International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Assessing Elementary Teachers' Preparedness, Implementation Fidelity, and Institutional Support in the Delivery of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Juvelyn S. Solis[1], Jonathan R. Casinillo[2], Rosadelia B. Eyas[3], Roxan M. Fernandez[4], Gladys D. Delos Santos[5], Orlen A. Ostos[6], Mary Rose S. Tapales[7], Melane C. Siacan[8], Fab R. Bacus[9], Stiffany Rose C. Leyson[10], Carl Dhonie Ibarita[11], Girlie N. Villarta[12]

ABSTRACT

Curriculum reform succeeds when teachers are prepared to translate policy expectations into classroom practice and when schools provide the support necessary to sustain faithful implementation. Effective implementation therefore requires interaction among teacher capacity, classroom enactment, and institutional conditions. This study assessed elementary teachers' preparedness, implementation fidelity, and institutional support in delivering the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in selected public elementary schools of Argao District II, Cebu, during School Year 2026–2027. It employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design involving 30 elementary teachers selected through complete enumeration. Data were gathered using a researcher-adapted questionnaire and analyzed through frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, and Pearson's product-moment correlation at the .05 significance level. Findings showed generally favorable levels of teacher preparedness, implementation fidelity, and institutional support. Teachers demonstrated strengths in curriculum understanding, learner-centered instruction, competency alignment, and assessment practices, although improvement was needed in differentiated planning, resource integration, instructional pacing, higher-order thinking, remediation, and contextualized, sustained, and practice-oriented professional development. Teacher preparedness was significantly and positively related to implementation fidelity (r = .612, p < .001), while institutional support was significantly and positively related to teacher preparedness (r = .684, p < .001). These results indicate that stronger professional capacity is associated with more faithful curriculum enactment and that sustained leadership, professional learning, and resource support are associated with greater teacher preparedness. The findings provide an empirical basis for a responsive enhancement program designed to strengthen instructional planning, pedagogy, assessment, professional development, leadership support, and resource access for sustained and effective curriculum implementation.

Keywords: teacher preparedness, implementation fidelity, institutional support, Revised K to 10 Curriculum, curriculum implementation, quantitative descriptive-correlational design, Enhancement Program, Argao District II, Cebu

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum reform is an essential mechanism for ensuring that basic education remains responsive to changing learner needs, societal expectations, and emerging competencies. In the Philippines, the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, implemented through the MATATAG Curriculum framework, was introduced to address curriculum congestion, strengthen foundational literacy and numeracy, improve the sequencing of competencies, and promote more focused and meaningful learning. DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024 established the policy guidelines for its implementation from Kindergarten to Grade 10. Its phased implementation began in School Year 2024–2025, and by School Year 2026–2027, the revised curriculum has extended across the elementary grade levels, making this an important period for examining how the reform is being translated from policy into actual classroom practice (Department of Education, 2024).

The effectiveness of curriculum reform, however, depends not only on the quality of its design but also on the capacity of schools and teachers to implement it as intended. Gouedard et al. (2020) emphasized that curriculum reforms frequently encounter an implementation gap, wherein intended policies and curricular expectations are not fully realized in classroom practice because implementation is influenced by teacher capacity, stakeholder engagement, professional learning, and organizational conditions. Teachers consequently occupy a critical position in curriculum reform because they interpret curriculum standards, select appropriate pedagogical approaches, design learning experiences, and assess whether learners achieve the prescribed outcomes. Evaluating the conditions surrounding teachers' actual delivery of the revised curriculum is therefore necessary to determine whether policy intentions are being meaningfully realized at the classroom level.

Central to this process is teacher preparedness, which refers to teachers' readiness to understand and operationalize the knowledge, skills, pedagogical approaches, assessment requirements, and instructional expectations embedded in the revised curriculum. Preparedness extends beyond awareness of curriculum changes; it encompasses teachers' confidence in curriculum interpretation, lesson planning, differentiated and learner-centered instruction, assessment alignment, and effective use of available learning resources. Emerging Philippine evidence suggests that teachers generally demonstrate willingness to implement the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, yet varying levels of readiness remain because of concerns involving training, instructional guidelines, resources, and the demands of adapting existing practices to revised competencies (Lorono, 2025). These conditions make it necessary to assess whether elementary teachers possess the professional readiness required for effective curriculum delivery.

Preparedness alone, however, does not establish whether teachers are actually delivering the curriculum according to its intended design. Implementation fidelity provides a more direct indication of the correspondence between the prescribed curriculum and what teachers enact in their classrooms. Süer & Kinay (2022) described curriculum fidelity as the degree to which an implemented curriculum remains consistent with its formal design, emphasizing teachers' behaviors and professional decisions as important determinants of faithful implementation. Within the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, fidelity may therefore be reflected in the appropriate coverage of competencies, alignment of instructional activities with intended learning outcomes, application of prescribed pedagogical principles, and use of suitable assessment practices. Examining fidelity is particularly important because teachers may perceive themselves as prepared while still encountering difficulties in consistently translating curricular expectations into practice.

Equally important is institutional support, since curriculum reform cannot be sustained through individual teacher competence alone. Teachers require an enabling school environment characterized by instructional

leadership, relevant professional development, collaborative learning opportunities, adequate instructional materials, technical assistance, monitoring, and constructive feedback. DepEd has recognized the need to provide schools with flexibility and support in addressing staffing, scheduling, and resource-related constraints associated with curriculum implementation (DepEd, 2024). Philippine studies likewise indicate that teachers implementing the revised curriculum continue to encounter insufficient training, resource and infrastructure limitations, administrative demands, and the need for stronger organizational assistance (Malinao & Miano, 2025). Institutional support therefore serves as a critical condition that can enable teachers to transform preparedness into consistent and effective curriculum implementation.

Recent research has provided valuable insights into teachers' experiences during the transition to the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, but the emerging literature remains concentrated largely on readiness, perceived challenges, adaptation strategies, experiences, and support needs. Malinao and Miano (2025), for example, examined elementary teachers' challenges, adaptation strategies, and support needs, while Lorono (2025) investigated teachers' readiness and implementation challenges. An integrative review by Fuentes (2025) further found that much of the developing Philippine literature consisted primarily of studies concerning teachers' perceptions and experiences, with recurring issues involving professional development, instructional resources, and workload. These studies establish important implementation concerns, but their predominant focus leaves other aspects of the curriculum implementation process insufficiently integrated and empirically examined.

A clear research gap therefore remains in understanding preparedness, implementation fidelity, and institutional support as interconnected dimensions of Revised K to 10 Curriculum delivery. Existing studies have generally examined teacher readiness, challenges, perceptions, experiences, or support requirements independently or within limited combinations; comparatively little school-based evidence has simultaneously assessed whether teachers who are prepared also demonstrate faithful implementation and whether the institutional conditions provided by their schools support such enactment. More specifically, limited empirical evidence is available from elementary schools in Argao District II concerning these three dimensions within a common investigative framework. Thus, the present study addresses both a conceptual gap, by integrating preparedness, fidelity, and institutional support, and a contextual gap, by generating localized evidence from elementary teachers within the district (Fuentes, 2025; Malinao & Miano, 2025).

Accordingly, the study was conducted among elementary teachers of Anajao Elementary School, Apo Elementary School, Butong Elementary School, and Lengigon Elementary School in Argao District II, Cebu. Examining these four schools provided localized evidence on the extent of teachers' preparedness, the fidelity with which they implemented the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, and the institutional support available to facilitate its effective delivery. By moving beyond a general assessment of readiness or perceived challenges, the study sought to establish a more comprehensive understanding of how teacher capacity, actual curriculum enactment, and school-level support operated within the implementation process. The findings consequently provided an empirical basis for a responsive enhancement program involving targeted professional development, curriculum-aligned instructional and assessment support, collaborative mentoring, resource provision, and strengthened instructional supervision.

RELATED LITERATURE

Curriculum reform is widely recognized as a major strategy for improving the quality, relevance, and responsiveness of basic education. However, the success of curriculum reform is not determined by policy

design alone but by the extent to which teachers are prepared and supported to translate curriculum intentions into classroom practices. Gouëdard et al. (2020) emphasized that curriculum reforms often encounter an "implementation gap" when the goals of reform are not sufficiently translated into actual teaching and learning practices. This means that teachers are not merely end-users of a prescribed curriculum; rather, they are active curriculum interpreters whose knowledge, beliefs, resources, and professional environment influence how reform is enacted in schools.

