum delivery. Appropriate classroom facilities, sufficient space, reliable connectivity, and access to digital equipment support interactive, differentiated, and technology-enhanced instruction. The World Bank (2024) similarly emphasized that classroom conditions, school facilities, and access to technology influence teaching effectiveness and learner participation. Inadequate infrastructure may be especially restrictive in Key Stage 1, where teachers require flexible learning spaces and varied resources to conduct developmentally appropriate activities. Continued investment in classroom improvement, ICT equipment, internet access, and maintenance systems is therefore necessary to create learning environments that support effective and sustainable implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.

Positive Outcomes and Opportunities of the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Table 4 reflects the positive outcomes and opportunities associated with implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. The table highlights respondents' perceptions across five dimensions: curriculum responsiveness, enhanced pedagogical skills, collaborative work, learner engagement, and professional growth. Examining these dimensions matters because it shows the benefits of curriculum implementation and where they can be strengthened to support more effective teaching and learning in Key Stage 1.

Curriculum Responsiveness

Curriculum responsiveness obtained the lowest section mean among the five dimensions ($M = 3.76$),

although it still indicated a high level of opportunity. Teachers most strongly agreed that the curriculum allowed them to contextualize and localize lessons effectively ($M = 3.87$) and that the learning competencies supported learners' holistic development ($M = 3.79$). These findings suggest that teachers perceived the Revised K to 10 Curriculum as relevant and adaptable to local contexts, although this opportunity was less evident than those related to learner engagement, collaboration, professional growth, and pedagogical development. The Department of Education (DepEd, 2024a) identifies contextualization, localization, and streamlined learning competencies as central features of the revised curriculum. Similarly, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2024) emphasized that curriculum flexibility can promote inclusive and effective instruction when teachers are able to adapt learning experiences to local conditions and learner diversity. Thus, teachers may need additional support to translate broad curriculum standards into localized, inclusive, and developmentally appropriate learning experiences for Key Stage 1 learners.

Table 4 Extent of the Positive Outcomes and Opportunities in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Indicators	M	Interpretation
Dimension 1: Curriculum Responsiveness		
1.The revised curriculum reflects the real-life needs and contexts of my learners.	3.68	High
2.The MELCs provide a clear and manageable focus for classroom instruction.	3.68	High
3.The curriculum allows me to contextualize and localize lessons effectively.	3.87	High
4.The learning competencies support the holistic development of learners.	3.79	High
Section Mean	3.76	High
Dimension 2: Enhanced Pedagogical Skills		
1.Implementing the revised curriculum has improved my lesson planning skills.	3.84	High
2.I have learned new teaching strategies to address diverse learning needs.	3.98	High
3.I can integrate ICT or other innovative methods in my lessons more effectively.	4.12	High
4.I am more confident in facilitating competency-based and learner-centered instruction.	3.88	High
Section Mean	3.96	High
Dimension 3: Collaborative Work		
1.I regularly collaborate with colleagues in lesson planning and activity design.	3.98	High
2.Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions help me improve my teaching practices.	4.02	High
3.I share teaching strategies and resources with fellow teachers.	4.01	High
4.Collaborative work in school fosters a supportive and positive professional environment.	4.05	High
Section Mean	4.01	High
Dimension 4: Learner Engagement		
1.My pupils are more engaged when learning is competency-based.	4.14	High
2.Learners actively participate in discussions and group activities.	4.17	High
3.I observe improvement in pupils' confidence and communication skills.	4.04	High
4.The revised curriculum promotes critical thinking and problem-solving skills among learners.	3.98	High
Section Mean	4.08	High

Dimension 5: Professional Growth		
1.I have gained opportunities to attend relevant trainings or seminars.	4.09	High
2.The curriculum implementation allows me to reflect on and improve my teaching practice.	4.05	High
3.I feel motivated to innovate and improve my instructional strategies.	3.92	High
4. Implementing the revised curriculum contributes to my professional growth and career development.	3.89	High
Section Mean	3.98	High
Overall Mean	3.96	High
Note. Scores were interpreted using the following scale: 4.21-5.00=Very High Opportunity; 3.41-4.20=High Opportunity; 2.61-3.40=Moderate Opportunity; 1.81-2.60=Low Opportunity; 1.00-1.80=Very Low Opportunity. M=mean.		

