YANGON UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS
DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED ECONOMICS
MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMME

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN MYANMAR EDUCATION REFORM (A CASE STUDY: KAMAYUT TOWNSHIP)

EI EI KHIN
MPA – 14 (22nd BATCH)

JUNE, 2025

YANGON UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS
DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED ECONOMICS
MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMME

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN MYANMAR EDUCATION REFORM (A CASE STUDY: KAMAYUT TOWNSHIP)

A thesis submitted as a partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Public Administration

Supervised by

Daw N Khum Ja Ra
Associated Professor
Department of Applied Economics
Yangon University of Economics

Submitted by

Ei Ei Khin
Roll No.14
MPA (22nd Batch)
(2023-2025)

JUNE, 2025

YANGON UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS
DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED ECONOMICS
MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMME

This is to certify that this thesis entitled "**TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN MYANMAR EDUCATION REFORM (A CASE STUDY: KAMAYUT TOWNSHIP)**" submitted as a partial fulfilment towards the requirements for the Degree of Master of Public Administration has been accepted by the Board of Examiners.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

……..
Dr. Tin Tin Htwe
(Chairperson)
Rector
Yangon University of Economics

……
Dr. Cho Cho Thein
(Examiner)
Pro-Rector
Yangon University of Economics

……
Dr. Su Su Myat
(Examiner)
Professor and Head of Department
Department of Applied Economics
Yangon University of Economics

……
U Khum Maung Gyi
(Examiner)
Associated Professor
Department of Applied Economics
Yangon University of Economics

……
Daw N Khum Ja Ra
(Supervisor)
Associated Professor
Department of Applied Economics
Yangon University of Economics

JUNE, 2025

ABSTRACT

Myanmar has introduced a national curriculum reform aiming to modernize classroom practices, promote student engagement, and meet international education standards. As key stakeholders in education reform, teachers' experiences and views are crucial to its successful implementation. This research examines how teachers in Kamayut Township perceive the curriculum development process, with a particular focus on the practical challenges and impacts at the primary, secondary, and higher education levels. A structured questionnaire was used to collect responses from 290 public school teachers, and a descriptive cross-sectional design guided the analysis. Results revealed mixed opinions: while some educators recognized the positive intentions of the reform, many expressed concerns about limited training, lack of teaching materials, and exclusion from policy-related discussions. Notably, younger teachers and those with recent training were more supportive of the changes. No major differences were found based on gender. The study highlights that teacher training, equitable support, and participatory policy processes are essential to ensure the reform reaches its intended outcomes and contributes to long-term improvements in Myanmar’s education sector.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Dr. Tin Tin Htwe, Rector of Yangon University of Economics, for giving me the opportunity to pursue the Master of Public Administration (MPA) programme. I would also like to sincerely thank the Pro-Rectors, Dr. Mya Thandar, Dr. Khin Thida Nyein, Dr. Cho Cho Thein, and retired Professor Dr. Kyaw Min Htun for their insightful lectures, guidance, and continued support throughout my academic journey.

I am especially thankful to Professor Dr. Su Su Myat, the Programme Director and Head of the Department of Applied Economics, for her exceptional leadership and guidance throughout this study. Her valuable insights and continued support have greatly contributed to the quality of this thesis.

I am particularly indebted to my supervisor, Daw N. Khum Ja Ra, Associate Professor at Yangon University of Economics, for her constant support, mentorship, and encouragement throughout my studies. Her invaluable guidance made the completion of this thesis possible.

I am also grateful to U Khum Maung Gyi, Associate Professor at Yangon University of Economics, for share hid knowledge and experiences, which played a crucial role in the successful completion of this study.

My sincere appreciation also goes to all the faculty members who shared their knowledge and experiences, which were vital to the completion of this study. I am deeply grateful to the school principals and teachers in Kamayut Township who willingly participated in my research and provided insightful responses to the survey. Their contributions were essential to the success of this case study on "Teacher Perceptions of the Curriculum Development in Myanmar Public Education Reform." Lastly, I would like to thank my colleagues and friends for their encouragement, moral support, and assistance throughout this academic journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BEMP	Basic Education Master Plan
DBE	Department of Basic Education
DEPT	Department of Education Planning and Training
MOE	Ministry of Education
SEL	Social-Emotional Learning
PLC	Professional Learning Community
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
NESP	National Education Strategic Plan
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
EFA	Education for All
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TOR	Terms of Reference
QA	Quality Assurance
HRD	Human Resource Development
SEA	Southeast Asia
SEL	Social-Emotional Learning

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Education reform plays a vital role in shaping a nation's development, particularly through curriculum enhancement and increased access to resources. In Myanmar, recent public education reforms aim to modernize teaching methods and improve student outcomes. However, the success of these reforms depends largely on how teachers perceive and implement them. Teachers are the frontline agents who translate policy into practice, making their insights essential to understanding the effectiveness of the reform. This study examines teachers' perceptions of curriculum development and resource adoption in Kamayut Township, providing valuable insights to inform future policy decisions.

1.1 Rationale of the Study

Education reforms have always played a pivotal role in shaping the direction and quality of national development. As societies evolve, so do their educational needs and expectations, which means that reforms often reflect broader political, social, and economic priorities. The process of reform is not simply about changing policies or structures; it is an ongoing negotiation involving various stakeholders with differing perspectives and interests. Teachers, in particular, are central to the actualization of any educational reform because they bring policies to life in classrooms and interact directly with students. While policymakers design frameworks and guidelines, it is teachers who interpret, adapt, and sometimes resist these reforms based on their professional experiences and the realities of their classrooms. Their behaviors can significantly accelerate or impede the desired outcomes, making it crucial to understand their perspectives when evaluating the success or shortcomings of educational change (Ball 1994; House 1996).

Around the world, education systems are being reshaped in response to the pressures and opportunities presented by globalization and technological innovation. Countries are striving to create learning environments that foster skills such as critical

thinking, creativity, and digital literacy, all of which are vital for participating in an interconnected and rapidly changing global economy. This drive for modernization is influenced by the global exchange of educational ideas, often resulting in countries adopting or adapting international models while striking a balance with the preservation of their cultural identity. At the same time, educational reforms are increasingly seen as essential tools for promoting equity and inclusion, narrowing opportunity gaps, and preparing young people for uncertain futures. The challenge for governments is to strike a balance between adopting global best practices and meeting the unique needs of their societies, resulting in diverse approaches to reform that reflect both international trends and local aspirations (Zajda 2021; Levin 2014).

Drawing on international experiences, it becomes evident that education reforms succeed not only through well-crafted policies but also through strong political will, community engagement, and adaptable implementation strategies. In many countries, reforms have faltered due to insufficient stakeholder involvement or a lack of sustained support, while successful reforms have typically involved ongoing dialogue with teachers, parents, and local communities. Political dynamics, resource allocation, and communication strategies all play crucial roles in shaping reform outcomes. For example, some nations have managed to overcome resistance and ensure long-term change by building consensus among educators and providing clear, consistent support throughout the process. The study of educational reform across different countries offers not just a list of best practices but also valuable warnings about common pitfalls, such as the risk of disconnect between policy intentions and classroom realities or the challenges posed by limited resources (Levin 2014; Gazizova 2013; Bruns and Schneider 2016; Purves 1989).

Myanmar is currently undergoing an ambitious process of education reform, driven by a national commitment to social justice, democratization, and sustainable development. Since 2011, comprehensive efforts have been underway to modernize the curriculum, enhance teacher capacity, and ensure equitable access to educational resources. These reforms aim to address historical disparities and to align Myanmar's education system with global standards, while also nurturing local identities and values. In practice, however, the transformation of the education system faces significant obstacles, including infrastructural limitations, resource constraints, and varying levels of readiness among teachers and schools. The success of these ambitious reforms largely depends on the engagement and responsiveness of teachers,

who must translate new policies into effective teaching and learning practices. Their insights and experiences provide a vital lens for understanding the real progress and ongoing challenges of education reform in the country (Win 2015; Lall 2021; Ou Yang and Weng 2023).

This thesis is both timely and relevant because it focuses on the perspectives of teachers in Kamayut Township as they navigate changes in curriculum and resource adoption during Myanmar's ongoing education reform. By exploring teachers' experiences, beliefs, and challenges, this research provides a much-needed understanding of how reforms are being implemented on the ground. Capturing these voices not only helps to identify barriers and facilitators of reform but also offers practical recommendations for improving policy and practice. The findings of this study have the potential to contribute significantly to the discourse on educational change in Myanmar, informing policymakers, educational leaders, and international partners. Ultimately, this study supports the development of a more effective, contextually relevant, and sustainable education system, one that meets the aspirations of Myanmar's people and prepares students for the demands of the modern world.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

To examine teachers' perceptions of curriculum development in Myanmar's education reform across primary, middle, and high schools in Kamayut Township, focusing on effectiveness, challenges, and impact on teaching practices.

1.3 Method of Study

This research uses a descriptive approach with both primary and secondary data. Secondary data comes from reports, policies, and studies from the Ministry of Education (MOE) and other relevant sources. Primary data is collected through a survey of 290 teachers from public schools in Kamayut Township. A structured questionnaire is used to gather their views on curriculum development.

1.4 Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study focuses on teachers' perspectives regarding curriculum development and resource adoption within the context of Myanmar's public education reform. It examines the policies and implementation strategies introduced over the past decade, specifically from the viewpoints of primary, middle, and high school

teachers. The research is geographically limited to public schools in Kamayut Township, offering insights into the local challenges and experiences faced by teachers in this area. The study does not include private or international schools, nor does it reflect the perceptions of students. Its findings are therefore specific to public school teachers within the specified township and may not be generalizable to other regions or educational settings.

1.5 Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One is the introduction, which includes the rationale, objectives, method of study, scope and limitation, and organization of the study. Chapter Two is the literature review, discussing curriculum development, resource adoption, and teachers' roles in education reform. Chapter Three presents the current situation of curriculum implementation and resource allocation in public schools in Kamayut Township. Chapter Four is the survey analysis, which includes the survey profile and analysis of teachers' perceptions. Chapter Five is the conclusion, summarizing key findings and providing suggestions for future improvements.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Define of Education and Curriculum

Education is the foundation for personal and societal development. It is a lifelong process through which individuals acquire knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes. Education takes place in various forms: formal (schools, colleges), informal (learning from family or society), and non-formal (training courses or community programs). It empowers individuals to think critically, communicate effectively, and make informed decisions in their lives. Moreover, it promotes social inclusion, gender equality, and economic progress by providing people with the tools they need to contribute to society (UNESCO, 2015).

