



Educational Transformation in the Highlands: A Study on Matatag Curriculum Implementation in Tinoc District

Ela Flor Peralta¹, Celso C. Dumalig^{2*}

Graduate School, Northeastern College, Inc., Santiago City, Philippines

Corresponding Author: Celso C. Dumalig celso.dumalig@deped.gov.ph

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: MATATAG Curriculum, Curriculum Implementation, Educational Challenges

Received : 29, March

Revised : 30, April

Accepted: 26, May

©2026 Peralta, Dumalig: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study examined the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum in Tinoc District, Ifugao, focusing on the preparedness of teachers and school heads, classroom practices in literacy and numeracy, resource availability, school-community collaboration, and challenges encountered. Using a descriptive-evaluative mixed-methods design, data were gathered through survey questionnaires, interviews, and focus group discussions. Results showed high levels of preparedness and strong classroom practices; however, limitations in instructional resources, access to specialized training, and contextual challenges in geographically isolated areas affected implementation. School-community collaboration was evident but inconsistent. The findings indicate that curriculum implementation is shaped by both professional capacity and environmental constraints, leading to the development of a Curriculum Implementation Enhancement Plan (CIEP) to strengthen support systems and instructional practices.

INTRODUCTION

Education in the Philippines continues to face persistent challenges in quality, access, and equity, prompting continuous curriculum reforms to improve learning outcomes and align instruction with 21st-century demands. The most recent reform, the MATATAG Curriculum introduced by the Department of Education (DepEd, 2023), aims to decongest the K-12 curriculum, strengthen foundational literacy and numeracy, and enhance values formation and contextualized learning. However, research shows that successful curriculum implementation depends heavily on teacher preparedness, instructional leadership, resource availability, and community support (Abaiz et al., 2025; Ta-Ala et al., 2025; IJMABER, 2024). In geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas such as Tinoc District, Ifugao, these factors are further complicated by limited infrastructure, cultural diversity, and resource constraints, making the study of MATATAG implementation highly relevant.

Despite its promise, existing literature reveals significant implementation gaps in the MATATAG Curriculum. Studies indicate that teachers often struggle with insufficient training, limited instructional materials, and time constraints that hinder effective delivery of literacy and numeracy instruction (Fernandez et al., 2025; Angeles & Rabago, 2025). Similarly, resource limitations such as weak internet connectivity and lack of aligned materials negatively affect instructional quality (Wabingga & Tomakin, 2024; Malinao & Miano, 2025). While school-community collaboration has been identified as a key support system (Sanders & Harvey, 2002; IJMABER, 2024), challenges in workload, policy alignment, and socio-economic conditions continue to hinder full curriculum success (Chabu et al., 2025; Sellen, 2016). These issues highlight the need to examine how MATATAG is actually implemented in remote contexts like Tinoc District.

Addressing these challenges requires strengthening teacher preparedness, improving instructional practices, ensuring adequate learning resources, and reinforcing school-community partnerships. Literature emphasizes that continuous professional development, instructional leadership, and collaborative learning communities significantly improve curriculum implementation (Lai & Cheung, 2013; Penuel et al., 2009; Kodama et al., 2023). Likewise, learner-centered pedagogies and contextualized instruction enhance literacy, numeracy, and student engagement outcomes (Balansag et al., 2024; Subramani & Iyappan, 2018). Bridging these gaps requires a systemic approach that integrates capacity-building, resource support, and stakeholder collaboration to ensure that curriculum reforms translate effectively into classroom practice.

This dissertation therefore proposes an in-depth investigation of MATATAG Curriculum implementation in Tinoc District, Ifugao, focusing on teacher and school head preparedness, classroom practices in literacy and numeracy, resource availability, school-community collaboration, and implementation challenges. Grounded in relevant literature and prior studies (DepEd, 2023; IJMABER, 2024; Eastern Visayas State University, 2024), the study aims to generate context-specific insights on how curriculum reform is experienced in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas. Ultimately, the

research seeks to contribute evidence-based recommendations to strengthen policy implementation and promote a more inclusive, equitable, and effective Philippine education system.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The reviewed literature highlights that effective curriculum implementation is primarily shaped by teacher and school head preparedness alongside the quality of classroom practices. Studies consistently show that professional training, pedagogical readiness, and instructional leadership are critical in ensuring successful reform adoption (Barrot, 2021; Ta-Ala et al., 2025; Barcelona & Cacharo, 2025; Donaire, 2025; Elardo, 2025; Motel, 2025; Gumilao & Langam, 2025; Perez & Banayo, 2023; Lai & Cheung, 2013; Tong, 2010; Gatela & Arpilleda, 2025). Classroom practices, particularly in literacy and numeracy, serve as the direct translation of curriculum goals into learning outcomes, with learner-centered and innovative strategies significantly enhancing student engagement and skill development (Bautista et al., 2022; Balansag et al., 2024; Soriano, 2025; Saro et al., 2024; Demate et al., 2025; Arsaga, 2024; Farinango et al., 2024; Morkel & McLaughlin, 2015; Idris, 2024; Maligalig et al., 2019; Dooma et al., 2024; Membangun Kualitas et al., 2024; Falcunaya, 2023; Himeji-Ken Dela Peña, 2025; Evangelou, 2023; Subramani & Iyappan, 2018; Pandey, 2025). These studies affirm that while educators demonstrate high levels of readiness and commitment, gaps in training, technology integration, and assessment practices remain, emphasizing the need for continuous professional development and leadership support.