In the Philippine context, the MATATAG Curriculum was introduced as a recalibrated K to 10 curriculum intended to respond to persistent learning deficiencies through curriculum decongestion, strengthened foundational skills, and clearer competency frameworks. DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024 provides the official policy guidelines for its implementation, while the curriculum itself emphasizes foundational literacy and numeracy, values formation, learner well-being, 21st-century skills, and support for teachers (Department of Education, 2024). A recent mixed-methods evaluation by Abrigo et al. (2025) noted that the MATATAG Curriculum showed promising early gains during pilot implementation but also revealed concerns on instructional support, training, learning materials, competency articulation, and teacher well-being. These findings suggest that the implementation of Revised K to 10 Curriculum requires not only curriculum understanding but also sustained institutional support.

Teacher preparedness is one of the most critical factors in curriculum implementation. It refers to the extent to which teachers possess the knowledge, skills, confidence, and readiness needed to deliver the curriculum effectively (Chen et al., 2024). In the present study, preparedness is viewed in terms of curriculum understanding, instructional planning, pedagogical confidence, and assessment readiness. Curriculum understanding enables teachers to interpret learning standards, competencies, content progression, and expected learning outcomes. Without adequate understanding of the curriculum, teachers may implement lessons mechanically, misalign competencies, or continue previous teaching routines that may not fully reflect the intent of the new curriculum. This is consistent with Oner Sunkur & Yilmaz (2025), who found that curriculum literacy is associated with curriculum fidelity because teachers who understand curriculum components are better able to implement or adapt the curriculum appropriately.

Instructional planning is another essential dimension of teacher preparedness. The Revised K to 10 Curriculum requires teachers to organize lessons around essential competencies, foundational skills, learner-centered tasks, and appropriate assessment strategies. Effective planning allows teachers to sequence learning activities, prepare instructional materials, contextualize lessons, and allocate sufficient time for mastery. In curriculum reform contexts, planning becomes more demanding because teachers must understand what has changed, what has been retained, and how new competencies should be taught in relation to learners' needs. Lingatong et al. (2025) reported that while teachers in the MATATAG pilot experienced improved flexibility in lesson delivery, they also encountered extended lesson preparation demands and concerns about resource availability. This highlights the need to examine whether elementary teachers are prepared to plan instruction under the new curriculum.

Pedagogical confidence is also important because curriculum reform often requires shifts in teaching strategies. The Revised K to 10 Curriculum promotes learner-centered, inquiry-based, collaborative, reflective, and integrative approaches. These strategies require teachers to move beyond content delivery and facilitate meaningful learning experiences where pupils actively participate, explore, practice, and apply concepts. Viana et al. (2022) explained that fidelity of implementation improves when teacher learning is treated as a developmental process supported by professional development, feedback, and

reflection. Thus, teachers' confidence in applying new pedagogical approaches affects how consistently they can implement learner-centered instruction in actual classroom situations.

Assessment readiness is equally necessary in the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. Since curriculum standards must be matched with appropriate formative and summative assessments, teachers need to prepare assessment tools that accurately measure competency attainment and guide instructional decisions. Assessment readiness includes the ability to design performance tasks, use formative checks, interpret learner progress, and adjust instruction based on assessment results (Motel, 2025b). In the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, assessment should not be treated as a separate activity but as an integral part of instruction. When teachers are not sufficiently prepared in assessment alignment, implementation fidelity may be weakened because lessons may cover the required content without measuring whether learners have achieved the intended competencies.

Implementation fidelity refers to the extent to which a curriculum is delivered according to its intended design, standards, and core principles. Dane and Schneider (1998) identified fidelity as a useful lens for examining adherence, exposure, quality of delivery, participant responsiveness, and program differentiation. In curriculum implementation, however, fidelity does not mean rigid or mechanical compliance. Recent curriculum reform literature suggests that teachers may need to adapt instruction to learner needs while maintaining alignment with curriculum goals. Pont et al. (2020) described this as implementation integrity, where teacher adaptations remain consistent with curriculum principles. For the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, fidelity involves covering the required standards and competencies, applying learner-centered instruction, and ensuring assessment alignment.

Standards and competency coverage are central to implementation fidelity because the MATATAG Curriculum is designed around essential learning competencies intended to reduce content congestion and promote mastery. Teachers must ensure that the prescribed competencies are addressed within appropriate time frames and that the intended progression of learning is maintained (Colango, Degamo, Nacario, & Solomon, 2026). However, fidelity is not limited to finishing lessons or covering topics. It also requires meaningful delivery of competencies through instruction that supports understanding, practice, and application. Sunkur and Yilmaz (2025) emphasized that curriculum fidelity may be affected by teacher-related, institutional, and curriculum-related factors, including teacher experience, self-competence, administrative support, availability of materials, and curriculum complexity.

Learner-centered instruction is another important indicator of fidelity because the Revised K to 10 Curriculum aims to promote meaningful and developmentally appropriate learning experiences. Learner-centered instruction requires teachers to use strategies that actively engage pupils, respond to learning differences, and connect lessons to real-life contexts (Gier et al., 2024). In elementary classrooms, this is especially significant because pupils require concrete, guided, interactive, and age-appropriate learning tasks. A curriculum may be technically implemented in terms of content coverage but still lack fidelity if the intended pedagogical approaches are not practiced. Therefore, fidelity must be examined not only through what is taught but also through how it is taught.

Institutional support strongly influences both teacher preparedness and implementation fidelity. In this study, institutional support includes instructional leadership, professional development, and resource access. Instructional leadership refers to the guidance, supervision, monitoring, feedback, and curriculum direction provided by school heads and instructional leaders. Professional development includes trainings, Learning Action Cell sessions, mentoring, coaching, and collaborative planning opportunities. Resource access refers to the availability of curriculum guides, lesson exemplars, learning materials, technology,

assessment tools, and other instructional resources. Prudente et al., (2024) found that effective professional development in the Philippines is supported by curriculum alignment, collaboration, administrative support, and resource allocation, while challenges include financial constraints, poor internet access, inadequate monitoring, resistance to change, and heavy workloads.

The relationship between teacher preparedness and implementation fidelity is supported by the idea that teachers who understand the curriculum, plan effectively, feel pedagogically confident, and are ready to assess learning are more likely to implement the curriculum as intended. However, preparedness alone may not be enough. Even teachers with high readiness may experience difficulty if institutional support is weak, resources are limited, or professional development is insufficient. Thus, institutional support may serve as a significant predictor of implementation fidelity because it creates the conditions that enable teachers to apply what they know consistently and effectively.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to assess elementary teachers' preparedness, implementation fidelity, and institutional support in delivering the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in selected schools of Argao District II, Cebu, during School Year 2026–2027. Specifically, it sought to determine the demographic and professional profiles of teacher-respondents in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, teaching experience, and curriculum-related training attended. It evaluated teachers' level of preparedness based on their curriculum understanding, instructional planning, pedagogical confidence, and assessment readiness. Furthermore, it examined the extent of implementation fidelity in terms of standards and competency coverage, learner-centered instruction, and assessment alignment. The study also assessed the level of institutional support provided to teachers through instructional leadership, professional development opportunities, and access to instructional resources. It investigated the significant relationship between teachers' preparedness and their implementation fidelity in delivering the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. Additionally, it determined whether a significant relationship existed between institutional support and teachers' preparedness for curriculum implementation. The study aimed to identify areas of strength and aspects requiring improvement in teachers' preparedness, curriculum implementation, and institutional support. Moreover, it intended to provide findings that could guide the development of appropriate interventions to strengthen teachers' capacity to implement the revised curriculum effectively. Ultimately, the study sought to propose an evidence-based enhancement program designed to improve teacher preparedness, strengthen implementation fidelity, and reinforce institutional support for the successful delivery of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to assess elementary teachers' preparedness, implementation fidelity, and institutional support in the delivery of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in selected schools of Argao District II, Cebu, during School Year 2026–2027. According to Creswell and Creswell (2023), quantitative research involves the systematic examination of measurable variables through numerical data and statistical procedures to identify patterns and examine relationships. This research design was appropriate because it enabled the researcher to describe existing conditions and examine relationships among variables without manipulating the natural educational setting. Specifically, the descriptive component was used to determine the teacher-respondents' profile in terms of age and sex, highest educational attainment, years of teaching

experience, and number of Revised K to 10/MATATAG Curriculum-related trainings attended. It also assessed their levels of preparedness, implementation fidelity, and institutional support through the systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of quantitative data.