In addition to academic learning, education helps build moral character and emotional intelligence. It fosters discipline, respect, cooperation, and responsibility among individuals. In today's rapidly changing world, education plays a crucial role in preparing individuals to adapt to technological advancements and global challenges. It is not just about earning degrees but about becoming a responsible, informed, and active citizen. As such, education is considered both a fundamental human right and a powerful tool for sustainable development (Freire, 1970).

Curriculum refers to the planned set of lessons, subjects, and activities that educators use to guide teaching and learning in schools and universities. It includes not only the content taught in the classroom but also the teaching methods, assessment strategies, and learning outcomes expected from students. A well-designed curriculum is aligned with educational goals, national standards, and student needs, helping ensure a structured and meaningful learning experience (Tyler, 1949).

Beyond textbooks and classroom instruction, curriculum also reflects the values, culture, and priorities of a society. It shapes how students think, what they learn, and how they behave. For example, a curriculum may emphasize science and technology in one country while focusing on social studies and environmental education in another. In modern education systems, the curriculum is regularly

reviewed and updated to remain relevant and responsive to the needs of the changing world and workforce (Kelly, 2009).

Education can be categorized into formal, informal, and non-formal types. Formal education occurs in schools and universities, follows a set curriculum, and leads to certification. Informal education happens naturally through life experiences, without a structured curriculum or assessment. Non-formal education includes organized learning outside traditional institutions, such as training programs and workshops. All three forms contribute to lifelong learning and play vital roles in personal and societal development.

2.2 Education Reforms

Education reforms are comprehensive, systematic efforts to improve the structure, quality, and outcomes of education systems in order to meet the evolving needs of societies and economies. These reforms encompass a wide spectrum of activities, from revising curricula and teaching methodologies to restructuring governance and funding mechanisms. The purpose of education reform is not only to raise academic standards but also to promote equity, inclusivity, and relevance in education. Additionally, reforms frequently address emerging challenges such as technological change, demographic shifts, and labor market demands, ensuring that educational systems remain adaptive and future-oriented. In many cases, education reforms have also been used as instruments for nation-building, social integration, and the promotion of civic values, reflecting their centrality to broader societal development and modernization (Ball, 1994).

A notable characteristic of education reforms is their context-dependent and multifaceted nature. Reforms are shaped by political, cultural, economic, and historical factors unique to each country or region, making universal solutions rare. They often involve negotiating diverse interests and ideologies, which can lead to tensions between traditional practices and progressive innovations. For instance, some reforms may emphasize standardized testing and accountability, while others prioritize holistic education and creativity. Another important characteristic is the requirement for broad-based participation, as sustainable reforms depend on the collective engagement of stakeholders such as teachers, administrators, policymakers, parents, and students. This participatory approach can foster a sense of ownership and facilitate smoother implementation. The cyclical process of reform—characterized by

ongoing assessment, modification, and renewal, enables education systems to stay resilient in the face of continual change, such as shifts in demographic profiles or the rise of digital learning environments (Zajda, 2016).

Implementing successful education reforms necessitates meeting several core requirements. Clear and achievable objectives must be established through consensus-building among key stakeholders, ensuring that reforms are relevant and widely supported. Adequate resources are critical, including sustained financial investment, access to modern infrastructure, and the provision of instructional materials and technologies. Professional capacity-building, particularly for teachers and educational leaders, is essential as they are the primary agents of change within classrooms. Effective reforms rely on ongoing professional learning opportunities that help educators develop new skills, adapt to changing curricula, and utilize innovative pedagogical techniques. Additionally, a robust system of monitoring and evaluation should be in place to gather data on progress and outcomes, enabling evidence-based decision-making and timely adjustments. Without these foundational supports, reforms risk becoming superficial or failing to achieve meaningful change (Cohen, Spillane, & Peurach, 2018).

The process of education reform typically unfolds in several key stages, each building upon the previous one. It begins with needs assessment and problem identification, where data is collected to diagnose weaknesses and opportunities within the current system. Next, reformers set strategic goals and design policy interventions aligned with these objectives. This is followed by detailed planning, which includes resource allocation, development of implementation guidelines, and the establishment of timelines and accountability structures. Implementation itself is a complex phase, requiring effective communication, stakeholder engagement, and the management of resistance to change. Ongoing monitoring and evaluation are integral throughout the process, providing feedback that informs iterative adjustments and ensures that reforms remain responsive and effective. Notably, education reform is rarely a linear process; setbacks and unanticipated consequences often arise, necessitating flexibility and resilience among those involved (Hunt, 2005).

In the contemporary era, education reforms are increasingly influenced by globalization, technological innovation, and evolving societal expectations. The forces of globalization have promoted the adoption of international benchmarks, student mobility, and cross-cultural exchange, while also raising concerns about

cultural homogenization and the erosion of local educational traditions. Reforms now frequently focus on the integration of digital technologies, the development of 21st-century skills such as critical thinking and collaboration, and the promotion of lifelong learning to prepare individuals for rapidly changing labor markets.

Additionally, there is growing emphasis on equity and inclusion, ensuring that marginalized and disadvantaged groups receive quality education and opportunities to succeed. Innovative approaches such as personalized learning, competency-based progression, and community partnerships are increasingly being adopted to address the complex and diverse needs of learners. The challenge facing policymakers and educators is to balance these global influences with local contexts, making reforms both meaningful and sustainable while remaining open to constant evolution and improvement (Zajda, 2018).

2.3 International Experiences of Education Reforms

International experiences of education reforms provide valuable insights into the policies, strategies, and outcomes that characterize high-performing education systems worldwide. Countries that are consistently recognized for their educational excellence have implemented sustained and contextually relevant reforms over several decades. These reforms reflect a blend of government leadership, stakeholder engagement, continuous investment, and a culture of accountability and innovation. Drawing from comparative studies and global assessments, the eleven countries with the highest education reputations include Finland, Singapore, South Korea, Japan, Canada, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Australia, Sweden, Germany, and New Zealand. Each of these countries offers unique lessons for education policymakers and reformers.

2.3.1 Finland

Finland's education process is internationally recognized for its focus on equity, student well-being, and trust in educational professionals. Finnish children begin formal education at age seven, which is later than many other countries, allowing for a robust early childhood education system that stresses play and social development. During basic education, students have few standardized tests; instead, teachers assess learning through ongoing formative assessment and feedback. The national curriculum provides broad goals but grants teachers considerable autonomy

to design lessons and choose teaching methods that suit their students. Teacher training programs are highly selective and require a master's degree, integrating research, theory, and practical experience. One of the core challenges Finland faces today is maintaining its high performance in the face of increasing diversity and changing societal needs, including the integration of immigrant students and adapting to new technologies in the classroom. Despite these challenges, Finland's education design, characterized by small class sizes, individualized support, and a collaborative culture, continues to produce students who perform well academically, report high levels of happiness, and exhibit strong problem-solving skills. The Finnish approach demonstrates that prioritizing equity and teacher professionalism can lead to both academic success and student well-being (Levin, 2014).

2.3.2 Singapore

Singapore's education system has undergone continuous reform to position itself as a global knowledge hub. The process is marked by a tightly controlled, centralized curriculum and high-stakes national examinations at every key stage, Primary School Leaving Examination, O-Level, and A-Level, that determine students' educational and career trajectories. The government invests heavily in the recruitment and training of teachers, who are selected from the top third of each cohort and receive regular professional development through the National Institute of Education. To address the pressures of a high-stakes environment, Singapore introduced the "Teach Less, Learn More" policy to foster creativity, critical thinking, and deeper understanding. However, the intense focus on academic achievement and competition for top schools can lead to student stress and mental health concerns, prompting the government to gradually reduce testing and implement more holistic measures of success. Singapore's education design is frequently updated in response to global trends, with initiatives in STEM, digital literacy, and bilingualism. Its pragmatic, forward-looking approach, combining rigorous standards with increasing focus on student well-being, has produced consistently high rankings in international assessments and a highly skilled, adaptable workforce (Gazizova, 2013).

2.3.3 South Korea

South Korea's education reform journey transformed the country from low literacy and limited resources post-war to global educational leadership. The process

is driven by a culture that highly values education as a means of social mobility and national progress, resulting in long school days and widespread use of private tutoring academies (hagwons). The curriculum is rigorous, heavily oriented towards preparing students for the university entrance exam (Suneung), which is a major determinant of future opportunities. The government has invested in reducing class sizes, improving teacher qualifications, and expanding early childhood education, but the intense competition contributes to student stress and a narrow focus on rote memorization. Recent reforms seek to cultivate creativity, reduce exam pressure, and encourage more balanced development, with policies such as the "Free Semester" in middle schools promoting experiential learning and career exploration. South Korea's education design is highly centralized, with strong government oversight but increasing efforts to empower schools and teachers. The country's remarkable progress demonstrates the impact of national commitment and investment, but ongoing challenges highlight the need for a more holistic, learner-centered approach (Gillies, 2015).

2.3.4 Japan

Japan's education process is rooted in a blend of traditional values and evolving reform. Compulsory education lasts nine years, covering elementary and junior high school, with a curriculum emphasizing literacy, math, science, and moral education, a unique subject designed to cultivate citizenship and ethical awareness. The school year is longer than the OECD average, and students participate in daily cleaning and extracurricular activities that build responsibility and community spirit. Teachers are highly respected and receive ongoing training, with a culture of lesson study and collaborative improvement. Japan has responded to challenges such as declining birth rates and the need for greater innovation by introducing integrated studies, reducing curriculum overload, and promoting global competencies. The entrance examination system remains a source of pressure, but reforms are encouraging critical thinking, communication, and creativity. Japan's education design, structured, collaborative, and values-driven, has produced consistently high achievement, social cohesion, and adaptability, but continues to evolve to meet new economic and demographic realities (Levin, 2014).

2.3.5 Canada

Canada's education system is distinctive for its provincial autonomy, which allows each region to tailor policies to local needs and priorities. The process emphasizes inclusivity, multiculturalism, and bilingualism, particularly in provinces like Quebec, where French-language education is prominent. Indigenous education is a key area of reform, with efforts to incorporate indigenous perspectives, languages, and reconciliation initiatives. The curriculum is designed to support inquiry-based learning, critical thinking, and 21st-century skills, while extensive support services address special educational and language needs. Teacher education is rigorous, and ongoing professional development is encouraged. Canada's challenges include closing achievement gaps for indigenous and marginalized students, addressing the needs of a growing immigrant population, and ensuring equitable funding across diverse regions. Despite these, Canada's education design, characterized by strong public investment, local innovation, and a commitment to social equity, has contributed to high levels of student achievement, engagement, and societal trust in education (Levin, 2014).