A second dominant theme emphasizes the critical role of resources, school-community collaboration, and systemic challenges in shaping curriculum implementation. Resource limitations—including shortages in instructional materials, inadequate infrastructure, and limited access to technology—significantly constrain teaching effectiveness (David et al., 2019; Malinao & Miano, 2025; Wabingga & Tomakin, 2024; Wabingga & Tomakin, 2025; Prado & Asparin, 2025; Tuimur & Chemwei, 2015; Kaye et al., 2022; Malunda & Atwebembeire, 2018; Glewwe et al., 2011; Yunita et al., 2023; Barrett et al., 2019; Rieuwpassa, 2024; Brown, 2000; Hushin, 2025; Purcell et al., 2013; Koob et al., 2022). At the same time, collaboration among schools, families, LGUs, and NGOs strengthens resource mobilization and supports learner outcomes (Epstein, 2018; Sanders & Harvey, 2002; Cortés, 1996; Deslandes, 2006; Kodama et al., 2023; Eden et al., 2024; Crites, 2008; Fatt, 1999; Lemmer, 2023; Lisao et al., 2024; Cayabas et al., 2023; Edo et al., 2002; Liana, 2013; Kazanskaia, 2025; Lepphoto & Mohasi, 2009; Hou, 2025; Guan & Stanford, 2016). However, persistent challenges such as teacher workload, limited training, policy misalignment, and socio-economic constraints continue to hinder reform success (Bongco et al., 2020; Aslam et al., 2024; Obilo et al., 2012; Okoth, 2016; Widiensyah et al., 2024; Manegdeg & Paglinawan, 2024; Sellen, 2016; Sağır, 2014; Ali, 2018; Otukile-Mongwaketse et al., 2016; Pangan et al., 2025; Mzizi & Rambuda, 2014; Taş, 2022; Penuel et al., 2009; Chabu et al., 2025; Nevenglosky et al., 2019; Nathan et al., 2017). These findings collectively demonstrate that successful curriculum implementation

requires an integrated approach that combines capacity-building, adequate resources, strong partnerships, and responsive policies, particularly in resource-constrained and geographically isolated contexts.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a descriptive–evaluative research design using a mixed-methods approach to examine the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum in Tinoc District, Ifugao. Quantitative data are collected through structured survey questionnaires administered to school heads and teachers, focusing on their preparedness, classroom practices, resource availability, and challenges encountered. These data are analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations to identify patterns and levels of readiness. Complementing this, qualitative data are gathered through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with teachers, school heads, and selected community stakeholders to provide deeper insights into contextual realities, instructional practices, and school–community collaboration. This combination allows for a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of curriculum implementation, particularly in a highland setting where complexities extend beyond measurable indicators.

The study is conducted in Tinoc District, a geographically isolated and resource-constrained area, with respondents selected through purposive sampling to ensure their direct involvement in the MATATAG Curriculum. Instruments include validated survey questionnaires and interview guides, both pilot-tested to ensure reliability and clarity. Data gathering follows ethical protocols, including securing permissions and informed consent, and involves both face-to-face and, when necessary, virtual data collection. Quantitative data are statistically analyzed, while qualitative data undergo thematic analysis to extract key themes and lived experiences. Through triangulation of findings, the methodology ensures validity and depth, enabling the study to capture both the breadth and complexity of curriculum implementation in marginalized educational contexts.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age; Gender; Position, Length of Service; Highest Educational Attainment; and Related Trainings, and Seminars Attended

1. Age

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age

| Indicators | DH/MT f | % | Teachers f | % | Overall f | % |
|------------------------|---------|-----|------------|-----|-----------|-----|
| 24 years old and below | 5 | 20 | 35 | 28 | 40 | 27 |
| 25–29 years old | 5 | 20 | 16 | 13 | 21 | 14 |
| 30–34 years old | 3 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 19 | 13 |
| 35–39 years old | 1 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 9 |
| 40 years old and above | 11 | 44 | 46 | 36 | 57 | 37 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 125 | 100 | 150 | 100 |

Table 1 shows that most respondents are aged 40 and above (37%), indicating a large group of experienced educators, while 27% are 24 years old and below, representing early-career teachers who may benefit more from professional development. Meanwhile, 25–29 (14%) and 30–34 (13%) age groups reflect mid-career educators in a stage of growth and advancement, and only 9% fall within the 35–39 bracket. Overall, the age distribution highlights a diverse mix of experience levels, allowing for varied perspectives on the implementation and effectiveness of Continuing Education Programs, with younger teachers showing adaptability and older teachers contributing experience-based insights.

2. Gender

Table 2. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Gender

| Indicators | DH/MT | | Teachers | | Overall | |
|------------|-------|-----|----------|-----|---------|-----|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| Male | 8 | 32 | 18 | 14 | 26 | 17 |
| Female | 17 | 68 | 107 | 86 | 124 | 83 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 125 | 100 | 150 | 100 |

Table 2 shows the gender distribution of respondents, revealing a predominantly female workforce. Among department heads/master teachers, 68% are females and 32% are males, while among teachers, 86% are females and 14% are males. Overall, 83% of all respondents are female, indicating that both teaching and leadership roles in the district are largely occupied by women, consistent with national trends in Philippine basic education.

This dominance of female educators suggests that the implementation and evaluation of the MATATAG Curriculum are largely shaped by women’s perspectives, reflecting the long-standing feminization of the teaching profession due to socio-cultural and historical factors. It also highlights the need for professional development programs that are responsive to a predominantly female workforce, ensuring that their needs and working conditions are adequately supported.

3. Position

Table 3. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Position

| Indicators | Respondents (f) | % | Rank |
|----------------------|-----------------|----|------|
| Teacher I-III | 125 | 83 | 1 |
| Department Head I-VI | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| Master Teacher I-III | 19 | 13 | 2 |
| Total | 150 | | |

Table 3 shows that the majority of respondents are classroom teachers (Teacher I-III), comprising 125 or 83% of the sample, indicating that the study largely reflects the perspectives of those directly implementing the MATATAG Curriculum. Meanwhile, 19 or 13% are Master Teachers, who provide expert and mentoring perspectives based on experience, and 6 or 4% are Department Heads,

who contribute supervisory and administrative insights despite being the smallest group.