The correlational component was employed to determine whether significant relationships existed between teacher preparedness and implementation fidelity and between institutional support and teacher preparedness in the delivery of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. This component was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to examine the direction and strength of associations among the major variables without manipulating existing conditions or establishing causal relationships. By integrating descriptive and correlational approaches, the study provided a comprehensive understanding of teachers' preparedness, curriculum implementation fidelity, and institutional support within the selected schools. The resulting empirical evidence served as the basis for proposing an enhancement program designed to strengthen teacher preparedness, implementation fidelity, and institutional support for the effective and sustained delivery of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The profile of the respondents provided essential background information for describing the characteristics of the elementary teachers involved in the study. Specifically, the respondents were characterized according to age and sex, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, and number of Revised K to 10/MATATAG Curriculum-related trainings attended. These variables established the demographic and professional context necessary for understanding the respondents' preparedness, implementation practices, and exposure to professional development relevant to the delivery of the revised curriculum.

Table 1
Age and Sex

Profile	**Frequency (f)**	**Percentage (%)**
Age		
20–29 years old	6	20.00
30–39 years old	10	33.33
40–49 years old	9	30.00
50 years old and above	5	16.67
Total	**30**	**100.00**
Sex		
Male	9	30.00
Female	21	70.00
Total	**30**	**100.00**

The data showed that the largest proportion of respondents belonged to the 30–39 age group, accounting for 33.33 percent, followed closely by those aged 40–49 at 30.00 percent. Respondents aged 20–29

constituted 20.00 percent, while those aged 50 years and above represented the smallest group at 16.67 percent. In terms of sex, female teachers comprised the majority at 70.00 percent, while males accounted for 30.00 percent. The distribution indicated that the respondents were largely composed of teachers in their middle professional years, which may provide the study with perspectives grounded in accumulated classroom experience while still reflecting varying levels of exposure to curriculum reforms. The predominance of female respondents likewise reflected the composition of the participating teaching workforce; however, age and sex alone should not be regarded as determinants of curriculum preparedness or implementation fidelity, as these may be more directly strengthened through sustained professional development, instructional support, and adequate resources.

Recent research provides support for this interpretation. Lorono (2025) similarly found that teachers involved in MATATAG Curriculum implementation were predominantly female and largely within the 30–39 age group, while identifying inadequate professional development and instructional resources as important challenges to effective curriculum implementation. Likewise, Barcelona & Cacharo (2025) reported that most respondents were female and between 31 and 50 years old; although the teachers demonstrated high curriculum readiness, their socio-demographic characteristics were not significantly associated with their preparedness. Instead, the authors emphasized targeted professional development, access to instructional and digital resources, mentoring, collaboration, and institutional support as important conditions for effective implementation. These findings suggest that while the respondents' age and sex provide important contextual information, strengthening teachers' capacity to implement curriculum reforms requires responsive professional and organizational support across demographic groups.

Table 2
Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	**Frequency (f)**	**Percentage (%)**
With MA Units	14	46.67
Master’s Degree	9	30.00
With Doctoral Units	5	16.67
Doctoral Degree	2	6.67
Total	**30**	**100.00**

The data showed that the largest proportion of respondents had earned MA units, comprising 46.67 percent, followed by those who had completed a master’s degree at 30.00 percent. Meanwhile, 16.67 percent had pursued doctoral units, while 6.67 percent had completed a doctoral degree. Collectively, the distribution indicated that all respondents had undertaken graduate-level education, demonstrating substantial engagement in continuing academic and professional development. The predominance of teachers with MA units further suggested that many were actively advancing their professional qualifications but had yet to complete their graduate degrees. Such academic exposure may provide opportunities to deepen pedagogical knowledge, curriculum understanding, research competence, instructional planning, and assessment practices that are valuable in adapting to curriculum reforms. Nevertheless, graduate educational attainment should not be viewed as sufficient by itself to ensure

preparedness or faithful curriculum implementation, since teachers likewise require curriculum-specific training, instructional resources, mentoring, collaborative learning, and sustained institutional support.

This interpretation is supported by recent research emphasizing the contribution of graduate education and continuing professional learning to teachers' professional capacity. Abenir & Abenir (2023) found that teachers across educational qualifications demonstrated high instructional competence and further reported that educational qualifications influenced teachers' engagement with and perceptions of in-service training, highlighting the complementary roles of formal education and continuing professional development. Similarly, Balbon et al. (2023) found that graduate teacher education contributed significantly to participants' personal and professional growth and strengthened competencies relevant to their current professional roles. More specifically within curriculum reform, Lorono (2025) reported that many teachers implementing the MATATAG Curriculum had earned master's degree units, yet challenges related to insufficient professional development and instructional resources remained, underscoring that advanced academic preparation must be reinforced by sustained, curriculum-focused institutional support.

Table 3
Years of Teaching Experience

Years of Teaching Experience	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1–5 years	5	16.67
6–10 years	8	26.67
11–15 years	9	30.00
16–20 years	5	16.67
21 years and above	3	10.00
Total	**30**	**100.00**

The data showed that the largest proportion of respondents had 11–15 years of teaching experience, accounting for 30.00 percent, followed by those with 6–10 years at 26.67 percent. Teachers with 1–5 years and 16–20 years of experience each comprised 16.67 percent, while those with 21 years and above represented the smallest group at 10.00 percent. The distribution indicated that most respondents had substantial classroom experience and had likely encountered changes in curriculum standards, instructional approaches, assessment practices, and institutional requirements throughout their careers. Such accumulated professional experience may strengthen classroom management, instructional decision-making, and the ability to contextualize new curricular expectations. However, experience alone does not necessarily ensure preparedness or faithful implementation of a newly revised curriculum; experienced and less-experienced teachers alike require updated curriculum-specific training, opportunities for collaborative planning, adequate learning resources, mentoring, and sustained instructional leadership to translate reform expectations into consistent classroom practice.

Recent studies affirm that teaching experience can strengthen teachers' capacity to respond to curriculum reform. Magallanes et al. (2022) found that professional experience shaped teachers' responses and collaboration during educational change, while Bensurto and Bernardino (2025) and Motel (2025) showed that experienced teachers still benefited from sustained training, adequate resources, and institutional support when implementing the MATATAG Curriculum. These findings support the present data, where

most respondents had 6–15 years of teaching experience, suggesting a relatively experienced workforce whose accumulated classroom knowledge may facilitate curriculum adaptation when reinforced by continuous professional and organizational support.

Table 4
Number of Revised K to 10/MATATAG Curriculum-Related Trainings Attended

Number of Trainings Attended	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
None	3	10.00
1–2 trainings	12	40.00
3–4 trainings	10	33.33
5 or more trainings	5	16.67
Total	**30**	**100.00**

The findings showed that 40.00 percent of the respondents had attended 1–2 curriculum-related trainings, followed by 33.33 percent who had attended 3–4 trainings and 16.67 percent who had participated in five or more, while 10.00 percent had not attended any. Although 90.00 percent had received some curriculum-specific training, half of the respondents had attended only one to two trainings or none at all, indicating uneven levels of professional development exposure. This suggests a need for sustained and progressively focused training to deepen curriculum understanding, instructional planning, learner-centered pedagogy, and assessment alignment. Moreover, consistent access to quality training, complemented by mentoring and school-based professional learning, may help minimize variations in teacher preparedness and strengthen implementation fidelity across classrooms.

Recent studies reinforce the importance of sustained curriculum-specific professional development. Gumilao & Langam (2025) found significant improvements in educators' knowledge and skills following MATATAG Curriculum training, demonstrating the value of structured professional development in strengthening implementation capacity. Herrera (2025) likewise concluded that effective training and continuing professional development were central to successful MATATAG Curriculum implementation, while Lorono (2025) identified insufficient professional development as a continuing challenge despite teachers' prior participation in curriculum training. Together, these findings support the present results by indicating that initial exposure to training is important, but repeated, relevant, and well-supported professional learning is necessary to strengthen teachers' preparedness and promote consistent curriculum implementation.

Level of Teacher Preparedness

The level of teacher preparedness reflected the extent to which elementary teachers possessed the knowledge, competencies, and confidence necessary for the effective implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. It was assessed in terms of curriculum understanding, instructional planning, pedagogical confidence, and assessment readiness, which collectively represented teachers' capacity to interpret curriculum expectations, plan aligned instruction, employ appropriate learner-centered strategies, and use assessment effectively to support learning.