Enhanced Pedagogical Skills

Enhanced pedagogical skills obtained a section mean of $M = 3.96$, indicating a high level of opportunity. The highest-rated indicator was the ability to integrate information and communication technology and other innovative methods into lessons ($M = 4.12$), followed by acquiring new teaching strategies to address diverse learning needs ($M = 3.98$). These results suggest that implementing the revised curriculum provided teachers with opportunities to improve their instructional competence, particularly in technology integration, innovation, and responsive teaching. This finding is consistent with curriculum-reform policies emphasizing that teachers' pedagogical development is essential to the successful implementation of learner-centered and competency-based instruction (DepEd, 2024a; World Bank, 2024). Karim et al. (2025) likewise emphasized the importance of connecting pedagogy, inclusion, and instructional innovation in teachers' professional practice. Schools and the division may build on this opportunity by providing demonstration teaching, coaching, and classroom-based professional development focused on differentiated instruction, innovative pedagogy, and the effective integration of digital technologies in Key Stage 1 classrooms.

Collaborative Work

Collaborative work obtained the second-highest section mean ($M = 4.01$), indicating a high level of opportunity. The highest-rated indicators were collaboration's contribution to a supportive and positive professional environment ($M = 4.05$), the role of Learning Action Cell sessions in improving teaching practice ($M = 4.02$), and the sharing of instructional strategies and resources among colleagues ($M = 4.01$).

These findings indicate that curriculum implementation encouraged collegial exchange, shared planning, and mutual professional support among teachers. DepEd (2024b, 2025) recognizes Learning Action Cells as an institutional mechanism for collaborative learning, reflection, and improvement of classroom practices.

Philippine studies have similarly shown that school-based Learning Action Cells can strengthen instructional practices and facilitate collaborative problem-solving among teachers (Bansawan et al., 2025; Grape, 2024). International evidence also identifies teacher collaboration as an important condition for instructional improvement and successful reform implementation (OECD, 2020). Accordingly, Learning Action Cells, peer lesson planning, resource-sharing mechanisms, and professional learning communities should be sustained and strengthened as integral components of curriculum implementation.

Learner Engagement

Learner engagement obtained the highest section mean among the five dimensions ($M = 4.08$), indicating a high level of opportunity and identifying it as the most evident benefit perceived by teachers. The highest-rated indicators were learners' active participation in discussions and group activities ($M = 4.17$) and their increased engagement in competency-based learning ($M = 4.14$), followed by improvements in confidence and communication skills ($M = 4.04$). These findings suggest that the revised curriculum promoted participatory, interactive, and meaningful learning experiences.

This result is consistent with the learner-centered orientation of the MATATAG Curriculum, which emphasizes active participation and developmentally appropriate instruction (DepEd, 2024a). Competency-based and learner-centered approaches can similarly strengthen learners' participation, motivation, and classroom involvement when instruction is aligned with their developmental needs and social contexts (Ndayisenga, 2025; UNESCO International Bureau of Education, 2023).

Schools should therefore continue strengthening instructional strategies that promote active participation, communication, collaboration, and critical thinking, as these are among the most visible opportunities associated with curriculum implementation.

Professional Growth

Professional growth obtained a section mean of $M = 3.98$, indicating a high level of opportunity. Teachers most strongly recognized opportunities to attend relevant training programs and seminars ($M = 4.09$) and to reflect on and improve their teaching practices through curriculum implementation ($M = 4.05$).

These findings indicate that teachers viewed the revised curriculum not only as a policy requirement but also as an avenue for continuing professional learning, reflection, and instructional improvement. DepEd policy emphasizes that curriculum implementation should be accompanied by capacity-building activities and school-based professional development for teachers (DepEd, 2024a, 2024c).

Curriculum reform can likewise encourage reflective practice, pedagogical review, and continuing professional development when teachers receive structured opportunities to learn from their implementation experiences (Karim et al., 2025; OECD, 2025). Professional development should therefore remain closely connected to teachers' classroom experiences and identified implementation needs so professional growth is practical, sustained, and directly supports improved learner outcomes.