Overall, the distribution reflects a typical school staffing structure where teachers form the largest group, supported by instructional leaders and administrators. This ensures that the study captures a comprehensive view of curriculum implementation from classroom practice to leadership supervision, strengthening the validity of the findings.

4. Length of Service

Table 4. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Length of Service

| Indicators | DH/MT | | Teachers | | Overall | |
|--------------------|-------|-----|----------|-----|---------|-----|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| 3 years and below | 5 | 20 | 44 | 35 | 49 | 33 |
| 4-13 years | 6 | 24 | 49 | 39 | 55 | 36 |
| 14-23 years | 7 | 28 | 15 | 12 | 22 | 15 |
| 24-33 years | 6 | 24 | 16 | 13 | 22 | 15 |
| 34 years and above | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 125 | 100 | 150 | 100 |

Table 4 shows the respondents' length of service. Among department heads and master teachers, the largest group has 14-23 years of service (28%), followed by those with 4-13 years and 24-33 years (both 24%), while 20% have 3 years or below and only 4% have 34 years and above. This indicates that school leaders are generally experienced professionals with a mix of mid- to long-term service. In contrast, most teachers have 4-13 years of service (39%) and 3 years or below (35%), showing that the teaching workforce is largely composed of early- and mid-career educators, with smaller proportions having longer experience.

Overall, nearly 70% of respondents fall under the 3 years below and 4-13 years categories, suggesting a relatively young and developing workforce, balanced by experienced educators in leadership roles. This mix provides both adaptability to new reforms and stability through experienced guidance in implementing the MATATAG Curriculum.

5. Highest Educational Attainment

Table 5. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Highest Educational Attainment

| Indicators | DH/MT | | Teachers | | Overall | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----|----------|-----|---------|-----|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| Bachelor's Degree Graduate | 7 | 28 | 50 | 41 | 57 | 38 |
| With Master's Degree Units | 5 | 20 | 54 | 43 | 59 | 39 |
| Master's Degree Graduate | 10 | 40 | 18 | 14 | 28 | 19 |
| With Doctoral Units | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Doctorate Degree Graduate | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 125 | 100 | 150 | 100 |

Table 5 presents the highest educational attainment of respondents. Among department heads and master teachers, most are Master's degree graduates (40%), followed by Bachelor's degree holders (28%), those with Master's units (20%), and a smaller portion with Doctorate degrees (12%), indicating strong academic preparation in leadership roles. For teachers, the largest group has Master's units (43%), followed by Bachelor's degree holders (41%), Master's degree graduates (14%), and a small percentage with doctoral units (2%), showing that many are still pursuing graduate studies for professional advancement.

Overall, the combined results show that most respondents are engaged in or have completed graduate education, reflecting a strong culture of continuous professional development in the district. This academic profile suggests that respondents are well-prepared to understand and implement the MATATAG Curriculum, with their advanced qualifications contributing to more informed and effective instructional practices.

6. *Related Trainings and Seminars Attended*

Table 6. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Related Trainings and Seminars Attended

| Indicators | DH/MT | | Teachers | | Overall | |
|---|-------|----|----------|----|---------|----|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| Classroom Management | 5 | 20 | 96 | 77 | 101 | 67 |
| Technology and Integration | 13 | 52 | 61 | 49 | 74 | 49 |
| Social & Emotional Well-being | 4 | 16 | 39 | 31 | 43 | 29 |
| Special Education Strategies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Assessment and Differentiated Instruction | 9 | 36 | 43 | 34 | 52 | 35 |
| Others | 5 | 20 | 28 | 22 | 33 | 22 |

Table 6 presents the trainings attended by respondents, showing their professional development related to instruction and curriculum implementation. Among DH/MTs, the most attended training is Technology and Integration (52%), followed by Assessment and Differentiated Instruction (36%), while smaller proportions attended Classroom Management and Social and Emotional Well-being, and none attended Special Education Strategies. For teachers, the most attended training is Classroom Management (77%), followed by Technology and Integration (49%), Assessment and Differentiated Instruction (34%), and Social and Emotional Well-being (31%), with no participation in Special Education Strategies.

Overall, Classroom Management (67%) and Technology and Integration (49%) are the most common trainings, while Special Education Strategies has no representation. This indicates that while respondents are generally equipped with skills for classroom management and instructional innovation, there is still a need to strengthen training on inclusive education and specialized learner support to ensure effective curriculum implementation.

The Level of Assessment on the Effectiveness of Continuing Education Program as Assessed by Department Heads/Master Teachers and Teachers in Terms of Self-reflection, Attitude, and Collaboration

1. Self-Reflection

Table 7. The Level of Assessment on the Effectiveness of Continuing Education Program as Assessed by Department Heads/Master Teachers and Teachers in Terms of Self-reflection