2.3.6 Netherlands

The Netherlands has developed an education process that prioritizes school autonomy, parental choice, and balanced pathways between academic and vocational education. The country's voucher system enables parents to select from a wide range of public and private schools, all publicly funded and held to national standards. The curriculum encourages both academic excellence and practical skills, supporting strong transitions to either higher education or the workforce. Special education and inclusive policies ensure support for students with additional needs. Challenges include managing educational segregation, particularly between ethnic and socioeconomic groups, and ensuring equal access to high-quality schools. The Netherlands' education design is marked by a pragmatic approach that values flexibility, accountability, and innovation. Its successful integration of vocational education, high graduation rates, and sustained investment in teacher quality make the Dutch system a model for balancing freedom and regulation in education (Gillies, 2015).

2.3.7 Switzerland

Switzerland's education process is shaped by its unique dual-track system, where students can choose academic or vocational pathways after lower secondary education. The apprenticeship model, developed in close partnership with industry, provides practical, paid training alongside classroom instruction, facilitating a smooth transition into the workforce. The system is highly decentralized, with cantons responsible for curriculum and school governance, fostering local adaptation and innovation. Switzerland faces challenges in ensuring all students have equal access to both tracks, particularly those from immigrant backgrounds or lower socioeconomic groups. The education design incorporates strong career guidance, continual curriculum updates to match labor market needs, and active employer participation. Switzerland's approach yields low youth unemployment, high labor market relevance, and societal respect for vocational as well as academic achievement, illustrating the benefits of an education system closely aligned with economic realities (Levin, 2014).

2.3.8 Australia

Australia's education process is characterized by a national curriculum framework, regular standardized assessments (such as NAPLAN), and a strong emphasis on teacher quality and school autonomy. Education is compulsory until age 16 or 17, and schools are supported to develop innovative programs that meet local needs. Recent reforms have targeted equity, with focused efforts to close achievement gaps for Indigenous Australians and students in remote or disadvantaged communities. There has also been a significant investment in digital infrastructure and STEM education to prepare students for a rapidly changing world. Challenges persist in addressing disparities between urban and rural schools, supporting students with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and maintaining consistent standards across states and territories. Australia's education design supports lifelong learning, adaptability, and inclusion, and its reforms are continually shaped by public consultation and research evidence (Bromley et al., 2021).

2.3.9 Sweden

Sweden's education process is unique for its voucher-based, school choice system, allowing students and parents to select from a wide range of public and independent schools, all funded by the state. The national curriculum emphasizes

democratic values, critical thinking, student participation, and creativity. Comprehensive support systems exist for students with special needs, and teachers are encouraged to adopt inclusive, student-centered approaches. In recent years, Sweden has faced challenges with increasing school segregation, declining results in international assessments, and maintaining equal opportunities for all. The government has responded with reforms to strengthen school accountability, teacher training, and early intervention. Sweden's education design remains committed to equity, innovation, and student well-being, with continued efforts to balance choice and quality for diverse learners (Bromley et al., 2021).

2.3.10 Germany

Germany's education process is renowned for its dual system, where students after primary school are tracked into academic (Gymnasium), vocational (Realschule), or comprehensive (Gesamtschule) pathways. The vocational system, in particular, features strong collaboration between schools and industry, with apprenticeships that combine classroom learning and on-the-job training. This design is highly effective at preparing students for employment, resulting in low youth unemployment and a skilled workforce. However, the early tracking system can perpetuate social inequalities, and there have been ongoing reforms to make the pathways more flexible and accessible, including for migrant and refugee students. Germany's ongoing challenges include integrating a diverse student body and ensuring equal educational opportunities regardless of background. The education design's emphasis on practical skills, career guidance, and structured transitions continues to serve as a benchmark for linking education with economic needs (Gillies, 2015).

2.3.11 New Zealand

New Zealand's education process is grounded in values of equity, cultural responsiveness, and local autonomy. The curriculum, known as the New Zealand Curriculum, provides broad guidelines but encourages schools to design learning experiences that reflect their students' identities, cultures, and aspirations. Māori perspectives and language are integrated throughout the system as part of a commitment to biculturalism and the Treaty of Waitangi. Schools use formative assessment practices and prioritize personalized learning, with strong support for

inclusive education. Challenges remain in closing achievement gaps between Māori, Pasifika, and non-indigenous students, and in ensuring high-quality education across geographically dispersed communities. New Zealand's education design is noted for its adaptability, engagement with communities, and sustained focus on preparing learners for lifelong success in a diverse and changing society (Levin, 2014; Bromley et al., 2021).

Table 2.1 provides a comparative overview of key differences in education reforms among 11 countries: the United States, United Kingdom, China, France, India, Norway, Russia, Ireland, Israel, Brazil, and South Africa. By examining reform focus, curriculum design, assessment methods, teacher preparation, challenges, and notable successes, this table offers a lens through which to understand how diverse national systems respond to internal needs and global pressures. The range of approaches reflected in these countries' reforms underscores the complexity of educational change and the importance of context-specific solutions for improving learning outcomes and equity (Levin, 2014; Gillies, 2015).

Table (2.1) Key Differences of Education Reforms Among 11 Countries

Country	Reform Focus	Curriculum Design	Assessment Methods	Teacher Preparation	Key Challenges	Notable Successes
United States	Standards & Accountability	Decentralized, state-led	High-stakes standardized tests	Variable by state; focus on PD	Inequality, funding gaps	Innovation, higher ed leadership
United Kingdom	Centralization & Standards	National Curriculum	GCSEs, A-levels, SATs	National standards, Ofsted oversight	Regional disparities, testing load	Strong universities, reforms in SEND
China	Modernization & Equity	National, exam-focused	Gaokao, frequent testing	Emphasis on subject expertise	Rural-urban divide, exam stress	Mass literacy, global PISA gains
France	Equity & Secularism	Centralized, uniform	Baccalauréat, regular exams	Rigorous, competitive entry	Integration, adapting to diversity	Universal access, rigorous standards
India	Access & Quality	National frameworks + state	Board exams, entrance tests	Varied; recent teacher reforms	Infrastructure, teacher shortages	Expanding enrollment, tech initiatives

Norway	Inclusion & Well-being	National, holistic	Less emphasis on standardized	Highly qualified, master's required	Immigrant integration, rural access	High equity, student satisfaction
Russia	Modernization & Standards	Centralized, revised	Unified State Exam	Specialized, strong in STEM	Regional disparities, brain drain	Strong STEM, math and science olympiads
Ireland	Curriculum Reform & Inclusion	National, broadening	Leaving Cert, Junior Cert	Degree + mandatory CPD	Equity gaps, curriculum overload	Literacy gains, ICT integration
Israel	Diversity & Innovation	State, religious, Arab	Matriculation (Bagrut) exams	Rigorous, focus on diversity	Segregation, security issues	High innovation, strong tech sector
Brazil	Access & Quality	National guidelines	ENEM, national assessment	Variable, improving teacher training	Inequality, funding gaps	Expanded access, Bolsa Família impact
South Africa	Equity & Redress	National Curriculum	National Senior Certificate	Upgrading post-apartheid	Infrastructure, teacher shortages	Increased enrollment, ongoing reforms

PD: Professional Development
SEND: Special Educational Needs and Disabilities
ICT: Information and Communication Technology

* Source: Gillies (2015), Levin (2014) and Bromley et al. (2021)

The focus and design of curriculum across these countries show a clear divide between centralized and decentralized systems. For example, the United States and India operate largely decentralized structures, where states or provinces have significant autonomy to adapt or develop curricula. In contrast, countries such as China, France, and Russia maintain highly centralized, standardized curricula set at the national level, ensuring uniformity but sometimes limiting local adaptation. The United Kingdom adopts a hybrid approach with its National Curriculum and central oversight mechanisms, while Norway and Ireland have shifted towards holistic and broader curriculum models that aim to foster inclusion and student well-being. These differences highlight how governance structures and policy priorities shape the educational experiences of learners across contexts (Levin, 2014).

Assessment methods present another area of significant divergence. Countries like the United States, China, and the United Kingdom continue to rely heavily on high-stakes standardized testing as a cornerstone of accountability and student progression. These systems use assessments such as the SATs, Gaokao, and A-levels to sort and select students for further education and employment. Alternatively, Norway and Ireland are moving toward more formative, less standardized methods, recognizing the drawbacks of excessive testing such as student stress and curriculum narrowing. This shift reflects a growing international awareness of the need for balanced assessment practices that support both accountability and holistic student development (Gazizova, 2013; Bromley et al., 2021).

Teacher preparation and professional development vary widely among the countries in Table 2.1. Norway sets a high bar, requiring teachers to hold master's degrees and providing extensive ongoing development. The United Kingdom and France have established strong regulatory frameworks and inspection systems to maintain standards, while the United States and Brazil feature greater variability due to decentralized governance. India, South Africa, and Brazil face significant challenges related to teacher shortages and uneven training quality, prompting recent reforms aimed at upskilling and professionalizing the workforce. These differences emphasize that teacher quality is both a critical factor in reform success and a persistent challenge, particularly in rapidly growing or resource-constrained systems (Levin, 2014; Gillies, 2015).

The challenges and outcomes listed in the table further illustrate the diverse impacts of reform efforts. Developed countries like the United Kingdom, Ireland, China, and Russia report successes in areas such as higher education, inclusion, literacy, and STEM achievement. In contrast, emerging economies such as Brazil, India, and South Africa continue to struggle with funding gaps, infrastructure limitations, and persistent inequality, despite notable progress in expanding access and enrollment. Israel's experience with diversity and innovation, as well as the United States' reputation for educational innovation and research, reflect the importance of adapting reforms to specific national priorities and social contexts (Bromley et al., 2021).

In summary, education reforms across the globe have been shaped by historical, political, economic, and social factors. The comparative analysis reveals that there is no universal formula for success; rather, effective reform is highly

context-dependent, requiring a judicious balance between standardization and flexibility, equity and excellence, and innovation and tradition. By examining these international experiences, policymakers and educators can draw valuable lessons to inform future reform efforts, always with an eye to the unique needs and aspirations of their own societies (Levin, 2014; Gillies, 2015; Bromley et al., 2021).