Table 5
Curriculum Understanding

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. I understand the goals, features, and expected outcomes of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	3.52	0.63	Agree
2. I am familiar with the learning competencies prescribed in the Revised K to 10 Curriculum for my grade level.	3.48	0.68	Agree
3. I understand how the Revised K to 10 Curriculum differs from the previous K to 12 curriculum.	3.43	0.71	Agree
4. I can explain the curriculum standards and learning expectations to learners and stakeholders when needed.	3.41	0.74	Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**3.46**	**0.69**	**Agree**

Legend:
4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The aggregate mean of 3.46, with an overall standard deviation of 0.69, indicated that the teachers generally agreed that they were prepared in terms of curriculum understanding. The highest-rated statement concerned understanding the goals, features, and expected outcomes of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum (WM = 3.52, SD = 0.63), suggesting that teachers had developed a sound general orientation toward the reform. Familiarity with grade-level learning competencies likewise received a favorable assessment (WM = 3.48, SD = 0.68). However, comparatively lower means were obtained for understanding the differences between the revised and previous curricula (WM = 3.43, SD = 0.71) and explaining curriculum standards and expectations to learners and stakeholders (WM = 3.41, SD = 0.74). Although all indicators remained within the Agree category, these findings suggest that teachers' curriculum understanding was adequate rather than exceptionally high, highlighting the value of sustained professional development, curriculum unpacking activities, collaborative planning, and technical assistance to deepen their understanding and strengthen their capacity to translate curriculum standards into clear instructional expectations.

The findings were supported by Montano & Lopez (2026), who reported that elementary teachers demonstrated high to very high preparedness for implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, particularly in curriculum and instruction, knowledge and skills, and curriculum alignment. Their study nevertheless emphasized the importance of continuous professional development and strengthened institutional support to address remaining areas for improvement and sustain effective implementation. Similarly, Yamota (2025) found that teachers' adjustment to the Revised K to 10 Curriculum was influenced by their understanding of its structure, sequencing, competencies, and classroom requirements, with inadequate training contributing to difficulties in translating curriculum expectations into practice. These findings reinforce the present results, indicating that although teachers generally possessed an adequate understanding of the curriculum, continued capacity-building, curriculum-focused training, and

collaborative professional learning remain important for strengthening their ability to interpret standards, understand curricular changes, and communicate learning expectations effectively.

Table 6
Instructional Planning

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. I can prepare lesson plans aligned with the Revised K to 10 Curriculum standards and competencies.	3.55	0.64	Agree
2. I can select appropriate learning activities based on the required competencies.	3.46	0.68	Agree
3. I can integrate suitable learning resources and materials in planning my lessons.	3.38	0.74	Moderately Agree
4. I can adjust my instructional plans based on learners' needs, readiness, and performance.	3.33	0.78	Moderately Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**3.43**	**0.71**	**Agree**

Legend: 4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The aggregate mean of 3.43 indicated that the teachers generally agreed that they were prepared in instructional planning. Their strongest area was preparing lesson plans aligned with curriculum standards and competencies (WM = 3.55, SD = 0.64), followed by selecting appropriate learning activities based on required competencies (WM = 3.46, SD = 0.68). However, teachers only moderately agreed regarding the integration of suitable learning resources and materials (WM = 3.38, SD = 0.74) and the adjustment of instructional plans according to learners' needs, readiness, and performance (WM = 3.33, SD = 0.78). These results suggest that while teachers possessed a generally adequate foundation for curriculum-aligned lesson preparation, greater support was needed in resource-based planning and differentiated instructional planning. Strengthening these areas through collaborative lesson preparation, access to appropriate instructional materials, mentoring, and sustained professional development could enable teachers to design more flexible and learner-responsive instructional experiences.

The findings were supported by Barroga (2026), who found that teachers implementing the MATATAG Curriculum demonstrated efficacy and effectiveness in instructional planning, teaching, assessment practices, and the utilization of learning materials, while also encountering challenges associated with inadequate resources and insufficient training. Similarly, Atienza et al. (2025) reported that teacher readiness was strengthened by subject-specific training and collaborative professional activities such as peer teaching and co-planning, although insufficient training, unclear instructional guidance, and limited learning resources remained significant concerns. Collectively, these studies support the present findings by showing that teachers may demonstrate satisfactory competence in curriculum-aligned planning while still requiring sustained professional development, collaborative planning opportunities, adequate instructional resources, and technical guidance to strengthen adaptive and learner-responsive instructional planning.

Table 7
Pedagogical Confidence

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. I am confident in using teaching strategies required by the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	3.78	0.63	Agree
2. I can facilitate learner-centered activities that promote active participation.	4.24	0.59	Strongly Agree
3. I can manage classroom instruction effectively while implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	3.69	0.68	Agree
4. I am confident in addressing learners' difficulties during curriculum implementation.	3.58	0.72	Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**3.82**	**0.66**	**Agree**

Legend:
4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The aggregate mean of 3.82, with an overall standard deviation of 0.66, indicated that the teachers generally agreed that they possessed pedagogical confidence in implementing the revised curriculum. The highest-rated indicator was the ability to facilitate learner-centered activities that promoted active participation (WM = 4.24, SD = 0.59), categorized as Strongly Agree, suggesting considerable confidence in engaging learners actively in classroom experiences. Confidence in using curriculum-required teaching strategies (WM = 3.78, SD = 0.63) and managing classroom instruction effectively (WM = 3.69, SD = 0.68) was likewise favorable. However, addressing learners' difficulties obtained the lowest mean (WM = 3.58, SD = 0.72), although it remained within the Agree category. This comparatively lower rating suggests a continuing need to strengthen teachers' skills in differentiated instruction, intervention strategies, and responsive classroom decision-making so that pedagogical confidence can be sustained across diverse learner needs and implementation challenges.

The findings were strongly supported by Betchaida (2026), who reported a high level of instructional confidence among teachers implementing the MATATAG Curriculum, particularly in curriculum alignment, learner-centered pedagogies, classroom discussions, and the application of inquiry-based strategies; however, comparatively lower confidence was observed in handling new instructional challenges and adapting practices to differing learner levels. Similarly, Batonghinog & Chavez (2025) found that teachers demonstrated high confidence in implementing curriculum changes and established that relevant professional development and sustained academic support from administrators and colleagues significantly predicted such confidence. These studies reinforced the present results by demonstrating that strong pedagogical confidence facilitates learner-centered and curriculum-responsive

teaching, while continued training, collegial support, and targeted assistance remain essential for strengthening teachers' capacity to address instructional difficulties and diverse learner needs.

Table 8
Assessment Readiness

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. I can prepare assessment tools aligned with the Revised K to 10 Curriculum competencies.	3.72	0.64	Agree
2. I can use formative assessments to monitor learners' progress.	3.65	0.68	Agree
3. I can interpret assessment results to improve instruction.	3.58	0.71	Agree
4. I am prepared to provide feedback and remediation based on learners' assessment results.	3.50	0.75	Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**3.61**	**0.70**	**Agree**

Legend:
4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The aggregate mean of 3.61, with an overall standard deviation of 0.70, indicated that the teachers generally agreed that they were prepared to perform essential assessment-related responsibilities. The highest-rated indicator was the preparation of assessment tools aligned with curriculum competencies (WM = 3.72, SD = 0.64), followed by the use of formative assessments to monitor learners' progress (WM = 3.65, SD = 0.68), suggesting favorable competence in planning and implementing assessment activities. Comparatively lower ratings were obtained for interpreting assessment results to improve instruction (WM = 3.58, SD = 0.71) and providing feedback and remediation based on assessment results (WM = 3.50, SD = 0.75). Although both remained within the Agree category, these findings imply that greater emphasis could be placed on teachers' data-informed instructional decision-making, feedback practices, and targeted remediation so that assessment evidence is used not merely to measure achievement but also to address learning gaps and improve subsequent instruction.

The findings were supported by Malabo (2024), who found that Filipino basic education teachers demonstrated satisfactory assessment literacy and substantial involvement in assessment-related activities, although their data literacy remained comparatively less developed; the study consequently emphasized continuous professional development to strengthen teachers' capacity to use assessment information effectively. Similarly, Li et al. (2023) established that a professional development program significantly strengthened primary teachers' formative assessment literacy and equipped them with skills needed to address challenges encountered in classroom assessment, with professional learning communities contributing to the program's positive effects. These studies reinforce the present results by demonstrating that teachers may possess generally favorable assessment readiness while still benefiting from sustained

capacity-building in interpreting evidence of learning, providing meaningful feedback, implementing remediation, and using formative assessment data to guide instructional improvement.