| Indicators | DH/MT | | Teachers | | Average | |
|---|-------|----|----------|----|---------|----|
| | WM | VI | WM | VI | WM | VI |
| 1. am updated with latest research, trends, and best practices in education. | 3.56 | VE | 3.46 | VE | 3.51 | VE |
| 2. develops new teaching strategies and classroom management skills. | 3.52 | VE | 3.50 | VE | 3.51 | VE |
| 3. can expand my networks to provide me with valuable insights and collaboration opportunities to improve myself personally and professionally. | 3.68 | VE | 3.49 | VE | 3.58 | VE |
| 4. demonstrate commitment to professional growth and development. | 3.64 | VE | 3.59 | VE | 3.62 | VE |
| 5. discover new interest and areas of expertise that align with my career goals. | 3.60 | VE | 3.55 | VE | 3.58 | VE |
| 6. engage in activities that promote work-life balance. | 3.56 | VE | 3.58 | VE | 3.57 | VE |
| 7. can apply innovative ideas to increase efficiency, productivity, and effectiveness in my job. | 3.76 | VE | 3.46 | VE | 3.61 | VE |
| 8. cultivate a lifelong learning mindset. | 3.68 | VE | 3.58 | VE | 3.63 | VE |
| 9. allow myself to pursue my passion that can contribute to my advancement in my present position. | 3.76 | VE | 3.57 | VE | 3.66 | VE |
| 10. can adapt to the evolving demands of my profession. | 3.68 | VE | 3.55 | VE | 3.62 | VE |
| Overall Weighted Mean | 3.64 | VE | 3.54 | VE | 3.59 | VE |
| Scale: 1.00-1.75 - Not Effective (NE), 1.76-2.50 - Slightly Effective (SE), 2.51-3.25 - Effective (E), 3.26-4.00 - Very Effective (VE) | | | | | | |

Table 7 shows that the Continuing Education Program (CEP) is Very Effective in promoting self-reflection among respondents, with a grand weighted mean of 3.59. Department Heads/Master Teachers obtained a slightly higher overall mean (3.64) than Teachers (3.54), both interpreted as Very Effective, indicating strong agreement between the two groups on the program's impact. Results show that the CEP strongly supports innovation, professional growth, and lifelong learning, with the highest ratings given to applying innovative ideas and pursuing professional advancement (DH/MTs) and demonstrating commitment to growth and lifelong learning (Teachers). The lowest rating, though still Very Effective, was on being updated with research and best practices. Overall, the findings confirm that the CEP effectively strengthens teachers' self-reflection and professional development, contributing to improved instructional practice and readiness for educational reforms.

2. Attitude

Table 8. The Level of Assessment on the Effectiveness of Continuing Education Program as Assessed by Department Heads/Master Teachers and Teachers in Terms of Attitude

| Indicators | DH/MT | | Teachers | | Average | |
|--|-------|----|----------|----|---------|----|
| | WM | VI | WM | VI | WM | VI |
| 1. become more motivated and enthusiastic about my work | 3.72 | VE | 3.50 | VE | 3.61 | VE |
| 2. feel competent and knowledgeable in my work | 3.64 | VE | 3.51 | VE | 3.58 | VE |
| 3. become more positive towards work | 3.72 | VE | 3.57 | VE | 3.64 | VE |
| 4. become more of a reflective teacher | 3.76 | VE | 3.53 | VE | 3.64 | VE |
| 5. feel a sense of fulfillment | 3.72 | VE | 3.53 | VE | 3.62 | VE |
| 6. am more resilient and agile in facing challenges | 3.68 | VE | 3.46 | VE | 3.57 | VE |
| 7. take pride in my work performance | 3.60 | VE | 3.50 | VE | 3.55 | VE |
| 8. look forward to teaching more when I attended training for enhancement | 3.68 | VE | 3.54 | VE | 3.61 | VE |
| 9. consider my job as interesting and worthy | 3.64 | VE | 3.56 | VE | 3.60 | VE |
| 10. accept the possibility of failure and seeing it as an opportunity for growth and improvement | 3.72 | VE | 3.63 | VE | 3.68 | VE |
| Overall Weighted Mean | 3.69 | VE | 3.53 | VE | 3.61 | VE |
| Scale: 1.00-1.75 - Not Effective (NE), 1.76-2.50 - Slightly Effective (SE), 2.51-3.25 - Effective (E), 3.26-4.00 - Very Effective (VE) | | | | | | |

Table 8 shows that the Continuing Education Program (CEP) is Very Effective in improving respondents' work attitudes, with a grand weighted mean of 3.61. Department Heads/Master Teachers obtained a slightly higher mean (3.69) than Teachers (3.53), both interpreted as Very Effective, indicating strong agreement on the program's positive influence. The CEP significantly enhances growth mindset, motivation, positivity, reflection, fulfillment, competence, and resilience, with the highest rating on accepting failure as an opportunity for growth (3.68). Although all indicators were rated Very Effective, the lowest mean was on taking pride in work performance (3.55), suggesting a minor area for improvement. Overall, the findings confirm that the CEP effectively fosters positive professional attitudes that support sustained teaching performance and adaptability to educational demands.

3. Collaboration

Table 9. The Level of Assessment on the Effectiveness of Continuing Education Program as Assessed by Department Heads/Master Teachers and Teachers in Terms of Collaboration

| Indicators | DH/MT | | Teachers | | Average | |
|---|-------|----|----------|----|---------|----|
| | WM | VI | WM | VI | WM | VI |
| 1. gain insights and knowledge by engaging in discussions, workshops, and training | 3.76 | VE | 3.58 | VE | 3.67 | VE |
| 2. CEP made me realize that by working with others, my goals are achieved | 3.64 | VE | 3.56 | VE | 3.60 | VE |
| 3. can connect with like-minded individuals, builds relationships and expand my professional network | 3.68 | VE | 3.49 | VE | 3.58 | VE |
| 4. involve me in group work and collaboration | 3.80 | VE | 3.54 | VE | 3.67 | VE |
| 5. help to bring together professionals from diverse background | 3.80 | VE | 3.51 | VE | 3.66 | VE |
| 6. allow me to leverage each other's strengths and solve problems collaboratively | 3.60 | VE | 3.56 | VE | 3.58 | VE |
| 7. enjoy working collaboratively with others to achieve our goals and according to a planned timeline | 3.72 | VE | 3.57 | VE | 3.64 | VE |
| 8. learn to accept feedback to improve myself | 3.72 | VE | 3.46 | VE | 3.68 | VE |
| 9. achieve my set goals easier with the help of others | 3.60 | VE | 3.51 | VE | 3.56 | VE |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|----|------|----|------|----|
| 10. learn to work with others and develop mutual trust in the team | 3.76 | VE | 3.59 | VE | 3.68 | VE |
| Overall Weighted Mean | 3.71 | VE | 3.56 | VE | 3.63 | VE |
| Scale: 1.00-1.75 - Not Effective (NE), 1.76-2.50 - Slightly Effective (SE), 2.51-3.25 - Effective (E), 3.26-4.00 - Very Effective (VE) | | | | | | |