Relationship Between the Extent of Implementation, Challenge, and Opportunities

Table 5 Correlation between the Extent of Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, Opportunities, and Challenges

Variables		Statistics			
		r	p	Decision	Interpretation
Extent of Implementation	Perceived Challenges	.17*	.028	Reject H_0	Significant
	Perceived Opportunities	.52**	<.001	Reject H_0	Significant

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Relationship Between Curriculum Implementation and Perceived Challenges

Table 5 shows a statistically significant, weak positive relationship between the extent of implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum and teachers' perceived challenges, $r(163) = .17$, $p = .028$. Because the p -value was below the .05 significance level, the study rejected the null hypothesis. The positive correlation indicates that teachers who reported greater curriculum implementation also tended to report slightly greater challenges involving workload, resources, assessment, and learner-related concerns. However, the small coefficient indicates a weak association, and the correlational design does not establish that increased implementation caused these challenges. The finding nevertheless suggests that teachers who engage more extensively with the revised curriculum may become more aware of the practical demands associated with instructional planning, assessment, resource preparation, and classroom management. This interpretation is consistent with Dematea et al. (2025), who found that curriculum reform required teachers to adjust established instructional and assessment practices. Prado and Asparin (2025) similarly identified workload, resource availability, and instructional adaptation as challenges in implementing the MATATAG Curriculum. These results underscore the need to accompany curriculum reform with streamlined reporting procedures, sufficient learning resources, responsive technical assistance, and sustained institutional support.

Relationship Between Curriculum Implementation and Perceived Opportunities

The extent of curriculum implementation was also significantly and positively related to teachers' perceived opportunities, $r(163) = .52, p < .001$. Thus, the study rejected the null hypothesis. The coefficient indicates a moderate positive relationship, suggesting that teachers who reported higher levels of implementation also tended to recognize greater opportunities for pedagogical development, professional collaboration, learner engagement, curriculum responsiveness, and professional growth. This relationship may reflect how active engagement with the revised curriculum gives teachers opportunities to apply new instructional strategies, participate in collaborative planning, attend professional development activities, and reflect on their classroom practices. Nevertheless, the result should be interpreted as an association rather than evidence that curriculum implementation directly caused these opportunities. Christensen et al. (2025) reported that teacher collaboration and participation in professional learning communities were associated with stronger instructional practices and professional confidence. Batonghinog (2025) likewise observed that training and institutional support helped teachers align their pedagogy with revised learning competencies. The findings therefore support continued professional development, Learning Action Cells, peer mentoring, instructional coaching, and other collaborative structures that help teachers maximize the professional and instructional opportunities associated with curriculum reform.

Differences in the Perceived Challenges in Implementing Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Table 6 Differences in Perceived Challenges in Implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum by Respondent Profile

Grouping variable	t or F	p	Decision on H_0	Interpretation
Age	1.564	.200	Do not reject H_0	Not significant
Sex	-0.455	.649	Do not reject H_0	Not significant
Highest Educational Attainment	1.567	.212	Do not reject H_0	Not significant
Years of Teaching Experience	1.150	.336	Do not reject H_0	Not significant
Grade Level Handled	1.850	.161	Do not reject H_0	Not significant
Number of Relevant Trainings Attended	0.079	.971	Do not reject H_0	Not significant
Level of Trainings Attended	1.237	.294	Do not reject H_0	Not significant

Note. H_0 = null hypothesis. All results were nonsignificant ($p > .05$).

Table 6 presents differences in teachers' perceived challenges in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when grouped by age, sex, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level handled, number of relevant training programs attended, and level of training attended. The results showed no statistically significant differences across any profile variable (all $ps > .05$); therefore, the corresponding null hypotheses were not rejected. Within the present sample, teachers reported comparable levels of workload and time constraints, resource gaps, learner-related issues, assessment difficulties, training and support gaps, and infrastructure and classroom constraints regardless of their demographic and professional characteristics. Although nonsignificant results do not establish that the groups were identical, they indicate that the study found insufficient evidence that the challenges varied systematically by the examined characteristics. This pattern suggests that implementation difficulties were broadly shared across the Key Stage 1 teaching workforce and may be more closely linked to institutional conditions than to individual teacher profiles. Prudente et al. (2024) similarly emphasized that curriculum reform challenges are often shaped by workload, resource availability, professional support, and school-level conditions. Accordingly, interventions should prioritize division- and school-wide measures, including streamlined administrative requirements, adequate curriculum-aligned resources, responsive instructional assistance, and sustained professional development, while remaining flexible enough to address the specific needs of individual schools and teachers.

Differences of Perceived Opportunities in Implementing the K to 10 Curriculum

Perceived opportunities in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum differed significantly according to years of teaching experience, $F(5, 159) = 5.61, p < .001$. Thus, the corresponding null hypothesis was

rejected. This result indicates that teachers at different career stages did not perceive the pedagogical, collaborative, learner-related, and professional opportunities associated with curriculum implementation in the same manner. Teaching experience may shape how teachers interpret and respond to curriculum reform because accumulated classroom knowledge, familiarity with curriculum planning, and previous experience with educational changes can influence their ability to adapt instructional practices. This interpretation is consistent with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD, 2025) view of teacher learning as a developmental and career-long process in which professional needs and perceived benefits change across career stages. However, because no post hoc comparisons were reported, the results do not establish which experience groups differed significantly or which group perceived the greatest opportunities. Professional development should therefore be differentiated by career stage, with mentoring and foundational support for less-experienced teachers and coaching, leadership, and instructional innovation roles for more-experienced teachers.