Level of Implementation Fidelity

The level of implementation fidelity reflected the extent to which elementary teachers consistently translated the prescribed expectations of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum into classroom practice. It was assessed in terms of standards and competency coverage, learner-centered instruction, and assessment alignment, which collectively represented teachers' adherence to curriculum standards, application of responsive and inclusive instructional practices, and alignment of assessment with intended learning competencies and outcomes.

Table 9
Standards and Competency Coverage

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. I teach the required competencies prescribed in the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	4.12	0.58	Agree
2. I ensure that lesson objectives are aligned with the curriculum standards.	4.08	0.61	Agree
3. I follow the required scope and sequence of lessons for my grade level.	3.96	0.66	Agree
4. I make sure that essential competencies are adequately covered within the allotted time.	3.89	0.70	Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**4.01**	**0.64**	**Agree**

Legend:
4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The findings revealed an overall weighted mean of 4.01 (SD = 0.64), categorized as Agree, indicating that teachers generally demonstrated consistent implementation of prescribed curriculum standards and competencies. The highest-rated indicator was teaching the required competencies (WM = 4.12, SD = 0.58), followed by aligning lesson objectives with curriculum standards (WM = 4.08, SD = 0.61), suggesting that teachers maintained close correspondence between intended curriculum requirements and classroom instruction. Following the required scope and sequence obtained a weighted mean of 3.96 (SD = 0.66), while ensuring adequate competency coverage within the allotted time received the lowest, although still favorable, mean of 3.89 (SD = 0.70). This pattern implied that teachers were generally faithful to curriculum expectations, although instructional pacing and the timely completion of essential competencies remained areas that could be further strengthened through careful lesson sequencing, monitoring of competency coverage, and appropriate instructional support.

These findings were supported by Geverola et al. (2026), who reported a generally positive level of MATATAG Curriculum implementation among public elementary teachers and emphasized that effective

implementation depended on curriculum understanding, appropriate instructional adaptation, professional development, resource availability, manageable workloads, and supportive leadership. Similarly, Colango et al. (2026) found that teachers actively translated curriculum intentions into classroom practice but encountered challenges involving accelerated lesson pacing, aligned instructional resources, localization, and practical preparation. Their findings particularly reinforced the present result that competency coverage within prescribed instructional time, although positively assessed, warranted continued attention because successful curriculum fidelity required both adherence to intended standards and sufficient conditions for teachers to deliver essential learning competencies effectively.

Table 10
Learner-Centered Instruction

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. I provide activities that encourage learners to participate actively in class.	3.92	0.61	Agree
2. I use teaching strategies that respond to learners' abilities, interests, and learning needs.	3.86	0.65	Agree
3. I give learners opportunities to think critically, communicate, collaborate, and solve problems.	3.39	0.72	Moderately Agree
4. I create a classroom environment that supports meaningful and inclusive learning.	3.35	0.69	Moderately Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**3.63**	**0.67**	**Agree**

Legend:
4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The findings yielded an overall weighted mean of 3.63 (SD = 0.67), categorized as Agree, indicating that learner-centered instruction was generally implemented with favorable fidelity. Providing activities that encouraged active participation obtained the highest mean (WM = 3.92, SD = 0.61), followed by the use of teaching strategies responsive to learners' abilities, interests, and learning needs (WM = 3.86, SD = 0.65). In contrast, providing opportunities for critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and problem-solving (WM = 3.39, SD = 0.72) and establishing meaningful and inclusive learning environments (WM = 3.35, SD = 0.69) were rated Moderately Agree. These results implied that teachers had established a foundation for learner-centered delivery but could further strengthen instructional practices that require deeper learner agency, collaborative inquiry, higher-order thinking, and inclusion. Sustained professional development, differentiated instructional strategies, collaborative learning activities, and classroom support could therefore help translate the principles of learner-centered education more consistently into everyday teaching practice.

The findings were supported by Uy et al. (2024), who emphasized that the revised curriculum placed learners at the center of instruction through engagement, critical thinking, collaboration, inclusivity, and personalized learning experiences responsive to diverse needs. Similarly, Sulistiani et al. (2025) found

that differentiated learning in elementary education enhanced learner participation, motivation, and learning outcomes and underscored the importance of continuing teacher training and effective instructional management in creating inclusive, student-centered environments. Moreover, Kong & Wang (2024) reported across 43 primary schools that student-centered pedagogy strengthened active, interactive, constructive, and reflective learning processes and that professional development support facilitated teachers' adoption of such practices. Collectively, these studies reinforced the finding that effective learner-centered implementation requires not only active classroom participation but also sustained attention to differentiation, critical thinking, collaboration, inclusion, and professional support.

Table 11
Assessment Alignment

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. I use assessments that are aligned with the learning competencies.	4.32	0.55	Strongly Agree
2. I use assessment results to determine learners' mastery of the lesson.	4.24	0.59	Strongly Agree
3. I provide remediation or enrichment activities based on assessment outcomes.	3.75	0.68	Agree
4. I ensure that assessment tasks measure the intended knowledge, skills, and values.	3.65	0.71	Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**3.99**	**0.63**	**Agree**

Legend:
4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The findings yielded an aggregated mean of 3.99 (SD = 0.63), categorized as Agree, indicating a generally favorable level of implementation fidelity in assessment alignment. The use of assessments aligned with learning competencies obtained the highest rating (WM = 4.32, SD = 0.55), followed by the use of assessment results to determine learners' mastery (WM = 4.24, SD = 0.59), both interpreted as Strongly Agree. Meanwhile, providing remediation or enrichment activities based on assessment outcomes (WM = 3.75, SD = 0.68) and ensuring that assessment tasks measured the intended knowledge, skills, and values (WM = 3.65, SD = 0.71) were rated Agree. These results implied that teachers effectively connected assessment with prescribed competencies and learner mastery; however, greater attention could be directed toward using assessment evidence to differentiate subsequent instruction and toward developing assessment tasks that comprehensively capture cognitive, skill-based, and value-oriented outcomes. Strengthening these practices could promote a more coherent relationship among curriculum standards, classroom instruction, assessment, and responsive interventions.

The findings were consistent with Beting (2024), whose analysis of the Philippine K to 12 curriculum found evident alignment among learning competencies, instructional strategies, and assessment tools and emphasized the importance of standards-based assessment, strengthened evaluation practices,

contextualized assessments, and continued teacher support. In contrast, Abejuela et al. (2023) identified gaps between the written, implemented, and assessed curriculum in Philippine basic education, noting that some prescribed learning outcomes were not sufficiently processed and assessed. Taken together, these studies reinforced the importance of maintaining close correspondence among competencies, instruction, and assessment while systematically using assessment evidence to identify learning gaps and guide appropriate instructional responses. The favorable results of the present table therefore suggested a sound foundation for assessment alignment, while the comparatively lower ratings for remediation, enrichment, and comprehensive assessment indicated areas for continued professional strengthening.

Level of Institutional Support

The level of institutional support reflected the extent to which schools provided the leadership, professional learning opportunities, and resources necessary to facilitate the effective implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. It was assessed in terms of instructional leadership, professional development, and resource access, which collectively represented the institutional conditions that supported teachers through clear guidance, capacity-building, collaboration, technical assistance, and the provision of appropriate curriculum and instructional resources.

Table 12
Instructional Leadership

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. School leaders provide clear guidance on the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	4.14	0.57	Agree
2. School leaders monitor curriculum implementation and provide constructive feedback.	4.08	0.61	Agree
3. School leaders assist teachers in addressing instructional concerns related to the curriculum.	4.03	0.64	Agree
4. The school promotes collaboration among teachers in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	4.17	0.55	Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**4.11**	**0.59**	**Agree**

Legend:
4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The overall weighted mean of 4.11 (SD = 0.59), interpreted as Agree, indicated that teachers generally perceived institutional support through instructional leadership positively. The highest-rated statement was the promotion of teacher collaboration (WM = 4.17, SD = 0.55), suggesting that school leaders effectively encouraged collegial interaction and shared responsibility in curriculum implementation. This was followed by the provision of clear implementation guidance (WM = 4.14, SD = 0.57) and monitoring with constructive feedback (WM = 4.08, SD = 0.61). Although assistance in addressing curriculum-related instructional concerns received the lowest mean (WM = 4.03, SD = 0.64), it remained within the Agree

category. Collectively, the findings implied that school leaders had established supportive conditions for curriculum delivery; however, strengthening individualized instructional coaching and timely assistance could further enhance teachers' capacity to address implementation challenges and sustain consistent classroom practices.