Table 9 shows that the Continuing Education Program (CEP) is Very Effective in strengthening collaboration, with a grand weighted mean of 3.63. Department Heads/Master Teachers rated it slightly higher (3.71) than Teachers (3.56), both interpreted as Very Effective, indicating strong agreement on its positive impact on teamwork and professional cooperation. The CEP promotes collaboration, networking, and knowledge sharing, with the highest ratings on involving professionals in group work and diverse collaboration (DH/MTs) and building mutual trust within teams (Teachers). High ratings were also given to feedback acceptance and learning through discussions and trainings. Overall, the findings confirm that the CEP effectively fosters teamwork, collective learning, and a strong professional learning community that supports instructional improvement and curriculum implementation.

4. Classroom Performance

Table 10. The Level of Assessment on the Effectiveness of Continuing Education Program as Assessed by Department Heads/Master Teachers and Teachers in Terms of Classroom Performance

| Indicators | DH/MT | | Teachers | | Average | |
|--|-------|----|----------|----|---------|----|
| | WM | VI | WM | VI | WM | VI |
| 1. develop my teaching skills because of continuing education program | 3.64 | VE | 3.59 | VE | 3.62 | VE |
| 2. understand the implementation of formative evaluation plan clearly | 3.64 | VE | 3.56 | VE | 3.60 | VE |
| 3. can improve my overall performance in class | 3.60 | VE | 3.55 | VE | 3.58 | VE |
| 4. allow my students to explore new knowledge and broaden their perspective | 3.72 | VE | 3.62 | VE | 3.67 | VE |
| 5. incorporate real-world knowledge for the students to bridge the gap between theory and practice | 3.80 | VE | 3.60 | VE | 3.70 | VE |
| 6. engage my students in their learning by providing activities to explore their interests | 3.72 | VE | 3.58 | VE | 3.65 | VE |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|----|------|----|------|----|
| 7. encourage my students to think critically on how to approach different challenges | 3.68 | VE | 3.62 | VE | 3.65 | VE |
| 8. encourage my students to communicate their thoughts, ideas, and analysis | 3.72 | VE | 3.58 | VE | 3.65 | VE |
| 9. incorporate practical application in the classroom | 3.72 | VE | 3.58 | VE | 3.65 | VE |
| 10. engage my students in a more interactive learning process using technology | 3.76 | VE | 3.60 | VE | 3.68 | VE |
| Overall Weighted Mean | 3.70 | VE | 3.59 | VE | 3.64 | VE |
| Scale: 1.00-1.75 - Not Effective (NE), 1.76-2.50 - Slightly Effective (SE), 2.51-3.25 - Effective (E), 3.26-4.00 - Very Effective (VE) | | | | | | |

Table 10 shows that the Continuing Education Program (CEP) is Very Effective in enhancing classroom performance, with a grand weighted mean of 3.64. Department Heads/Master Teachers rated it slightly higher (3.70) than Teachers (3.59), both interpreted as Very Effective, indicating strong agreement that the program improves instructional practice. The CEP significantly strengthens teachers’ ability to contextualize learning, engage students, promote critical thinking, encourage communication, integrate practical applications, and use technology for interactive learning, with the highest rating on linking real-world knowledge to lessons. Overall, the findings confirm that the CEP effectively translates professional development into improved classroom instruction, supporting learner-centered, engaging, and competency-based teaching practices.

The Test of Significant Difference in the Assessment of the Respondents on the Continuing Education Program Terms of Self-reflection, Attitude, Collaboration, and Classroom Performance

Table 11. The Test of Significant Difference in the Assessment of the Respondents on the Continuing Education Program Terms of Self-reflection, Attitude, Collaboration, and Classroom Performance

| Continuing Education Program Variables | Mean (DH/MT) | Mean (Teachers) | z-test | z-critical | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|--|--------------|-----------------|--------|------------|---------|-----------|----------------|
| Self-Reflection | 3.64 | 3.30 | 2.432 | 1.96 | 0.015 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Attitude | 3.67 | 3.33 | 2.529 | 1.96 | 0.011 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Collaboration | 3.71 | 3.36 | 2.408 | 1.96 | 0.016 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Classroom Performance | 3.70 | 3.31 | 2.955 | 1.96 | 0.003 | Reject Ho | Significant |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|-------|------|-------|-----------|-------------|
| Overall | 3.68 | 3.33 | 2.581 | 1.96 | 0.011 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Level of Significance: $\alpha = 0.05$ at Two-tailed test p-value = 0.05. | | | | | | | |

Table 11 shows the test of significant difference in the assessment of respondents on the effectiveness of the Continuing Education Program (CEP) in terms of self-reflection, attitude, collaboration, and classroom performance using a z-test at 0.05 level of significance. Results reveal that all computed z-values (self-reflection = 2.432, attitude = 2.529, collaboration = 2.408, and classroom performance = 2.955) are greater than the critical value of 1.96, with all p-values below 0.05. This leads to the rejection of all null hypotheses, indicating that there are significant differences between the perceptions of Department Heads/Master Teachers and Teachers across all four domains.