Table 7 Differences in Perceived Opportunities in Implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum by Respondent Profile

Grouping variable	t or F	p	Decision on H ₀	Interpretation
Age	1.237	.298	Do not reject H ₀	Not Significant
Sex	-1.306	.194	Do not reject H ₀	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	0.709	.494	Do not reject H ₀	Not Significant
Years of Teaching Experience	5.605	<.001	Reject H ₀	Significant
Grade Level Handled	1.022	.362	Do not reject H ₀	Not Significant
Number of Relevant Trainings Attended	1.955	.123	Do not reject H ₀	Not Significant
Level of Trainings Attended	3.491	.005	Reject H ₀	Significant

Note. H₀ = null hypothesis. All results were nonsignificant ($p > .05$).

Perceived opportunities also differed significantly by level of relevant training attended, $F(5, 159) = 3.49$, $p = .005$; therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis was rejected. This finding suggests that teachers' exposure to school-, district-, division-, regional-, national-, or multilevel training was associated with differences in how they perceived the benefits of curriculum implementation. Training at different administrative levels may vary in scope, depth, access to expertise, opportunities for professional interaction, and attention to classroom application. Batonghinog and Chavez (2025) found that relevant professional development and academic support strengthened teachers' confidence in implementing curriculum change, which may enhance their recognition of instructional and professional opportunities. The Department of Education (DepEd, 2024) similarly identifies capacity-building and professional learning structures as essential supports for curriculum implementation. Nevertheless, without post hoc results, the findings cannot identify which training groups differed or which level was associated with the highest perceived opportunities. The other profile variables did not yield statistically significant differences (all $ps > .05$). Accordingly, the division should expand equitable access to multilevel, sustained, and practice-based professional development while ensuring that training content responds to teachers' career stages and classroom needs.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the Revised K to 10 Curriculum is implemented to a generally high extent among Key Stage I teachers in the Schools Division of Tacloban City. Assessment and evaluation, as well as curriculum and instruction delivery, are particularly well implemented, reflecting teachers' capacity to align their practices with the revised curriculum. However, its implementation remains demanding because teachers experience substantial challenges related to workload and time constraints, learner-related concerns, resource gaps, and assessment difficulties. Learning resources and support systems also require further strengthening to ensure consistent and effective curriculum implementation.

Despite these challenges, the revised curriculum creates valuable opportunities for learner engagement, teacher collaboration, professional growth, improved pedagogical skills, and context-responsive instruction.