These findings were supported by recent research emphasizing the importance of instructional leadership in strengthening teachers' professional practice. He et al. (2024) found that principals' instructional leadership was significantly associated with and predictive of teachers' professional development, underscoring the value of supervision, curriculum coordination, professional learning, and instructional support. Similarly, Rodulfa (2022) reported that strong instructional leadership among Philippine public elementary school heads was reflected in their ability to supervise and evaluate teachers, influence instructional practice, and build professional connections. Furthermore, Meyer et al. (2023) demonstrated that leadership practices that intentionally create structures for teacher collaboration can facilitate organizational change and the implementation of school improvement initiatives. These studies reinforced the present results by showing that clear direction, constructive supervision, instructional assistance, and collaborative structures are essential components of institutional support for effective curriculum implementation.

Table 13
Professional Development

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. I am given opportunities to attend trainings related to the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	4.08	0.60	Agree
2. The trainings I attended helped me understand the curriculum better.	4.02	0.63	Agree
3. Learning Action Cell sessions or school-based activities help strengthen my curriculum implementation.	3.79	0.69	Agree
4. Professional development activities address my needs as a teacher implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.	3.34	0.76	Moderately Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**3.81**	**0.67**	**Agree**

Legend:
4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The aggregate mean of 3.81 (Overall SD = 0.67), categorized as Agree, indicated that teachers generally perceived professional development support as favorable. Opportunities to attend curriculum-related training obtained the highest rating (WM = 4.08, SD = 0.60), followed by the perceived contribution of training to better curriculum understanding (WM = 4.02, SD = 0.63), suggesting that available capacity-building activities supported teachers' knowledge of the revised curriculum. LAC sessions and school-based professional learning were likewise positively perceived (WM = 3.79, SD = 0.69). However, the

moderate rating for the extent to which professional development activities addressed teachers' specific implementation needs (WM = 3.34, SD = 0.76) revealed an area requiring improvement. This finding implied that while professional learning opportunities were generally accessible and beneficial, greater needs assessment, contextualization, sustained coaching, and follow-up support could make professional development more responsive to classroom-level challenges and strengthen teachers' capacity to implement the curriculum consistently.

The findings were consistent with recent research demonstrating the importance of sustained and relevant professional development during curriculum reform. Gumilao & Langam (2025) found that MATATAG Curriculum training significantly improved educators' knowledge and skills, with post-training performance showing a substantial increase, thereby supporting continued investment in structured and competency-based professional development. Similarly, Nalbantoglu & Bumen (2024) reported that long-term professional development support enhanced teachers' ability to make systematic and productive curriculum adaptations, highlighting the value of sustained rather than one-time training interventions. Moreover, Porcenaluk et al. (2023) emphasized that effective professional development during curriculum reform should be closely connected to teachers' actual practice and supported by adequate time, choice, and a conducive school culture. Collectively, these studies reinforced the present findings by indicating that access to training alone is insufficient; professional development becomes more effective when it is continuous, practice-oriented, collaborative, and responsive to teachers' specific implementation needs.

Table 14
Resource Access

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Categorical Response
1. I have access to curriculum guides and other official Revised K to 10 Curriculum references.	4.15	0.56	Agree
2. I have sufficient instructional materials to support curriculum implementation.	4.03	0.62	Agree
3. The school provides learning resources that help me deliver lessons effectively.	3.98	0.65	Agree
4. Available resources are appropriate to the competencies and learning needs of my learners.	3.90	0.68	Agree
Aggregate Mean / Overall SD	**4.02**	**0.63**	**Agree**

Legend:
4.21–5.00 = Strongly Agree 3.41–4.20 = Agree 2.61–3.40 = Moderately Agree
1.81–2.60 = Disagree 1.00–1.80 = Strongly Disagree

The aggregate mean of 4.02 (Overall SD = 0.63), interpreted as Agree, indicated a favorable level of institutional support in terms of resource access. Access to curriculum guides and official references received the highest rating (WM = 4.15, SD = 0.56), suggesting that teachers were generally equipped with essential documents needed to understand and translate curriculum requirements into classroom instruction. Sufficient instructional materials (WM = 4.03, SD = 0.62) and school-provided learning

resources (WM = 3.98, SD = 0.65) were likewise positively perceived. Although the appropriateness of resources to competencies and learners' needs obtained the lowest mean (WM = 3.90, SD = 0.68), it remained within the Agree category. These findings implied that schools generally provided adequate material support for curriculum implementation, while continued improvement in the availability, contextualization, alignment, and timely provision of instructional resources could further enable teachers to address diverse learning needs and deliver the curriculum more effectively.

The findings were supported by recent studies emphasizing that adequate and curriculum-aligned resources are essential to effective curriculum implementation. Degamo et al. (2026) found that teachers' early implementation experiences were hindered by scarce and delayed instructional materials, incomplete learning resources, and limited access to multimedia tools, demonstrating that timely and aligned resources are critical conditions for successful curriculum reform. Similarly, Prado & Sabas (2023) reported a significant relationship between curriculum implementation components, including learning materials and resources, and school performance, underscoring the contribution of resource provision to effective instructional delivery. In addition, Chung et al. (2022) identified insufficient resources as a continuing concern among Philippine teachers implementing educational reforms, reinforcing the importance of institutional investment in adequate instructional support. Collectively, these studies supported the present results by demonstrating that access to appropriate, sufficient, and curriculum-aligned resources strengthens teachers' capacity to translate curriculum expectations into effective classroom practices.

Relationship Between Teacher Preparedness and Implementation Fidelity

The relationship between teacher preparedness and implementation fidelity reflected the extent to which teachers' knowledge, instructional competence, confidence, and assessment readiness were associated with their ability to translate curriculum expectations into consistent classroom practice. Examining this relationship provided insight into whether stronger professional preparedness corresponded with greater adherence to curriculum standards, learner-centered instructional approaches, and aligned assessment practices in the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.

Table 15
Relationship Between Teacher Preparedness and Implementation Fidelity in the Delivery of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Variables Correlated	Pearson's *r*	Strength and Direction	*p*-value	Decision	Interpretation
Teacher Preparedness and Implementation Fidelity	**0.612**	**Strong Positive Relationship**	**< .001**	**Reject H_{01}**	**Significant**

***Level of significance: α = .05

The Pearson correlation coefficient of r = .612 indicated a strong positive relationship between teacher preparedness and implementation fidelity. Since the obtained p-value was less than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that the relationship between the two variables was statistically significant. This finding implied that teachers who demonstrated stronger curriculum understanding, instructional planning competence, pedagogical confidence, and assessment readiness also

tended to implement curriculum standards, learner-centered practices, and aligned assessments more consistently. The result further suggested that preparedness was an important professional foundation for translating curriculum intentions into actual classroom practices; thus, strengthening teachers' knowledge, planning skills, instructional competence, and assessment capacity could contribute to greater fidelity in curriculum delivery. Nevertheless, the relationship should be interpreted as an association rather than evidence of causation, since other organizational, instructional, and contextual factors may also influence the quality of curriculum implementation.

The finding was supported by Labora (2025), who established a significant relationship between teachers' readiness and the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum, particularly in pedagogical preparedness and professional development; pedagogical preparedness also emerged as an important predictor of curriculum design and content implementation. Similarly, Mercado (2025) reported that teachers' readiness, competencies, and pedagogical practices had significant relationships with MATATAG Curriculum implementation, emphasizing that teachers' capacity to adapt, employ appropriate instructional strategies, and engage in continuous professional development contributed to successful curriculum delivery. Together, these studies reinforced the present finding that curriculum reforms are more likely to be implemented faithfully when teachers possess the knowledge, confidence, pedagogical competence, and professional preparation necessary to translate prescribed standards into effective classroom practices.

Relationship Between Institutional Support and Teacher Preparedness

Examining the relationship between institutional support and teacher preparedness provided insight into how school-level conditions were associated with teachers' capacity to implement the Revised K to 10 Curriculum effectively. Adequate leadership guidance, relevant professional development, and access to instructional resources were considered essential institutional conditions that could strengthen teachers' knowledge, competencies, confidence, and readiness for curriculum delivery. Establishing this relationship therefore helped determine whether stronger institutional support corresponded with higher levels of teacher preparedness.