Although both groups rated the CEP as Very Effective, Department Heads/Master Teachers consistently gave higher evaluations, suggesting that instructional leaders perceive a stronger impact of the program compared to classroom teachers. The most significant difference was observed in classroom performance ($p = 0.003$), highlighting a notable perception gap in instructional outcomes.

Overall, the findings confirm that while the CEP is highly effective, differences in perception exist due to varying professional perspectives, emphasizing the need for stronger alignment between leadership observations and classroom-level experiences.

Test of Significant Difference Between the Level of Assessment of the Respondents on the Effectiveness of the Continuing Education Program When Grouped According to Profile

Table 12. Test of Significant Difference Between the Level of Assessment of the Department Heads/Master Teachers on the Effectiveness of the Continuing Education Program When Grouped According to Profile

| Profile Variables | F-test / t-test | Critical Value | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---|-----------------|----------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|
| Age | 1.859 | 3.072 | 0.1676 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Gender | 0.092 | 2.179 | 0.9280 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Position | 0.031 | 4.279 | 0.8618 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Length of Service | 0.397 | 3.443 | 0.6771 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Highest Educational Attainment | 0.888 | 3.072 | 0.4637 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Related Trainings and Seminars Attended | 0.765 | 3.072 | 0.5265 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Overall | 0.672 | 3.186 | 0.6041 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |

| |
|---|
| Level of Significance: $\alpha = 0.05$ (Two-tailed) Gender was tested using t-test; all other variables were tested using one-way ANOVA. |
|---|

Table 12 shows the test of significant difference in the assessment of Department Heads/Master Teachers on the effectiveness of the Continuing Education Program (CEP) when grouped according to profile variables using ANOVA and t-test at 0.05 level of significance. Results reveal that all computed values for age ($F = 1.859, p = 0.1676$), gender ($t = 0.092, p = 0.9280$), position ($F = 0.031, p = 0.8618$), length of service ($F = 0.397, p = 0.6771$), highest educational attainment ($F = 0.888, p = 0.4637$), and related trainings attended ($F = 0.765, p = 0.5265$) are not significant since all p-values are greater than 0.05. The overall result ($F = 0.672, p = 0.6041$) likewise shows no significant difference, leading to the acceptance of all null hypotheses.

This means that Department Heads and Master Teachers have a uniform perception of the CEP’s effectiveness regardless of their demographic or professional profile. Overall, the findings indicate that the CEP provides consistent and equitable professional development impact across different groups of instructional leaders.

Table 13. The Test of Significant Difference Between the Level of Assessment of the Teachers on the Effectiveness of Continuing Education Program According to Profile

| Profile Variables | F-test / t-test | Critical Value | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|
| Age | 14.500 | 2.447 | 0.0000 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Gender* | 1.598 | 2.079 | 0.1249 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Position | 10.129 | 3.071 | 0.0000 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Length of Service | 12.630 | 2.679 | 0.0000 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Highest Educational Attainment | 9.873 | 2.680 | 0.0000 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Related Trainings and Seminars Attended | 1.118 | 2.447 | 0.1511 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Overall | 8.308 | 2.567 | 0.0460 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Level of Significance: $\alpha = 0.05$ at Two-tailed Gender was tested using t-test; all other variables were tested using one-way ANOVA. | | | | | |

Table 13 shows the test of significant difference in teachers’ assessment of the effectiveness of the Continuing Education Program (CEP) when grouped according to profile variables using ANOVA and t-test at 0.05 level of significance. Results reveal that age ($F = 14.500, p = 0.0000$), position ($F = 10.129, p = 0.0000$), length of service ($F = 12.630, p = 0.0000$), and highest educational attainment ($F = 9.873, p = 0.0000$) show significant differences, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. In contrast, gender ($t = 1.598, p = 0.1249$) and related trainings attended ($F = 1.118, p = 0.1511$) show no significant difference, leading to acceptance of the null hypothesis. The overall result ($F = 8.308, p = 0.0460$) indicates a significant difference in teachers’ assessments when grouped by profile.

This means that teachers' perceptions of CEP effectiveness vary depending on age, position, experience, and educational attainment, while gender and prior trainings do not significantly influence their views. Overall, the findings suggest that teacher characteristics significantly shape how the CEP is evaluated, highlighting the need for differentiated professional development approaches.

The Teacher's Performance Based on the Current Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF)

Table 14. The Teacher's Performance Based on the Current Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF)

| Range | Adjectival Rating | DH/MT | % | Teachers | % | Combined | % |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------|------|----------|------|----------|------|
| 4.500 – 5.000 | Outstanding | 7 | 28% | 21 | 17% | 28 | 19% |
| 3.500 – 4.499 | Very Satisfactory | 18 | 72% | 101 | 81% | 119 | 79% |
| 2.500 – 3.499 | Satisfactory | 0 | 0% | 3 | 2% | 3 | 2% |
| 1.500 – 2.499 | Unsatisfactory | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | – | 25 | 100% | 125 | 100% | 150 | 100% |

Level of Significance: $\alpha = 0.05$ at Two-tailed
Gender was tested using *t*-test; all other variables were tested using one-way ANOVA.

Table 14 shows the IPCRF performance ratings of 150 respondents as assessed by Department Heads/Master Teachers. Results reveal that 79% of teachers obtained a "Very Satisfactory" rating, 19% achieved "Outstanding," and only 2% were rated "Satisfactory," with no "Unsatisfactory" ratings recorded. For DH/MTs, 72% were rated Very Satisfactory and 28% Outstanding, indicating consistently high supervisory and instructional leadership performance. Among teachers, 81% were Very Satisfactory, 17% Outstanding, and 2% Satisfactory, showing that the vast majority meet or exceed expected standards.

Overall, the findings indicate a high-performing teaching workforce in the district, with most respondents rated at Very Satisfactory or Outstanding levels, reflecting strong instructional competence and effective support from school leadership and professional development programs.