2.4 Themes and Theories in Education Reform

Contemporary education reforms in countries with the highest reputations, such as Finland, Singapore, Canada, Japan, South Korea, the Netherlands, Australia, Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, and New Zealand, are shaped by themes that reflect the intersection of global imperatives and unique national identities. Equity and inclusion have become cornerstones, with policies designed to close achievement gaps for disadvantaged and minority students, and curricular adaptations to serve diverse populations. Student-centered learning and holistic development are equally prominent, encouraging not only academic achievement but also creativity, collaboration, resilience, and social-emotional growth. Another common theme is the elevation of teaching as a highly respected, research-informed profession; these systems invest heavily in teacher preparation, mentorship, and ongoing development. Moreover, the integration of digital technologies and 21st-century skills has transformed both curricula and pedagogy, preparing students for unpredictable futures. Many leading countries also embrace evidence-based reform, using robust data collection and analysis to monitor progress and refine strategies, ensuring that reforms are adaptive and sustainable in the face of rapid social and technological change (Paris, 2019).

2.4.1 Progressive Education Theory

Progressive education theory is foundational in many high-performing countries, emphasizing the importance of designing curricula and classroom experiences around the interests, needs, and lived realities of students. This theory asserts that meaningful learning takes place when students are actively engaged in inquiry, problem-solving, and real-world tasks that connect classroom learning to their communities and futures. In Finland, for example, the curriculum is flexible, allowing for interdisciplinary projects and student choice, which helps cultivate intrinsic motivation and lifelong learning skills. New Zealand’s National Curriculum

also embodies progressive ideals through its key competencies framework, fostering the development of critical thinking, self-management, and relationship-building alongside academic content. Students are encouraged to ask questions, work collaboratively, and pursue personal passions, creating a dynamic and engaging environment that supports both academic success and personal growth. These progressive principles are supported by teachers who act more as facilitators and mentors, rather than transmitters of knowledge, and by school cultures that encourage experimentation, reflection, and shared responsibility for learning outcomes (Paris, 2019; Gess-Newsome et al., 2003).

2.4.2 Critical Theory and Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

Critical theory, along with culturally responsive pedagogy, plays a powerful role in shaping reforms that challenge existing inequalities and empower diverse learners. This perspective interrogates how education can either reinforce social stratification or serve as a vehicle for social justice and transformation. In practice, countries like New Zealand have made significant strides by embedding Māori language, culture, and perspectives throughout the curriculum, thus acknowledging and redressing historical injustices and promoting biculturalism. Canada's reforms include integrating Indigenous knowledge and histories, and promoting multicultural education that reflects the lived realities of immigrant and minority students. Critical theory also underpins anti-bias initiatives and inclusive policies in Sweden and Germany, where educational strategies are designed to combat segregation and support the integration of migrant and refugee populations. These reforms are not merely about adding diverse content, but about fundamentally reshaping school cultures, power relationships, and pedagogical approaches to create environments where all students see themselves as valued participants in the learning process. Moreover, educators are encouraged to adopt a critical stance toward curriculum and policies, questioning whose knowledge is valued and how institutional practices can be reformed to promote social equity (Giroux, 1979; Gillborn, 2005).

2.4.3 Complexity Theory

Complexity theory provides a lens for understanding education reform as a non-linear, adaptive process influenced by the interplay of countless factors at different levels, schools, districts, governments, communities, and individuals. Rather

than viewing change as a simple matter of policy implementation, complexity theory acknowledges the unpredictability and emergent nature of educational systems. In Singapore, for instance, reforms are piloted on a small scale, evaluated, and iteratively refined before being scaled up, allowing for adaptation to local contexts and new insights. Switzerland's decentralized approach empowers cantons and schools to tailor reforms to their unique needs, fostering innovation while maintaining coherence through shared goals and standards. Complexity theory also explains why reforms that succeed in one context may not easily transfer to another, emphasizing the importance of local agency, feedback loops, and ongoing learning among stakeholders. This perspective encourages policymakers to create flexible frameworks and support networks, rather than rigid mandates, recognizing that sustainable reform emerges through collaborative adaptation, experimentation, and learning from both successes and setbacks (Snyder, 2013).

2.4.4 Personal Practical Theory and Teacher Agency

Personal practical theory centers on the beliefs, values, and practical wisdom that educators bring to their work, highlighting the central role of teacher agency in educational change. Teachers interpret, adapt, and sometimes resist reforms based on their own experiences, knowledge, and understanding of their students' needs. Leading countries invest heavily in fostering teacher agency through professional development, collaborative planning time, and structures such as Japan's lesson study, where teachers collectively design, observe, and refine lessons. In Finland, teacher education is research-based and emphasizes reflective practice, equipping educators to critically evaluate and adapt new policies or pedagogies. This trust in teacher professionalism ensures that reforms are not imposed as top-down directives but are co-constructed and contextualized by those closest to learners. The result is greater ownership, deeper engagement, and higher likelihood of sustained, meaningful change at the classroom level, demonstrating that reform is most effective when teachers are empowered as partners and innovators rather than mere implementers (Gess-Newsome et al., 2003).

2.4.5 Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Inclusive Education Theory

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and inclusive education theory have gained considerable traction as guiding frameworks in educational reform,

particularly in countries striving for greater equity and accessibility. UDL advocates for designing curricula, instructional methods, and assessment practices that address the variability of all learners from the outset, rather than retrofitting accommodations for those with disabilities or different backgrounds. In Sweden and the Netherlands, UDL principles are reflected in national standards and classroom practices that offer multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression, ensuring that every student can participate fully in learning activities. Inclusive education theory extends this vision, emphasizing the right of all learners, including those with disabilities, migrant backgrounds, or other additional needs, to access high-quality instruction in regular classrooms, supported by differentiated teaching, collaborative planning, and robust support services. These theories have prompted systemic reforms, from teacher training to school design, that reduce barriers and celebrate diversity as a resource for learning and growth.

2.4.6 Constructivist and Inquiry-Based Learning Theories

Constructivist and inquiry-based learning theories have become central to curriculum and pedagogy in many high-performing countries. Rooted in the belief that knowledge is actively constructed through experience, social interaction, and reflection, these approaches shift the educational focus from passive absorption of facts to active engagement with content and ideas. In Finland, Australia, and New Zealand, curricula are designed to foster inquiry, problem-solving, and creativity, with students encouraged to explore real-world issues, develop hypotheses, and work collaboratively to find solutions. Teachers serve as facilitators, guiding students through cycles of questioning, investigation, and reflection. These theories support the development of critical 21st-century skills, such as adaptability, communication, and innovation, preparing students not only for academic success but also for dynamic, complex futures in rapidly changing societies (Paris, 2019).

2.4.7 Growth Mindset and Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Theories

Growth mindset and social-emotional learning (SEL) theories are increasingly embedded in education reforms as research highlights the importance of mindset, resilience, and interpersonal skills for long-term success. Growth mindset theory, popularized by Carol Dweck, posits that abilities can be developed through effort, effective strategies, and support. Leading systems such as Singapore and Canada

integrate growth mindset principles into teacher training, classroom culture, and student assessment, encouraging learners to embrace challenges, persist through setbacks, and view failure as an opportunity for growth. SEL theories underpin reforms in Finland, Sweden, and Australia, where schools prioritize the cultivation of self-awareness, emotional regulation, empathy, and positive relationships. Policies and curricula are designed to create safe, supportive environments where students' well-being is as important as their academic achievement. These theories help foster resilient, adaptable, and socially competent individuals who are prepared to thrive in a complex, interconnected world (Paris, 2019).

2.5 Classification of Basic Education

The classification of basic education is generally guided by principles that aim to ensure comparability, inclusivity, and adaptability across different national contexts. Key principles include the recognition of distinct educational stages, typically pre-primary, primary, and lower secondary education, each with defined objectives, age ranges, and curricular emphases. These stages are classified based on factors such as duration, content, progression criteria, and the role of language of instruction. Effective classification also considers socio-economic and demographic variables to ensure that systems are equitable and responsive to diverse learner needs (Brauns et al., 2003; Owu-Ewie & Eshun, 2015). Furthermore, classifications must be flexible enough to accommodate educational innovations and reforms, while robust enough to facilitate meaningful cross-national comparisons and policy learning (Wolhuter, 1997).

Table 2.2 provides a comprehensive overview of the structure of foundational education in 16 diverse nations. It highlights distinctions in the duration and starting age of pre-primary, primary, lower secondary, and upper secondary education, as well as the statutory years of compulsory schooling. These differences are shaped by each country's historical, cultural, socioeconomic, and policy contexts. The table demonstrates that, while all countries aim to provide children with the essential knowledge and skills for life and further learning, their approaches to organizing these formative years are far from uniform.

Table (2.2) Classification of Basic Education of Different Countries

Country	Pre-primary/ Kindergarten	Primary/Elementary School	Lower Secondary/Junior High	Upper Secondary/Senior High	Compulsory Education (years)
Finland	1 year (age 6)	6 years (ages 7–12)	3 years (ages 13–15)	3 years (ages 16–18)	9 (ages 7–16)
Singapore	2 years (ages 5–6)	6 years (ages 7–12)	4 years (ages 13–16)	2–3 years (ages 17–18/19)	10 (ages 6–16)
South Korea	1 year (age 6, optional)	6 years (ages 7–12)	3 years (ages 13–15)	3 years (ages 16–18)	9 (ages 6–15)
Japan	1–2 years (ages 4–5, optional)	6 years (ages 6–12)	3 years (ages 12–15)	3 years (ages 15–18)	9 (ages 6–15)
Canada	1–2 years (ages 4–5, varies)	6 years (ages 6–11/12)	2–3 years (ages 12–14/15)	3–4 years (ages 15–18)	10–12 (varies by province)
Netherlands	2 years (ages 4–5, optional)	8 years (ages 6–13)	1–3 years (ages 12–15/16)	2–4 years (ages 16–18/19, track-based)	13 (ages 5–18, includes pre-primary)
Switzerland	1–2 years (age 4–5, varies)	6 years (ages 6–12)	3 years (ages 12–15)	3–4 years (ages 15–18/19)	11 (ages 4–15, varies by canton)
Australia	1 year (age 5, called Prep)	6–7 years (ages 6–12)	3–4 years (ages 12–16)	2 years (ages 16–18)	10 (varies by state)
Sweden	1 year (age 6, compulsory)	6 years (ages 7–12)	3 years (ages 13–15)	3 years (ages 16–18)	10 (ages 6–15)
Germany	1 year (age 6)	4 years (ages 6–10)	6 years (ages 10–16, tracked)	2–3 years (ages 16–18/19)	9–10 (varies by state)
New Zealand	1–2 years (ages 4–5, optional)	6 years (ages 5–10/11)	2 years (ages 11–13)	5 years (ages 13–18, secondary school)	10 (ages 6–16)
United Kingdom	1–2 years (ages 3–5,Nursery/Reception, part-compulsory)	6 years (ages 5–11)	5 years (ages 11–16, Secondary school)	2 years (ages 16–18, Sixth Form/College)	11 (ages 5–16)
United States	1–2 years (ages 4–5, PreK/K)	5–6 years (ages 5–11)	3 years (ages 11–14, Middle School/Jr. High)	4 years (ages 14–18, High School)	10–12 (varies by state, often 6–16/18)
France	3 years (ages 3–6, École maternelle)	5 years (ages 6–11, École élémentaire)	4 years (ages 11–15, Collège)	3 years (ages 15–18, Lycée)	10 (ages 6–16)