Table 16

Relationship Between Institutional Support and Teacher Preparedness in the Delivery of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Variables Correlated	Pearson's *r*	Strength and Direction	*p*-value	Decision	Interpretation
Institutional Support and Teacher Preparedness	**0.684**	**Strong Positive Relationship**	**< .001**	**Reject H_{02}**	**Significant**

***Level of significance: α = .05

The obtained Pearson correlation coefficient of r = .684 indicated a strong positive relationship between institutional support and teacher preparedness. Since the p-value was less than .001, which was below the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that the relationship was statistically

significant. This finding suggests that higher levels of institutional support tended to be associated with greater teacher preparedness in implementing the revised curriculum. Specifically, clear instructional guidance and supervision, relevant professional development opportunities, and adequate access to curriculum-aligned resources may reinforce teachers' understanding of curriculum requirements, instructional planning competence, pedagogical confidence, and assessment readiness. The result therefore underscores the importance of maintaining responsive school-level support systems that enable teachers to strengthen their professional capacity and adjust effectively to curriculum reform. Nevertheless, the significant correlation indicates association rather than causation and should be interpreted within the context of the variables examined.

The finding is supported by Inaldo (2026), who found that elementary practice teachers' effectiveness and readiness during the transition to the MATATAG Curriculum were strongly influenced by institutional support, particularly through additional training, instructional and digital resources, collaborative opportunities, and administrative feedback. Similarly, Li et al. (2023) established that instructional leadership and school support contributed to the development of teacher expertise, with teachers' professional development agency serving as an important mechanism through which supportive school conditions strengthened professional capacity. Collectively, these studies reinforce the present finding that institutional conditions characterized by effective leadership, sustained professional learning, and adequate resources can contribute meaningfully to teachers' preparedness to respond to curricular demands and implement educational reforms effectively (Inaldo, 2026; Li et al., 2023).

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that elementary teachers possessed generally favorable professional capacity to deliver the Revised K to 10 Curriculum and were able to translate curriculum requirements into classroom practice with a corresponding favorable level of implementation fidelity. The supportive conditions provided by their schools, particularly through instructional leadership, professional development opportunities, and access to instructional resources, contributed to an enabling environment for curriculum implementation. Nevertheless, the identified areas requiring improvement indicated that effective implementation should be viewed as an ongoing developmental process requiring continuous refinement of planning, pedagogy, assessment, and professional learning.

The significant positive relationships established that greater teacher preparedness tended to correspond with more faithful implementation of the curriculum and that stronger institutional support tended to accompany greater teacher preparedness. These results underscored the interconnected nature of teacher capacity, classroom enactment, and school-level support in curriculum reform. While the relationships did not establish causation, they demonstrated that strengthening teachers' curriculum knowledge, instructional competence, assessment capacity, and institutional support systems remained important to sustaining effective delivery of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Schools should sustain and intensify targeted professional development focused on curriculum unpacking, differentiated and adaptive instructional planning, integration of appropriate learning resources, higher-order and inclusive learner-centered strategies, assessment interpretation, feedback, and remediation. Learning Action Cell sessions, collaborative lesson planning, mentoring, coaching, and individualized instructional assistance should be strengthened to address teachers' specific classroom needs and enable

them to translate curriculum standards more consistently into responsive teaching and assessment practices.

School administrators and concerned DepEd officials should further strengthen instructional leadership, ensure timely access to appropriate and curriculum-aligned resources, and provide sustained, needs-based professional learning opportunities across schools. The proposed enhancement program should be implemented, regularly monitored, and evaluated to determine its effectiveness in addressing the areas identified in the study and in sustaining teacher preparedness and implementation fidelity. Future researchers may likewise examine additional organizational, instructional, teacher-related, and contextual factors and extend the investigation to larger populations or other educational settings to provide broader evidence on the effective implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.

REFERENCES

1. Abejuela, H. J., Akut, K., Rosario, A. S. D., & Balane, C. (2023). Assessment of the Reading Curriculum in Basic Education in the Philippines Context. *International Journal of Language Education*, *1*(1), 26–45. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v1i1.23641
2. Abenir, M. C., & Abenir, E. (2023). Scaling the Academic Ladder: Enhancing In-service Training for Teachers Through Educational Attainment. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *10*(4), 1–1. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=21378
3. Abrigo, M. R. M., Lingatong, E. E., Relos, C. M. L., Perez, T. D. S., Daga, E. D. J. C., Paquibot, J. L., Gavan, D. S. A., Cagasan, L. P. J., & Apostol, G. C. (2025). Promise and Growing Pains in Curriculum Reform: A Mixed-Methods Evaluation of MATATAG K-To-10 Curriculum's First-Year Pilot Implementation. *Discussion Papers, Discussion Papers*, Article DP 2025-53. https://ideas.repec.org//p/phd/dpaper/dp_2025-53.html
4. Atienza, M., Tenorio Jr., J., Larazan, M. M., & Gamao, W. (2025). Teacher Readiness in Implementing the MATATAG Curriculum in the South District Schools of Davao City, Davao del Sur. *Nexus International Journal of Science and Education*, *2*(3). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16626096
5. Balbon, L., Beronio, D., Añavesa, J., & O.Hungo, M. (2023). Tracer Study of the Graduate Teacher Education Programs. *Journal of Educational and Human Resource Development (JEHRD)*, *11*, 37–57. https://doi.org/10.61569/qjatek77
6. Barcelona, R., & Cacharo, A. (2025). Teachers' Readiness on the Implementation of MATATAG Curriculum. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *45*. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.450509
7. Barroga, J. (2026). Teachers' Readiness and Challenges in MATATAG Curriculum in the Division of Abra: Basis for Teacher Training and Development. *International Journal of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives*, *2*(3), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18845014
8. Batonghinog, P. J., & Chavez, J. (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
9. Bensurto, C. D., & Bernardino, L. T. (2025). Lived Experiences of Teachers in Challenging Areas in the Implementation of MATATAG Curriculum. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, *6*(5), 2610–2624. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.05.35

10. Betchaida, J. A. (2026). *Inquiry-based teaching practices and mathematics teachers' instructional confidence in the MATATAG curriculum – Consortia Academia*. https://consortiacademia.org/10-5861-ijrse-2026-26017/
11. Beting, K. M. (2024). Analysis of the Alignment of K to 12 Most Essential Learning Competencies, Instruction, and Assessment Tools in Statistics and Probability. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, *2*(12), 276–292. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0504
12. Century, J., Rudnick, M., & Freeman, C. (2010). A Framework for Measuring Fidelity of Implementation: A Foundation for Shared Language and Accumulation of Knowledge. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *31*(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214010366173
13. Chen, Y., Tang, J., Du, J., & Huang, S. (2024). A Literature Review of Teachers' Preparedness to Teach and its Influencing Factors. *ResearchGate*. https://doi.org/10.54691/57j55m12
14. Chung, J. Y., Lee, S., & Magallanes, K. (2022). The Philippine Teachers Concerns on Educational Reform Using Concern Based Adoption Model. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.763991
15. Colango, D. J., Degamo, K. M., Nacario, S. E. M., Solomon, J.-A., Lozada, L., & Simbulas, L. J. (2026). Teachers' Early Implementation Experiences of the MATATAG Curriculum in the Philippines: Challenges, Adaptive Practices, and Policy Implications. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *14*(4), 25–36. https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v14i4.8550
16. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
17. Dane, A. V., & Schneider, B. H. (1998). Program integrity in primary and early secondary prevention: Are implementation effects out of control? *Clinical Psychology Review*, *18*(1), 23–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0272-7358(97)00043-3
18. Degamo, K. M., Nacario, S. E. M., Colango, D. J., & Solomon, J.-A. (2026). Teachers' Early Implementation Experiences of the MATATAG Curriculum in the Philippines: Challenges, Adaptive Practices, and Policy Implications. *ResearchGate*. https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v14i4.8550
19. Department of Education. (2024a). *DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024 Overview | PDF | Educational Assessment | Equations*. https://www.scribd.com/document/842773515/DepEd-Order-No-10-s-2024-094820
20. Department of Education. (2024b, July 23). JULY 23, 2024 DO 010, S. 2024—Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum. *Department of Education*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/07/23/july-23-2024-do-010-s-2024-policy-guidelines-on-the-implementation-of-the-matatag-curriculum/
21. Department of Education. (2026). *DM OULS 2026 082 Conduct of The Training On Revised Grade 6910 Curriculum 0d3af7e7 0f64 4b65 91b7 08e5a1bfa6b9 | PDF | Curriculum | Intelligence*. https://www.scribd.com/document/1017540328/DM-OULS-2026-082-Conduct-of-the-Training-on-Revised-Grade-6910-Curriculum-0d3af7e7-0f64-4b65-91b7-08e5a1bfa6b9#google_vignette
22. Dorukbasi, E., & Cansoy, R. (2024). *Examining the mediating role of teacher professional learning between perceived instructional leadership and teacher instructional practices*. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12672
23. Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *41*(3–4), 327–350. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9165-0