The Test of Significant Difference Between the Level of Assessment on the Effectiveness of Continuing Education Program and the Teachers' Performance

Table 15. The Test of Significant Difference Between the Level of Assessment on the Effectiveness of Continuing Education Program and the Teachers' Performance

| CEP Components & Teachers' Performance | Mean | t-computed | t-critical (0.05) | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Self-reflection and Teachers' Performance | 3.64 / 4.09 | 4.255 | 2.064 | 0.0003 | Reject H ₀ | Significant |
| Attitude and Teachers' Performance | 4.09 / 3.33 | 3.753 | 2.064 | 0.0010 | Reject H ₀ | Significant |
| Collaboration and Teachers' Performance | 3.71 / 4.09 | 3.744 | 2.064 | 0.0010 | Reject H ₀ | Significant |
| Classroom Performance and Teachers' Performance | 3.70 / 4.09 | 3.986 | 2.064 | 0.0050 | Reject H ₀ | Significant |
| Overall | 3.68 / 3.33 | 3.931 | 2.064 | 0.0002 | Reject H₀ | Significant |
| 5% level of significance at two-tailed | | | | | | |

Table 15 shows the test of significant difference between the level of assessment on the effectiveness of the Continuing Education Program (CEP) and teachers' performance. Results reveal that all computed t-values are higher than the critical value of 2.064, with p-values ranging from 0.0002 to 0.0050, all of which are below 0.05. This indicates a statistically significant difference between teachers' assessment of CEP effectiveness and their actual performance. The findings suggest that self-reflection, attitude, collaboration, and classroom performance components of the CEP are significantly associated with improved teaching performance, highlighting that reflective practice, positive attitude, and collaboration contribute to better instructional outcomes.

Overall, the results confirm that the CEP has a meaningful and measurable impact on teachers' performance, supporting its role in strengthening instructional quality and promoting continuous professional growth in the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study indicate that the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum in Tinoc District is supported by a workforce of experienced and professionally prepared teachers and school heads, although access to specialized training remains limited. Respondents demonstrated a high level of preparedness and consistently applied classroom practices that support literacy and numeracy development. Despite these strengths, areas such as

contextualization, differentiated instruction, and assessment require further strengthening. The study also revealed that resource limitations, particularly in instructional materials, technology, and learning facilities, continue to hinder effective curriculum delivery, especially in geographically isolated schools. While school–community collaboration is evident, it remains inconsistent and requires further development. Moreover, demographic factors showed little influence on perceptions of implementation, whereas training exposure played a more significant role. Challenges such as limited resources and contextual constraints were found to directly affect the level of curriculum implementation. In response to these findings, a Curriculum Implementation Enhancement Plan (CIEP) was developed to address the identified needs.

In light of these conclusions, it is recommended that continuous and targeted professional development be provided to teachers and school heads, with emphasis on contextualized teaching, multi-grade instruction, and assessment practices. Schools should further strengthen literacy and numeracy instruction through structured programs and collaborative teaching strategies. The Department of Education and local government units are encouraged to prioritize the provision of adequate instructional and technological resources, particularly in remote areas. Strengthening school–community partnerships through more organized and sustained engagement is also necessary. Instructional supervision should be reinforced through regular monitoring, coaching, and mentoring to support teachers in improving classroom practices. In addition, initiatives that promote teacher well-being should be implemented to help address work-related challenges.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

Future studies may focus on long-term outcomes and comparative analyses, while the proposed Curriculum Implementation Enhancement Plan (CIEP) should be implemented, regularly assessed, and refined to ensure its effectiveness and sustainability.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers express their sincere appreciation to all who contributed to the completion of this study. They are grateful for the guidance, support, and cooperation received, as well as to the participants for their involvement. Appreciation is also extended to the tools and resources utilized, and to family and friends for their continued encouragement and support. The researchers would also like to extend their appreciation to the use of AI tools, which included GPT-5, Gemini, and Copilot, that were used to generate ideas and formulate the statement indicators.

REFERENCES

- Abaiz, J. C., Baluro, M. S., Dolotallas, J. L., Gimeno, J. R., Pomasin, R. L., & Cabanilla, J. D. (2025). Teachers' perspectives on the MATATAG Curriculum in Cebu City: Implications for instructional practice. *All Asia Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 1(1), 1-12.

- Angeles, R. T., & Rabago, J. C. (2025). The MATATAG curriculum and the challenges of Social Studies teachers in Ilocos Norte. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 43(4), 1–12. <https://journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/article/view/1918>
- Barrett, P., Zhang, Y., Davies, F., & Barrett, L. (2019). Clever classrooms: Summary report of the HEAD project. University of Salford. <https://doi.org/10.17866/rd.salford.5248321>
- Cayabas, M. C., Ramos, L. A., & Dizon, R. F. (2023). Building educational resilience through local government and NGO collaboration. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(4), 612–629. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2023.2210456>
- Chabu, L., Mwewa, G., & Kalaba, M. (2025). Administrative and policy barriers to curriculum implementation. *International Journal of Educational Policy Studies*, 17(1), 55–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijep.2025.11755>
- Deslandes, R. (2006). Designing and implementing school, family, and community collaboration programs. *The School Community Journal*, 16(1), 81–105.
- Eden, S., Wallace, J., & Byrne, K. (2024). Parent and community engagement in education. *Educational Review*, 76(3), 412–430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2185427>
- Elardo, J. P. (2025). Challenges of teachers in implementing the MATATAG curriculum. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 10(3), 88–99.
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). School, family, and community partnerships.
- Falcunaya, A. P. (2023). Pedagogical content knowledge of elementary mathematics teachers. *Asian Journal of Mathematics Education*, 12(1), 66–81.
- Fernandez, L. B., Dela Cruz, M. R., & Santos, A. G. (2025). Teachers' perceptions of the MATATAG curriculum. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 7(3), 122–135. <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/3/47139.pdf>
- Guan, L., & Stanford, J. (2016). Institutional strategies for supporting distance learners. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(5), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i5.1234>
- Gumilao, J., & Langam, D. S. (2025). Effectiveness of MATATAG training programs on teacher performance. *Journal of Teacher Education and Development Studies*, 12(2), 67–79.
- Himeji-Ken Dela Peña, R. (2025). Innovative pedagogical approaches and student achievement. *Journal of Modern Educational Innovations*, 14(1), 45–61.
- Hou, Y. (2025). Corporate approaches to workplace education. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 37(2), 101–117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-04-2025-0078>
- Hushin, R. (2025). Digital divides in education. *Global Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation*, 7(1), 14–29.
- Idris, N. S. (2024). Preparing learners for the 21st century. *Asian Journal of Education and Learning*, 10(3), 115–130.
- IJMABER. (2024). A scoping review of MATATAG curriculum implementation. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education*