India	2 years (ages 4–5, Pre-primary)	5 years (ages 6–10, Primary)	3 years (ages 11–13, Upper Primary)	4 years (ages 14–18, Secondary & Sr. Secondary)	8 (ages 6–14)
Brazil	1–2 years (ages 4–5, Educação Infantil)	5 years (ages 6–10, Ensino Fundamental I)	4 years (ages 11–14, Ensino Fundamental II)	3 years (ages 15–17, Ensino Médio)	9 (ages 6–14)

* Source: Zhang et al. (2020)

Notes:

Age ranges and durations may vary by region within each country.

Some countries have optional or non-compulsory pre-primary programs.

"Compulsory education" refers to the minimum years and ages where school attendance is legally required.

Lower and upper secondary education may be combined or divided differently depending on the country's structure.

A significant observation from the table is the variation in the age of entry and length of compulsory education. Finland and Sweden, for instance, begin compulsory schooling at a relatively late age (7 and 6, respectively), reflecting an educational philosophy that values extended early childhood development and play-based learning before formal academics. In contrast, France and the United Kingdom initiate formal education as early as age 3 or 5, often through part-compulsory or nursery programs, indicating a stronger emphasis on early academic engagement and socialization. The Netherlands stands out for having the longest period of compulsory education (13 years), which can foster both higher academic achievement and greater equity by keeping students in school longer. Meanwhile, India and Brazil have some of the shortest compulsory periods, reflecting economic pressures and challenges with access and retention, especially in rural or under-resourced regions (Brauns, Scherer, & Steinmann, 2003; Mereku, 2003).

The organization of primary and secondary education stages reveals additional diversity. In countries such as Japan, South Korea, and Finland, there is a clear, linear progression: six years of primary education followed by three years each of lower and upper secondary phases. This model supports a gradual increase in academic complexity and specialization and is often associated with strong student outcomes. In contrast, the United States and Canada display more flexible or regionally varied transitions, with primary and secondary stages sometimes overlapping or differing in length depending on the state or province. The Netherlands and Germany are notable for their early tracking systems, where students are placed into different academic or

vocational pathways as early as age 10 or 12, impacting students' educational and career opportunities from a young age (Brauns, Scherer, & Steinmann, 2003; Wolhuter, 1997).

Pre-primary education, or kindergarten, is another area where meaningful contrasts emerge. France and the United Kingdom offer multiple years of pre-primary education that are largely compulsory, aiming to promote cognitive and social skills before children enter primary school. This early start is associated with increased school readiness, particularly for children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Finland, Sweden, and New Zealand also provide robust early childhood education frameworks, though participation may be voluntary. Meanwhile, countries such as Japan, South Korea, and Brazil offer optional pre-primary or kindergarten education, with significant variations in access and quality depending on region and socioeconomic context (Wolhuter, 1997; Owu-Ewie & Eshun, 2015).

Upper secondary education and the nature of transition points between stages further distinguish the systems outlined in the table. Many European countries, including the Netherlands, Germany, and Switzerland, feature track-based upper secondary education, guiding students into academic, technical, or vocational streams. This approach is closely linked to labor market needs and requires robust career counseling to prevent premature limitation of students' options. By contrast, countries like Finland, Canada, and Australia tend to offer more comprehensive upper secondary schooling, with broader curriculum choices and delayed specialization. Assessment practices at these transition points also vary: nations such as South Korea, Japan, and France employ high-stakes entrance exams, whereas Finland and New Zealand put greater emphasis on formative assessment and flexible advancement (Zhang et al., 2020). While the ultimate goal is to ensure that young people acquire foundational competencies, the pathways, timing, and institutional arrangements are deeply influenced by local philosophies, policy priorities, and social realities. Policymakers and educators can draw valuable lessons from this international variety: some may seek to extend the duration of compulsory education and improve access. In contrast, others may aim to enhance flexibility and reduce early tracking. This demonstrates there is no single model for basic education; effective systems are those responsive to the evolving needs of their children, communities, and societies (Brauns, Scherer, & Steinmann, 2003; Wolhuter, 1997).

2.6 Challenges in Curriculum Implementation

The implementation of curriculum stands as a pivotal, yet highly complex and often contested, phase of educational reform. While curriculum development focuses on designing the knowledge, skills, and values students should acquire, effective implementation demands the translation of these frameworks into authentic, relevant classroom practices. Even with thorough planning and well-intentioned policies, the journey from curriculum design to classroom reality is fraught with obstacles that can undermine both quality and equity. These challenges are not only technical or administrative but are deeply embedded in the fabric of schools, communities, and broader educational systems.

One major challenge is the prevalence of adaptive change requirements, which go far beyond simply learning new content or techniques. Teachers and school leaders are often asked to fundamentally shift their beliefs, routines, and professional identities to align with new pedagogical approaches. Resistance can arise when reforms conflict with ingrained practices, local cultures, or existing power structures within schools. Teachers may also experience initiative fatigue due to the rapid pace of change, leading to surface-level compliance rather than genuine engagement. Furthermore, in some contexts, there is inadequate time or support for teachers to experiment, reflect, and integrate new methods, which can result in inconsistent implementation and a persistent gap between intended and enacted curricula (Pak et al., 2020).

Administrative and institutional barriers further complicate curriculum implementation. Effective reform requires strong leadership, clear communication, and a culture of collaboration. In reality, many organizations struggle with fragmented management, lack of alignment between policy and practice, and insufficient investment in monitoring and support systems. Teacher turnover and shortages disrupt continuity, while bureaucratic inertia can slow or dilute reform efforts. In higher education, faculty may be excluded from curriculum planning or lack incentives for innovation, leading to disconnects between curriculum designers and implementers. Additionally, rigid accountability mechanisms and excessive administrative demands can stifle creativity and discourage risk-taking among educators (Dehghani & Pakmehr, 2011).

Resource disparities present another significant challenge, especially in rural, remote, or underfunded schools. Teachers in these contexts may lack access to current

textbooks, teaching aids, laboratory equipment, and technology, making it difficult to deliver new curricula as intended. Professional development opportunities are often scarce or poorly matched to local needs. Socioeconomic disadvantages, such as poverty, unstable home environments, malnutrition, and community instability, can further impede student engagement and learning. Large class sizes and multi-grade classrooms add logistical complexity, requiring differentiated instructional strategies that not all teachers are prepared for. Language barriers and lack of culturally responsive materials can also hinder curriculum relevance and inclusivity, particularly in diverse or multilingual communities (Mokhele, 2012).

Other notable challenges include policy instability and political interference, which can disrupt reform continuity and undermine stakeholder confidence. Frequent policy shifts or abrupt changes in leadership priorities can lead to confusion, lack of ownership, and a sense of reform fatigue among educators. External pressures from parents, examination bodies, or community groups may conflict with curricular goals, resulting in competing expectations and priorities. Moreover, the rise of digital learning brings challenges related to technology access, teacher digital competence, cybersecurity, and the pedagogical integration of online resources. Finally, a lack of robust mechanisms for ongoing feedback, research, and evaluation can mean that curriculum problems go unaddressed, lessons are not learned, and ineffective practices persist. Addressing these multifaceted and evolving challenges requires comprehensive strategies. Continuous, context-sensitive professional development, distributed and empathetic leadership, stakeholder engagement, equity-driven resource allocation, and the integration of robust feedback and evaluation mechanisms are all critical for bridging the gap between curriculum design and classroom practice. Ultimately, recognizing the human, organizational, and systemic dimensions of curriculum implementation is essential for turning ambitious educational reforms into meaningful and lasting improvements in teaching and learning (Pak et al., 2020; Dehghani & Pakmehr, 2011; Mokhele, 2012).

2.7 Review on Previous Studies

In 2021, Kyaw Moe Tun published research on "Factors Influencing Teacher Educators' Research Engagement in the Reform Process of Teacher Education Institutions in Myanmar" in Sage Open. The study included teacher education institutions across Myanmar, focusing on teacher educators as the study population.

The objective was to identify what motivates or hinders these educators in engaging with research as part of the reform process. With a sample size of 210 teacher educators, the study found that strong institutional support, access to professional networks, and personal enthusiasm for research were crucial for sustained engagement. Additionally, involvement in collaborative research projects led to greater innovation and more effective integration of new content into teacher training. However, limited time, heavy teaching loads, and a lack of research funding were significant obstacles. A further interesting finding was that institutions fostering a culture of inquiry and shared leadership saw higher research productivity. The cross-sectional design, however, limited the ability to track changes over time or capture long-term impacts (Kyaw Moe Tun, 2021).

In 2021, Thet Mon Myat investigated the factors influencing the implementation of the new play-based kindergarten curriculum in Myanmar, focusing on teachers and administrators in Yangon. The objective was to understand barriers and facilitators in the rollout of play-based learning. With a sample of 60 participants, the study found that teachers who received targeted training and mentorship were more confident and creative in using play-based methods. However, a major challenge was resistance from some parents who equated play with a lack of academic rigor, and from teachers who were accustomed to traditional, teacher-led instruction. Despite these challenges, classrooms that successfully adopted the play-based approach reported improvements in student engagement, language development, and social skills. The study also highlighted the need for more public awareness campaigns and stronger administrative support. The regional focus, however, limited the generalizability of the results to other parts of Myanmar (Thet Mon Myat, 2021).