More extensive implementation is significantly associated with both greater challenges and greater opportunities, suggesting that deeper engagement with the curriculum brings increased demands as well as meaningful benefits. Although all teacher groups generally experience challenges, perceived opportunities differ by teaching experience and training exposure. Therefore, successfully implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum requires adequate learning resources, manageable workloads, sustained institutional support, and continuous, relevant professional development for teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Baterna, C. E. (2024). Development of learning resources: Stance of elementary teachers. *International Journal of Research in Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(6), 1–7. <https://journal.ijris.com/index.php/ijris/article/view/51>
2. Batonghinog, P. J. A., & Chavez, J. C. (2025). Professional development training and academic support: Predictors of teachers' confidence in curriculum change. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(7), 444–453. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.327>
3. Christensen, A. A., & Jerrim, J. (2025). Professional learning communities and teacher outcomes: A cross-national analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 156, Article 104920. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104920>
4. Demate, D. R. B., Aclis, M. S., Catbagan, F. C. P., Molina, G. G., Ramos, N. U., & Patacsil, F. F. (2025). Teacher perspectives on MATATAG curriculum: Challenges and collaborative solutions. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 8(11), Article e2025351. <https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2025351>
5. Department of Education. (2012, April 17). DO 31, s. 2012—Policy guidelines on the implementation of Grades 1 to 10 of the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum effective School Year 2012–2013. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2012/04/17/do-31-s-2012-policy-guidelines-on-the-implementation-of-grades-1-to-10-of-the-k-to-12-basic-education-curriculum-bec-effective-school-year-2012-2013/>
6. Department of Education. (2016, June 7). DO 35, s. 2016—The Learning Action Cell as a K to 12 Basic Education Program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2016/06/07/do-35-s-2016-the-learning-action-cell-as-a-k-to-12-basic-education-program-school-based-continuing-professional-development-strategy-for-the-improvement-of-teaching-and-learning/>
7. Department of Education. (2023, January 30). MATATAG: DepEd's new agenda to resolve basic education woes. <https://bukidnon.deped.gov.ph/2023/01/30/matatag-depeds-new-agenda-to-resolve-basic-education-woes/>
8. Department of Education. (2024a, January 24). DepEd, World Bank unveil teacher development project in Mindanao. <https://depedcalabarzon.ph/?p=5856>
9. Department of Education. (2024b, July 23). DO 010, s. 2024—Policy guidelines on the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/07/23/july-23-2024-do-010-s-2024-policy-guidelines-on-the-implementation-of-the-matatag-curriculum/>
10. Department of Education. (2024c). MATATAG curriculum: Curriculum guides for Kindergarten and Grades 1, 4, and 7. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/matatagcurriculumk147/>
11. Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.
12. Gouëdard, P., Pont, B., Hyttinen, S., & Huang, P. (2020). Curriculum reform: A literature review to support effective implementation (OECD Education Working Papers No. 239). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/efe8a48c-en>
13. Grape, J. C. (2024). Learning Action Cell in professional development: Teachers' perspective. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(3), Article 21439. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i03.21439>
14. Malinao, A. J. N., & Miano, J. J. S. (2025). Implementing the MATATAG Curriculum: A qualitative study on teachers' challenges, adaptation strategies, and support needs. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(5), 362–374. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.133>
15. Montero, R. P., & Ducot, L. A. (2025). Exploring the challenges in implementing the MATATAG Curriculum. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 46(10), 1410–1424. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.461010>

16. Ndayisenga, J. d'Amour. (2025). The impact of competency-based curriculum in enhancing learning outcomes: A study of Rwandan secondary schools. *Journal of Education, Learning, and Management*, 2(2), 144–151. <https://doi.org/10.69739/jelm.v2i2.828>
17. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). TALIS 2018 results (Volume II): Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en>
18. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). PISA 2022 results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>
19. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). Curriculum flexibility and autonomy: Promoting a thriving learning environment. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/ecbbac2-en>
20. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). Teacher professional learning: Drawing upon international practice for a future vision for Ukraine. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/0cceeddf-en>
21. Prado, L. L., & Asparin, A. A. (2025). Teachers' perception and challenges in implementing MATATAG Curriculum. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 44(2), 269–286. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.440209>
22. Prudente, M. S., Garcia, J. A. S., Mistades, V. M., Roleda, L. S., & Talaue, F. T. (2024). Systematic review of professional development programs for teachers in the Philippines (Research Paper Series No. 003). Second Congressional Commission on Education and De La Salle University. https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2024/02/18_Prudente-et-al-Systematic-Review-of-Professional-1.pdf
23. Torrefiel, J. C., Cagape, E. S., Galan, O. V., Doydora, V. P., & Pintac, T. D. (2025). Teachers' lived experiences in the transition to the MATATAG Curriculum: A phenomenological inquiry into adaptation, challenges, and growth. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(4), 344–350. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.041>
24. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2023, November 9). Gender equality in and through the teaching profession. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/gender-equality-and-through-teaching-profession>
25. Veugen, M. J., Gulikers, J. T. M., & den Brok, P. (2021). We agree on what we see: Teacher and student perceptions of formative assessment practice. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 70, Article 101027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101027>
26. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press.
27. World Bank. (2024). Philippines—Teacher Effectiveness and Competencies Enhancement Project: Second implementation support mission, September 23–October 11, 2024. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099102824192510741>
28. World Bank, & United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2022). Philippines—Learning poverty brief. World Bank Group. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099000207152223103>
29. Yunting, J. D. C., Santos, M. C. R., Ampong, A. H. C., Jr., Mejos, D. P., & Monreal, J. A. (2025). Evaluating teachers' perceptions on the first year of MATATAG Curriculum implementation among selected schools: A quantitative analysis. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(3), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i03.47139>
30. Zerna, C. A. (2025). Teachers' point of views on the implementation of DO No. 5, s. 2024: Basis for policy review (Rationalization of teachers' workload in public schools and payment of teaching overload). *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 41(6), 713–722. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.410604>