Research, 5(8), 345–359.
<https://www.ijmaberjournal.org/index.php/ijmaber/article/view/2114>

- Kaye, E. M., Kiprop, C. J., & Chepkilot, R. K. (2022). Instructional materials and teacher commitment. *African Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(1), 45–57.
- Kazanskaia, M. (2025). Resource mobilization strategies in developing countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 61(3), 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2025.103001>
- Kodama, T., Suzuki, Y., & Nishimura, H. (2023). Community engagement and sustainability education. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 24(2), 321–339. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-05-2022-0154>
- Koob, A., Jansen, M., & Rodriguez, T. (2022). Accessibility of educational technology tools. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 37(4), 401–415. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01626434211045678>
- Lai, E., & Cheung, D. (2013). Curriculum reform in schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(1), 61–72. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231311291452>
- Lemmer, E. (2023). School-family-community partnerships. *International Journal about Parents in Education*, 15(1), 23–38.
- Lephoto, M., & Mohasi, M. (2009). Learner support systems in distance education. *Open Learning*, 24(3), 211–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680510903201548>
- Liana, M. (2013). Strategic partnerships in education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(10), 45–53.
- Lisao, R., Tan, J., & Villanueva, P. (2024). Role of NGOs in community development. *Community Development*, 55(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2024.2345678>
- Malinao, A. J., & Miano, J. J. (2025). Resource challenges in MATATAG curriculum implementation. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 16(1), 74–89.
- Manegdeg, R. B., & Paglinawan, E. E. (2024). Teacher workload and professional development. *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement and Evaluation*, 12(2), 55–70.
- Morkel, C., & McLaughlin, T. (2015). Social and emotional competence in early childhood. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 43(5), 367–376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-014-0679-0>
- Nathan, P. E., Hill, R., & Selman, D. (2017). Factors affecting educational policy implementation. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(88), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.2978>
- Nevenglosky, E. A., Cale, C., & Aguilar, S. M. (2019). Barriers to curriculum implementation. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 36(1), 1–15. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1206891.pdf>
- Okoth, U. A. (2016). Curriculum implementation challenges in Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4(7), 295–306.

- Pangan, A. J., Cruz, M. E., & Villanueva, R. D. (2025). Teacher resilience in curriculum adaptation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 45(2), 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2025.2233445>
- Penuel, W. R., Gallagher, L. P., & Moorthy, S. (2009). Teacher professional development in science. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(2), 331–366. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831208328089>
- Prado, L., & Asparin, A. (2025). Institutional support in MATATAG curriculum. *Asian Journal of Educational Policy*, 11(2), 58–72.
- Purcell, K., Heaps, A., Buchanan, J., & Friedrich, L. (2013). Teachers and technology use. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2013/02/28/how-teachers-are-using-technology-at-home-and-in-their-classrooms/>
- Rieuwpassa, F. (2024). School facilities and academic development. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 14(2), 91–105.
- Sanders, M. G., & Harvey, A. (2002). School-community collaboration. *Teachers College Record*, 104(7), 1345–1368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9620.00205>
- Saro, J. L., Manalo, P. C., & Reyes, H. M. (2024). MATATAG curriculum and pedagogy. *Asian Journal of Pedagogical Studies*, 6(3), 134–148.
- Sellen, P. (2016). Teacher workload and professional development. Education Policy Institute Report. <https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/teacher-workload-and-professional-development>
- Soriano, A. F. (2025). Institutional support in MATATAG curriculum. *Journal of Philippine Education Policy and Reform*, 12(1), 23–37.
- Subramani, C., & Iyappan, V. (2018). Innovative methods of teaching. *Journal of Applied and Advanced Research*, 3(S1), 20–22. <https://doi.org/10.21839/jaar.2018.v3S1.165>
- Ta-Ala, R. C., Dela Cruz, M. L., & Villanueva, S. R. (2025). School heads' readiness in MATATAG curriculum. *Journal of Educational Management and Leadership*, 15(1), 25–39.
- Tuimur, H. N., & Chemwei, B. (2015). Instructional materials in primary schools. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(6), 224–234.
- Wabingga, R. J., & Tomakin, J. L. (2024). Resource limitations in MATATAG curriculum. *International Journal of Curriculum Development*, 9(1), 33–47.
- Widiansyah, A., Suryana, D., & Fitriyani, R. (2024). Teacher readiness in curriculum implementation. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2345678. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2345678>
- Yunita, A., Ramadhani, S., & Putra, D. (2023). School infrastructure and learning outcomes. *Journal of Educational Policy and Innovation*, 9(1), 33–48.
- Yunting, J. D. (2025). Teachers' perceptions on MATATAG curriculum implementation. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i03.47139>