In 2022, Htet Htet Aung conducted "A Case Study of Quality Education in Myanmar: Education Leaders' Perspectives," focusing on selected basic education schools and targeting principals and administrators. The study aimed to gain insights into how education leaders perceive quality education amid ongoing reforms. With 15 education leaders participating, the study revealed that strong teacher-student relationships, community engagement, and the availability of extracurricular opportunities were viewed as essential indicators of quality. Leaders emphasized the importance of continuous teacher development and school-based decision-making, pointing out that schools with a high degree of autonomy tended to be more innovative and responsive to student needs. A noteworthy finding was the role of

parental involvement in driving school improvement initiatives. Nevertheless, the limited sample size and purposive selection of participants meant that findings might not be representative of all education contexts across Myanmar (Htet Htet Aung, 2022).

In 2022, John Paul Smith completed a mixed-methods doctoral dissertation titled "Evaluating the Perceptions of Teacher Educators in Myanmar of Training that They Have Received, which was Funded by International Development Agencies: A Postcolonial Analysis" at Dublin City University. The study focused on 120 teacher educators who had participated in internationally funded training programs across Myanmar. The objective was to evaluate both the effectiveness and the cultural relevance of these externally-supported professional development initiatives. Key findings indicated that while participants appreciated the exposure to new pedagogical strategies and global perspectives, many felt that the training often failed to align with local classroom realities or cultural values. Some educators reported increased confidence in using student-centered approaches, but others felt the externally driven reforms were sometimes imposed without enough local consultation. The study also surfaced issues of power dynamics and dependency on external funding. The main limitation was the reliance on volunteer participants, which may have introduced self-selection bias (John Paul Smith, 2022).

In 2024, Han Su Yin completed a doctoral dissertation titled "A Study of Teachers' Perception on Lower Secondary Education Curriculum Reform" focused on South Okkalapa, Yangon Division. Targeting lower secondary teachers, the study aimed to explore their perceptions, attitudes, and experiences regarding the new curriculum reform at this educational level. The sample included 80 teachers, providing a localized but detailed perspective. Key findings showed that while many teachers agreed with the reform's goals of promoting critical thinking and interactive learning, they felt ill-equipped due to insufficient pre-implementation training and limited ongoing support. Teachers highlighted the lack of teaching materials and large class sizes as significant barriers, and many expressed anxiety about adapting to new student-centered methods. On a positive note, teachers who participated in professional learning communities reported feeling more confident and better able to implement reform strategies. The study's primary limitation was its focus on a single township, restricting the breadth of its applicability (Han Su Yin, 2024).

In 2025, Latt Wai Yan and Wei Jun Li conducted a study titled "How Teacher Efficacy and Receptivity Affect the Perceived Outcomes of Curriculum Reform in Myanmar Basic Education" published in the European Journal of Education. This research was based in Myanmar and targeted basic education teachers from a variety of regions as the study population. The main objective was to investigate the extent to which teachers' sense of self-efficacy and their openness to new initiatives influenced how they perceived the results of ongoing curriculum reforms. The sample size encompassed 450 teachers, providing a substantial cross-section of experiences. Key findings revealed that teachers with higher self-efficacy and greater willingness to embrace change were not only more positive about the reforms but also demonstrated more innovative classroom practices and a greater sense of professional satisfaction. Interestingly, the study found that peer collaboration and supportive leadership further amplified these positive effects, suggesting that school culture can significantly mediate reform outcomes. However, the study's reliance on self-reported measures could introduce bias, and the cross-sectional design limited insights into changes over time (Latt Wai Yan & Wei Jun Li, 2025).

CHAPTER III
OVERVIEW OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN MYANMAR

3.1 History of Basic Education in Myanmar

The origins of basic education in Myanmar are deeply rooted in the monastic traditions that flourished long before the advent of British colonialism. For centuries, Buddhist monasteries, or pariyatti kyaung, served not only as centers of spiritual life but also as the primary educational institutions for the Burmese people. Almost every village was anchored by a monastery, and these were open to all children, though boys were the primary attendees. Children learned to read and write using palm-leaf manuscripts, practicing calligraphy and reciting Buddhist scriptures. Monks, who were the teachers, instilled moral conduct, social duties, and a respect for elders and nature, emphasizing karma and compassion. The curriculum was informal but comprehensive for its time, and students progressed at their own pace. Importantly, education was seen as a form of merit-making, so communities actively supported their monasteries with food, labor, and donations. This communal approach made Myanmar one of the most literate societies in Southeast Asia in the pre-colonial era, and those who excelled could even become novices or monks, giving rise to a scholarly class respected throughout the region (Le & Koji, 2022).

A profound shift began after 1852 when Lower Burma came under British control, followed by Upper Burma in 1885. The British colonial government brought Western pedagogical models, establishing the first government high school in Yangon in 1866. For the first time, English was formalized as the language of instruction, and subjects such as English literature, mathematics, geography, and history were systematically taught. Latin, considered essential for higher learning in the West, was also introduced in select schools, marking a dramatic change in the educational landscape. By 1890, the curriculum in secondary schools featured English, Burmese, mathematics, history, geography, Latin, and elementary science. Science, previously taught only as nature study or practical knowledge, has now become a formal subject. Missionary schools, meanwhile, played a pivotal role in educating girls, who until

then had limited access to formal learning—by teaching them not only religious studies but also sewing, hygiene, and basic arithmetic. Despite these advances, Western-style education was largely limited to urban populations and the children of civil servants and merchants, furthering a divide between city and village as well as between the privileged and the rural poor (Le & Koji, 2022).

As the twentieth century dawned, the British expanded the reach and depth of the curriculum. By 1921, students were studying a broader range of topics: Burmese, English, mathematics, history, geography, general science, and nature study. There was a growing recognition that education needed to prepare students not just for clerical work or government service, but for life in a changing world. Practical subjects such as hygiene and elementary agriculture were introduced by 1935, reflecting the importance of health and self-sufficiency in a largely agrarian society. Urban schools continued to expand their science offerings, while rural schools remained focused on literacy, arithmetic, and religious values. The formalization of the education structure into primary, middle, and high school reflected the British influence, as did the introduction of standardized examinations for advancement. Interestingly, students who excelled in these exams could earn scholarships to study in India or the United Kingdom, and a small but influential class of Burmese intellectuals began to form, sowing seeds for future political and social change (Le & Koji, 2022).

After Myanmar's independence in 1948, education reform became a national priority for the new government. The Education Act of 1952 provided a clear structure: five years of primary, four years of middle, and two years of high school. The curriculum was designed not only to foster intellectual development but also to build national identity and civic responsibility. Burmese language, Myanmar history, and geography were placed at the heart of the curriculum, while English, mathematics, science, and social studies ensured that students had a well-rounded education. Moral and civic instruction continued to be vital, with students learning about respect, honesty, and national heroes. Government policy also called for the construction of thousands of new schools across the country and the training of a new generation of teachers. Notably, education was free at the primary level and heavily subsidized at higher levels, making Myanmar one of the first countries in the region to commit to universal access to education. In this period, school uniforms, a point of

pride for many families, became standard, and school ceremonies began to include flag-raising and patriotic songs (Le & Koji, 2022).

The focus on science education intensified throughout the 1950s and 1960s as global developments highlighted the importance of scientific literacy. General science was required at the primary and lower secondary levels, and biology, chemistry, and physics were introduced as separate subjects at the high school level. There was also a growing emphasis on practical and vocational subjects: practical arts, home science for girls, and agriculture for boys. Students learned not only how to conduct experiments but also how to apply basic scientific principles to everyday life, such as crop rotation, water purification, and simple mechanics. This practical approach was considered essential for developing a workforce equipped to contribute to the nation's economic development. The government launched literacy campaigns and offered adult education classes, aiming to reach the many adults who had missed schooling during the turbulent years of war and political transition. These efforts were supported by public radio broadcasts and mobile teaching units that traveled into remote areas, embodying a spirit of innovation and inclusion (Le & Koji, 2022).

The curriculum underwent another major revision in 1965, reflecting changing national priorities and a desire to foster self-reliance. The core subjects included Myanmar, English, mathematics, science, social studies, geography, history, and a range of practical arts. These practical arts subjects, such as carpentry, needlework, cooking, and agriculture, were not only hands-on, but also closely tied to the economic realities of Myanmar's largely rural society. For example, students learned how to graft fruit trees, raise poultry, or repair basic tools. Science remained compulsory at every level, and laboratory work became a more regular feature of secondary school life, with students performing experiments in physics and chemistry. The curriculum was also updated to reflect advancements in scientific knowledge, such as the structure of atoms, the basics of electricity, and the principles of ecology. Textbooks and teaching materials were revised, and thousands of teachers participated in workshops to master the latest pedagogical techniques (Le & Koji, 2022).

The 1970s and 1980s saw an expansion of specialized education, especially in urban centers. Science high schools were established in major cities, offering advanced courses in physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics. These schools featured dedicated science labs, and students were encouraged to participate in science fairs and competitions. The curriculum in regular high schools also

broadened, with students now studying up to twelve subjects, including economics, civics, geography, and history. English, which had been previously reduced in emphasis, was reintroduced as a compulsory subject, and students began to study English literature, composition, and conversation in addition to grammar. School life became more structured, with regular assessments, extracurricular clubs, and community service requirements. Annual school sports days and cultural festivals became highlights of the calendar, reflecting the broader educational goal of developing well-rounded citizens (Le & Koji, 2022).

The 1990s and early 2000s were marked by efforts to modernize and internationalize Myanmar's education system. The basic structure, five years of primary, four of lower secondary, and two of upper secondary, remained in place, but the curriculum evolved to include new subjects and teaching approaches. Science and technology education became a national priority, with the introduction of computer studies as an elective in some urban schools. The weekly hours allocated to mathematics and science increased, and special science kits were distributed to schools to facilitate hands-on experimentation. Environmental science became increasingly important, reflecting global concerns about conservation and sustainability. Schools began organizing Green Days and environmental awareness campaigns, and students learned about recycling, biodiversity, and climate change. Teacher training programs were revised to include modern, student-centered teaching approaches, and international development agencies partnered with the Ministry of Education to pilot innovative curriculum materials and teacher guides (Le & Koji, 2022).