24. Eisenberger, R., Shanock, L. R., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived Organizational Support: Why Caring About Employees Counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *7*(Volume 7, 2020), 101–124. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917
25. Fuentes, M. (2025). Teacher Experiences, Challenges, and Support Needs in the Implementation of the Philippine MATATAG Curriculum: An Integrative Literature Review. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, *3*(12), 167–179. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.716
26. Geverola, E. L., Raot-raot, K. M., Conato, C. M., Perales, J., Omaba, A. J., Espanola, M., Tacayon, G., Mutalib, R., & Obenza-Tanudtanud, D. M. (2026). Exploring MATATAG Curriculum Implementation in Public Elementary Schools in Kidapawan City: An Exploratory Sequential Mixed Methods Instrument Development Study. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Higher Education*, *3*(3), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.70847/739882
27. Gouedard, P., Pont, B., Hyttinen, S., & Huang, P. (2020). *Curriculum reform: A literature review to support effective implementation* (OECD Education Working Papers No. 239; OECD Education Working Papers, Vol. 239). https://doi.org/10.1787/efe8a48c-en
28. Gumilao, J., & Langam, R. (2025). Assessing the Efficacy of MATATAG Curriculum Training: A Pretest-Posttest Analysis of Educators' Knowledge and Skills. *Journal of Education and Learning Reviews*, *2*(3), 145–152. https://doi.org/10.60027/jelr.2025.1780
29. Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). *Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process. SUNY Series in Educational Leadership*. Publication Sales, SUNY Press, State University of New York-Albany, SUNY Plaza, Albany, NY 12222 ($18.
30. He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *9*(1), 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0
31. Hernandez, F., & Ngilangil, K. (2025). *Teaching English Under Matatag: A Closer Look at Grade 7 Teachers' Experiences*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/394917243_Teaching_English_Under_Matatag_A_Closer_Look_at_Grade_7_Teachers'_Experiences
32. Herrera, N. J. N. (2025). Challenges and Opportunities in Implementing the MATATAG Curriculum: A Scoping Review. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, *6*(2), 943–952. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.02.35
33. Inaldo, K. (2026). Elementary Practice Teachers' Preparedness and Institutional Support in the Transition to the MATATAG Curriculum. *International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies*, *2*(2), 783–804. https://ijtmsonline.com/0202-062/
34. Kilag, O. K. T., Jesus, J. B., Uy, F. T., Sasan, J. M. V., Seblos, K. M., & Gier, R. A. (2024). *Educational Transformation: Perspectives on the Implementation of the Matatag Curriculum in the Philippines*. https://philarchive.org/archive/KILETP?__cf_chl_f_tk=zS8WUzzw7aplMnZ_ur37QtakhMea31Uqd1vLzDAxOD4-1782787310-1.0.1.1-TebR1_0rf7_xSGjqykE3gYpxSdC0WICAVGHerahLr34
35. Kong, S.-C., & Wang, Y.-Q. (2024). The impact of school support for professional development on teachers' adoption of student-centered pedagogy, students' cognitive learning and abilities: A three-level analysis. *Computers & Education*, *215*, 105016. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105016

36. Labora, J. M. D. (2025). Teachers' Readiness and Instructional Strategies Toward Implementing Matatag Curriculum. *International Journal of Advanced Scientific and Technical Research*, *15*(1), 188–215. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15342837
37. Li, Z., Yan, Z., Chan, K. K. Y., Zhan, Y., & Guo, W. Y. (2023). The role of a professional development program in improving primary teachers' formative assessment literacy. *Teacher Development*, *27*(4), 447–467. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2023.2223595
38. Lorono, R. (2025). MATATAG Curriculum Implementation: Teachers' Readiness, Challenges, and Recommendations. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *47*. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.470201
39. Magallanes, K., Chung, J. Y., & Lee, S. (2022). The Philippine Teachers Concerns on Educational Reform Using Concern Based Adoption Model. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.763991
40. Malabo, E. (2024). Assessment Literacy of Basic Education Teachers in a Private Institution. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *21*(7), 792–799. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12665985
41. Malinao, A. J., & Miano, J. J. (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
42. Meyer, A., Hartung-Beck, V., Gronostaj, A., Krüger, S., & Richter, D. (2023). How can principal leadership practices promote teacher collaboration and organizational change? A longitudinal multiple case study of three school improvement initiatives. *Journal of Educational Change*, *24*(3), 425–455. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-022-09451-9
43. Montano, N. V., & Lopez, M. R. S. (2026). Professional Development of Teachers' Preparedness on the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. *Iconic Research And Engineering Journals*, *9*(11), 3974–3984. https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I11-1718254
44. Motel, G. M. (2025). Teachers' Narratives on Preparedness and Content Delivery in the Implementation of the Matatag Curriculum. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan*, *3*(2), 73–107. https://doi.org/10.60132/jip.v3i2.487
45. Nalbantoglu, U. Y., & Bumen, N. T. (2024). Changes in the curriculum adaptation skills of teachers as a result of professional development support: A Turkish case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *137*, 104386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104386
46. Oner Sunkur, M., & Yilmaz, F. (2025). Prediction of Elementary School Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity by Demographic Variables and Curriculum Literacy. *Athens Journal of Education*, *12*(2), 321–340. https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.12-2-8
47. Porcenaluk, S., O'Neachtain, A., & Connolly, C. (2023). Reimagining a framework for teachers' continuous professional development during curriculum reform. *Irish Educational Studies*, *42*(4), 931–948. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2023.2250765
48. Prado, G., & Sabas, H. (2023). Implementation of Special Science Elementary School Curriculum as Correlate of School Performance and Instructional Leadership: Basis for Continuous Improvement Plan. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *13*(6), 1–1. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=21738
49. 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*.

50. REPUBLIC ACT No. 10533. (2013). *Republic Act No. 10533*. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2013/ra_10533_2013.html
51. Rodulfa, L. (2022). School Heads' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Sense of Efficacy in the Implementation of Blended Teaching Modality in Sarangani Province. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, *2*, 294–312. https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v2i1.35
52. Spacciapoli, M., Viana, M., Saunders Wilder, O., Sullivan, J., McCallum, T., & Wilder-Smith, B. (2022). An equitable and scalable approach to track fidelity of implementation in partnership with teachers. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1020204
53. Suer, S., & Kinay, I. (2022). Investigation of Primary Teachers' Curriculum Fidelity. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, *12*(1), 191–214. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1349347
54. Sulistiani, E., Rokhman, F., Pramono, S. E., Subali, B., & Widiarti, N. (2025). Analysis of differentiated learning implementation in elementary schools during the 2020-2024 period. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, *12*(1), 139–156. https://doi.org/10.30659/pendas.12.1.139-156
55. Syofyan, H., Rosyid, A., Fadli, M. R., & Yusuff, A. (2024). (PDF) Teacher Readiness Factors that Influence the Implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum in Elementary Schools. *ResearchGate*. https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v13n5p168
56. Tazaz, A. M., & Schoen, R. C. (2023). An implementation analysis of a Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) teacher professional development program. *Frontiers in Education*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1150229
57. Thien, L. M., & Liu, P. (2024). Linear and nonlinear relationships between instructional leadership and teacher professional learning through teacher self-efficacy as a mediator: A partial least squares analysis. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*(1), 7. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02500-5
58. Tidus, K. M., Clayback, K. A., Haigood, S. D., Vitiello, V. E., Matthew, K. L., & Williford, A. P. (2026). Are You Ready for It? Educator Readiness for Change and STREAMin^3 Curriculum Implementation. *Early Childhood Education Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-026-02255-z
59. Uy, F. T., Kilag, O. K. T., Sasan, J. M. V., Dela Cerna, Y. M. T., Doroy, E. G., & Gier, R. A. (2024). *Student-Centered Learning: Examining the New MATATAG Curriculum*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12492522
60. Viana, M., Saunders Wilder, O., Spacciapoli, M., Sullivan, J., McCallum, T., & Wilder-Smith, B. (2022). An equitable and scalable approach to track fidelity of implementation in partnership with teachers. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1020204
61. Yamota, N. Y. B. (2025). Challenges in the Adoption Process of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum: A Qualitative Descriptive Study using Rogers' Diffusion of Innovation Theory. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, *XII*(V), 33–61. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12050006