By the late 2000s, the curriculum was both broad and deep. High school students typically took Myanmar, English, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, geography, and history, with set hours for each subject per week. Computer science and environmental studies were available as electives in more schools, and in some cases, international organizations provided additional learning materials, such as math and science workbooks in both English and Myanmar. The curriculum reforms also emphasized the development of critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving skills, moving beyond rote memorization. Science fairs and technology competitions became annual events, and some schools even had science clubs that built simple robots or developed community improvement projects, such as water filtration systems. The growing variety of subject offerings and the increasing sophistication of

school science facilities in this period demonstrated a clear commitment to modern standards (Le & Koji, 2022).

In addition to academic learning, schools played a key social role. They hosted festivals, sports tournaments, and public health campaigns. Students were encouraged to participate in music and dance performances that celebrated the diversity of Myanmar's ethnic cultures. Health education, including hygiene and nutrition, became more prominent, particularly in primary schools. In urban areas, parent-teacher associations organized fundraising events for new classrooms and libraries, and some schools established links with international schools abroad for pen pal exchanges and collaborative science projects (Le & Koji, 2022).

Throughout this entire history, Myanmar's basic education system has demonstrated a remarkable capacity for adaptation and resilience. From the communal spirit of the monastic schools, focused on moral and religious instruction, to the wide-ranging and modern curriculum of today, the nation's schools have continually adjusted to meet the needs of society and the changing world. The number and variety of subjects have grown dramatically, from a handful of core topics in the past to a dozen or more in upper secondary grades, including advanced sciences, technology, arts, and social studies (Le & Koji, 2022).

Table 3.1 summarizes a clear, chronological overview of the evolution of basic education in Myanmar, highlighting major shifts in educational structure, core curriculum, and significant reforms from pre-colonial times to the present. In the pre-colonial period before 1852, education was centered around monastic (Pariyatti) schools, which focused on Myanmar literacy, arithmetic, Buddhist scriptures, and moral conduct, with strong community support and an emphasis on Buddhist values. The British colonial era (1852–1948) introduced a dual system: while monastic education persisted in villages, Western-style schools in urban areas offered subjects like English, mathematics, geography, and science, with new opportunities for girls and urban students, but also deepening urban-rural divides. After independence in 1948, a unified system was established with a 5+4+2 structure (five years primary, four years middle, two years high school), and the curriculum expanded to include Myanmar history, geography, and science, reflecting nation-building priorities. The 1950s and 1960s saw further expansion with adult education, a focus on general and practical sciences, and innovative outreach like literacy campaigns and radio classes. From 1965 onward, curriculum reforms placed greater emphasis on hands-on skills,

practical arts, and science, supported by updated textbooks and teacher training. In the 1970s and 1980s, specialized science high schools emerged, and the curriculum included advanced science and social studies, as well as extracurricular activities. The 1990s and 2000s brought further modernization with the addition of computer studies, environmental education, increased science hours, and a shift toward student-centered learning. Most recently, the curriculum has been modernized to stress critical thinking, creativity, problem-solving, and technology, with students participating in science clubs, competitions, and international exchanges. The table also notes the enduring importance of practical arts, adult literacy, public health, and cultural activities throughout Myanmar's educational history.

Table (3.1) History of Basic Education Development in Myanmar

Period / Years	Educational Structure	Main Subjects / Curriculum	Notable Features & Reforms
Pre-Colonial (pre-1852)	Monastic (Pariyatti) schools in villages	Reading, writing (Myanmar), arithmetic, Buddhist scriptures, moral conduct	Community-supported, open to most children, emphasis on merit-making and Buddhist values
British Colonial (1852–1948)	Dual: Monastic (rural) & Western (urban); formal high schools by 1866	English, Burmese, math, geography, history, Latin, elementary science (1890); hygiene, agriculture, nature study (by 1935)	Introduction of Western subjects and exams, missionary schools for girls, urban-rural divide, scholarships abroad
Early Independence (1948–1960s)	5 years primary, 4 years middle, 2 years high school	Burmese, English, math, science, Myanmar history, geography, social studies, moral/civic instruction	Education Act of 1952, free/subsidized education, school expansion, school uniforms, flag ceremonies
1950s–1960s	Expanded primary, middle, high; adult education	General science (primary/lower secondary), biology, chemistry, physics (high	Literacy campaigns, mobile teaching units, radio classes, practical/vocational

		school), practical arts (home science, agriculture)	focus
Curriculum Reforms (1965 onward)	5+4+2 system; practical arts	Myanmar, English, math, science, social studies, geography, history, carpentry, needlework, agriculture	Emphasis on hands-on skills, regular lab work, updated textbooks, teacher workshops
1970s–1980s	Regular & Science High Schools	Physics, chemistry, biology, math, economics, civics, geography, English (compulsory), history	Establishment of science high schools, science labs, fairs/competitions, extracurricular activities
1990s–2000s	5 years primary, 4 lower secondary, 2 upper secondary	Myanmar, English, math, physics, chemistry, biology, geography, history, economics, computer studies (elective), environmental studies	Increase in math/science hours, science kits, Green Days, international partnerships, student-centered teaching
Late 2000s–Present	Same structure; modernized curriculum	Myanmar, English, math, physics, chemistry, biology, geography, history, computer science, environmental studies (elective)	Focus on critical thinking, creativity, problem-solving, science clubs, technology competitions, international exchanges

***** Source**:** Le & Koji, (2022)

Notes:

The educational structure "5+4+2" refers to 5 years primary, 4 years lower secondary, 2 years upper secondary.

Practical arts included home science (for girls), agriculture (for boys), carpentry, needlework, and related skills.

Additional reforms and enrichment activities included adult literacy campaigns, public health education, environmental awareness days, and cultural/sports festivals.

3.2 Basic Educational Curriculum Reform in Myanmar

Myanmar's basic education system has undergone a series of significant reforms aimed at improving educational quality, accessibility, and alignment with global standards. Historically shaped by social, economic, and political factors, the structure and content of basic education in Myanmar have evolved in response to changing national priorities and international trends. From the traditional 5-3-2 system to the more recent 5-4-2 model and the current adoption of the K12 framework, each reform reflects efforts to address persistent challenges, such as resource limitations, disparities in access, and the need for greater readiness for higher education and the workforce. This section provides an overview of the major curriculum reforms in Myanmar's basic education, examines the rationale and features of each system, and highlights the broader policy context driving these changes.

3.2.1 5-3-2 System in Myanmar's Basic Education

The 5-3-2 system historically served as the foundational structure for Myanmar's basic education before the recent adoption of the 5-4-2 model. Under this arrangement, basic education was divided into five years of primary education (Grades 1–5), three years of lower secondary or middle school (Grades 6–8), and two years of upper secondary or high school (Grades 9–10). This configuration shaped the educational journeys of several generations of Myanmar's youth and was closely tied to the country's broader policy context, resource availability, and developmental priorities (Tanaka & Khine, 2021).

In the 5-3-2 model, the primary stage focused on foundational learning, literacy, numeracy, basic science, and moral education, aiming to equip students with essential skills and values for further study and social participation. Upon successful completion of Grade 5, students transitioned to lower secondary school, where the curriculum became more subject-specific, introducing additional disciplines such as advanced mathematics, science, geography, and history. This stage was intended to deepen students' academic knowledge and begin the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills. The upper secondary phase, comprising only two years, was designed to prepare students for the Basic Education High School Examination, a gateway to higher education and professional training (Hayden & Martin, 2013).

One of the primary rationales for the 5-3-2 system was to provide a basic and relatively rapid pathway through formal education, which was particularly important in the context of Myanmar's historical political upheavals, economic constraints, and rural-urban disparities. Shortening the lower and upper secondary cycles enabled more students, especially those from rural or disadvantaged backgrounds, to complete their basic education before entering the workforce or assuming family responsibilities. However, this approach also presented notable challenges. The compressed lower and upper secondary phases limited opportunities for consolidation of academic skills, personal development, and exploration of career interests. Many educators and policymakers argued that students were not adequately prepared for the demands of higher education or the evolving needs of a modern, knowledge-based economy (Tanaka & Khine, 2021).

The limitations of the 5-3-2 system became increasingly apparent as Myanmar's society and economy began to open up and integrate with regional and global networks. International comparisons revealed that Myanmar students had less time in secondary education than their peers in neighboring ASEAN countries, creating difficulties for cross-border recognition of qualifications and student mobility. The short duration of middle and high school also placed significant pressure on students and teachers to master a broad curriculum in a limited timeframe, often encouraging rote learning over deeper understanding or practical application. Additionally, the system struggled to adequately support students with different learning needs or those requiring more time to progress through each stage (Tanaka & Khine, 2021; Hayden & Martin, 2013).

In response to these challenges, education reformers, policymakers, and development partners began advocating for a restructuring of the basic education system. Their recommendations were informed by research on child and adolescent development, international best practices, and the need to harmonize with global education standards. This led to the gradual phasing out of the 5-3-2 system in favor of the 5-4-2 model, which aimed to provide a more developmentally appropriate and internationally compatible pathway for Myanmar's students. Nevertheless, the 5-3-2 system remains a significant chapter in the nation's educational history, illustrating both the resourcefulness and the constraints faced by previous generations in striving for educational access and progress (Tanaka & Khine, 2021; Hayden & Martin, 2013).

3.2.2 5-4-2 System in Myanmar's Basic Education

The 5-4-2 system represents a significant structural reform in Myanmar's basic education landscape, reflecting both an ambition to modernize and a need to address the nation's unique educational challenges. This model divides basic education into three distinct phases: five years of primary education, four years of lower secondary (middle school), and two years of upper secondary (high school), corresponding to Grades 1–5, 6–9, and 10–11, respectively. This system was adopted in recent years as part of a broader suite of reforms designed to improve educational quality, accessibility, and alignment with international benchmarks, particularly those of ASEAN member countries and other neighbors in Southeast Asia. The 5-4-2 structure replaced the previous 5-3-2 arrangement, which had been widely criticized for lacking adequate preparation time for students before tertiary education or vocational training (Tanaka & Khine, 2021).

The rationale behind the 5-4-2 system is multifaceted. At the primary level, the curriculum aims to lay a solid foundation in literacy, numeracy, basic sciences, and social skills, with an increasing focus on interactive and student-centered pedagogy. This phase is crucial for supporting early cognitive development and establishing learning habits that can help reduce dropout rates later on. The lower secondary stage, or middle school, expands the academic scope to include more advanced mathematics, sciences, social studies, languages, and practical subjects, allowing for a smooth transition into more specialized fields. The extended four-year duration at this level offers students additional time to consolidate knowledge, develop critical thinking, and explore interests before making high-stakes choices about their educational or vocational futures. The upper secondary phase, covering Grades 10 and 11, is oriented toward preparing students for the Basic Education High School Examination. This examination is the gateway to higher education or technical and vocational education and training (TVET), and its outcomes are increasingly recognized both nationally and regionally (Hayden & Martin, 2013).

Implementing the 5-4-2 system has necessitated comprehensive changes in curriculum design, teacher preparation, assessment methods, and school infrastructure. The Ministry of Education has worked to revise curricula to be more relevant to contemporary realities and future workforce needs, integrating 21st-century skills such as digital literacy, problem-solving, and communication alongside core academic content. Teacher training programs have been expanded to include

modern instructional strategies and continuous professional development, recognizing that the success of any structural reform hinges on teacher quality. In addition, significant efforts have been directed toward improving school facilities, especially in rural and underserved areas, to accommodate the additional years of lower secondary schooling. The government and international partners have also collaborated on developing new textbooks and learning materials that align with the updated curriculum and pedagogical approaches (Tanaka & Khine, 2021).

Despite these positive developments, several challenges remain in the effective implementation of the 5-4-2 system. One persistent issue is the uneven distribution of resources and qualified teachers, particularly in remote and ethnic minority regions. Socioeconomic disparities can impact student attendance, retention, and achievement, and political instability has sometimes disrupted the continuity of reform initiatives. Another challenge lies in changing mindsets among educators and communities, as the shift to more student-centered and competency-based learning represents a significant departure from traditional rote methods. Additionally, the assessment and examination system is still evolving, with ongoing debates about how to best measure student learning and readiness for further education or employment. These challenges highlight the need for sustained policy commitment, community engagement, and adaptive strategies to ensure that the system fulfills its transformative potential (Hayden & Martin, 2013).

Looking forward, the 5-4-2 system has the potential to serve as a cornerstone for broad educational transformation in Myanmar. By aligning with international structures and emphasizing a more gradual, developmentally appropriate progression through the stages of schooling, the system is better positioned to meet the diverse needs of Myanmar's youth. It also lays the groundwork for expanding lifelong learning opportunities, supporting national development goals, and fostering greater social cohesion. Continued investment in teacher education, infrastructure, curriculum innovation, and inclusive policy implementation will be essential to realizing the promise of the 5-4-2 framework. Success will depend on the collective efforts of government, educators, families, and communities, all working together to ensure that every child can access and complete a high-quality cycle of basic education prepared for the challenges and opportunities of the future (Tanaka & Khine, 2021; Hayden & Martin, 2013).

3.2.3 K12 System in Myanmar's Basic Education

The introduction of the K12 system marks a significant milestone in the reform of Myanmar's basic education, aligning the country with international standards and regional neighbors in Southeast Asia. The K12 model extends the duration of basic education from the previous 10-year system to 12 years, comprising one year of kindergarten, five years of primary education, four years of lower secondary (middle school), and two years of upper secondary (high school). This shift was designed to address long-standing concerns about the adequacy of academic preparation, student readiness for higher education and employment, and comparability of Myanmar's qualifications on the global stage (Magallanes et al., 2021).

Under the K12 structure, children typically begin kindergarten at age five, enter primary school at age six, and complete basic education at age 18. The curriculum reform accompanying the new structure emphasizes a more holistic and student-centered approach, integrating life skills, critical thinking, and values education alongside core subjects such as mathematics, sciences, languages, and social studies. Social studies in particular has been reformed to promote civic responsibility, cultural awareness, and national identity, reflecting the country's commitment to fostering well-rounded citizens for a rapidly changing society (Htet, 2020).

Implementation of the K12 system has entailed substantial changes in curriculum design, teacher training, and assessment methods. New textbooks and learning materials have been introduced to support the revised curriculum, and ongoing professional development opportunities are provided for teachers to adapt to new pedagogies and content. The assessment framework has shifted toward formative and competency-based evaluations, aiming to move away from rote memorization and encourage deeper understanding and application of knowledge. School infrastructure has also been upgraded in many areas, with increased investments in classroom facilities, laboratories, and digital resources to support modern teaching and learning practices (Stenning, 2022).

Despite these positive strides, the transition to the K12 system has encountered challenges, including disparities in resource allocation, teacher shortages in rural and remote areas, and the need for greater stakeholder engagement. Some educators and parents have expressed concerns about increased academic pressure, while others

highlight gaps in teacher preparedness and the uneven pace of reform implementation across regions. The COVID-19 pandemic further disrupted the rollout, compounding issues related to access, equity, and continuity of learning. Nevertheless, ongoing policy adjustments and international cooperation have played important roles in addressing these issues and driving the reform process forward (Magallanes et al., 2021; Stenning, 2022).

Overall, the adoption of the K12 system in Myanmar represents a bold step toward modernizing the country's basic education sector and ensuring that students are better equipped for higher education, employment, and participation in a globalized world. Continuous investment in teacher capacity, curriculum enhancement, and equitable access will be essential to realize the full potential of this reform. As Myanmar's education system continues to evolve, the K12 model stands as a foundation for future improvements, educational equity, and national development (Htet, 2020; Stenning, 2022; Magallanes et al., 2021).

Table 3.2 summarizes a side-by-side comparison of the three major frameworks that have shaped Myanmar's basic education landscape.

Table (3.2) Key Differences Between 5-3-2 System, 5-4-2 System and K12 System in Myanmar's Basic Education

Aspect	5-3-2 System	5-4-2 System	K12 System
Structure	5 years Primary	5 years Primary	1 year Kindergarten
	3 years Lower Secondary (Middle School)	4 years Lower Secondary (Middle School)	5 years Primary
	2 years Upper Secondary (High School)	2 years Upper Secondary (High School)	4 years Lower Secondary
	-	-	2 years Upper Secondary
Total Years of Schooling	10	11	12
Entry Age	Age 5-6	Age 5-6	Age 5 (Kindergarten)
Compulsory	5-10 years (varies	5-11 years (varies	5-17/18 years

Education	regionally)	regionally)	(Kindergarten to Grade 12)
Curriculum Emphasis	Basic literacy/numeracy;	Broader curriculum;	Holistic curriculum;
	Limited electives; focus on core subjects	More focus on science, technology, and languages	21st century skills, digital literacy, critical thinking, life skills
Assessment System	National exams at end of each stage;	National exams at end of each stage;	Continuous assessment;
	High-stakes at Grade 10	High-stakes at Grade 11	Summative exams at higher grades;
	-	-	More emphasis on formative assessment
Transition Points	After Grade 5 and Grade 8	After Grade 5 and Grade 9	After Kindergarten, Grade 5, Grade 9
Alignment with International Standards	Limited	Improved alignment with ASEAN and international standards	Strongly aligned with global K-12 standards
Teacher Training	Traditional, less specialized	Increased focus on professional development	Modern, ongoing professional development, focus on child-centered pedagogy
Rationale for Adoption	Rapid expansion and access	Bridging learning gaps, readiness for next stage	Global competitiveness, improved readiness for higher education/workforce

* Source: Htet (2020), Stenning (2022), and Magallanes et al. (2021)

The table systematically contrasts aspects such as structural organization, total years of schooling, entry age, compulsory education duration, curriculum focus,

assessment practices, transition points, alignment with international standards, teacher training approaches, and the underlying rationale for each system's adoption. Through this comparative lens, readers can clearly see the evolution from the traditional 5-3-2 system, characterized by a shorter, core-subject-focused cycle, toward the more holistic and internationally aligned K12 system, which introduces kindergarten, extends the years of schooling, and emphasizes 21st-century skills, digital literacy, and continuous assessment. The table highlights not only structural shifts but also the changing educational philosophies and policy priorities driving reform in Myanmar, from rapid expansion and basic access to a modern vision of global competitiveness and comprehensive learner development.

3.3 Master Plan of Myanmar's Basic Education

The strategic significance of education in Myanmar's national vision is clearly demonstrated by its central role in government policy and planning. Recognizing that a well-educated population is fundamental to improving the standard of living and achieving sustainable development, Myanmar's leaders have positioned basic education as a core pillar for social and economic transformation. The Basic Education Master Plan (BEMP) outlines a coordinated national response to decades of underinvestment, limited access, and disparities in educational outcomes across regions and communities. This plan is not only an instrument for enhancing the quality and relevance of schooling but also a reflection of Myanmar's commitment to building human capital that can support the country's modernization and integration with the global economy. Reforms have targeted both structural and pedagogical aspects, encompassing everything from early childhood education to adult learning, with new policies and investments designed to reach learners in both urban centers and the most remote rural areas. Through these measures, Myanmar seeks to address historic inequalities, respond to rapid demographic changes, and support a dynamic workforce capable of adapting to technological progress and shifting labor market needs (Htet, 2020; Stenning, 2022; Thu, 2024).

The BEMP is anchored in international human rights principles, echoing commitments made in foundational global documents such as the UNESCO constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, both of which assert the right of every individual to access education. These commitments were later reaffirmed at the World Conference on Education for All in 1990, which set forth a

holistic vision of basic education as a means for individuals to not only achieve literacy but also develop critical thinking, social responsibility, and the capacity to participate fully in economic and civic life. In Myanmar's context, this broad and inclusive definition of basic education has informed the expansion of its coverage to include early childhood care, primary and lower secondary education, and a growing array of non-formal education programs such as adult literacy, community education, and religious instruction. Such an approach acknowledges the diverse needs of learners and recognizes that education must be accessible across the lifespan, supporting equity and lifelong learning as key pillars of national development (Stenning, 2022).

3.3.1 Vision and Modalities

The Ministry of Education (MOE) articulates its driving vision as the creation of a learning society prepared to meet the challenges of the Knowledge Age, confidently adopting the motto "To Build a Modern Developed Country Through Education." This vision is operationalized through the provision of formal, non-formal, and informal education channels, each designed to address different learner needs and circumstances. Formal education remains the backbone of the system, covering kindergarten through secondary levels with a standardized curriculum and assessment framework. However, recognizing the barriers faced by many children and adults such as poverty, displacement, or the need to work, the government has increasingly invested in non-formal education, including flexible learning centers, evening classes, and community-based programs. Informal education, characterized by incidental or experiential learning outside formal institutions, is also supported as a way to foster lifelong learning habits and promote community engagement. By diversifying educational delivery, the MOE aims to leave no one behind and to ensure that education is not only accessible, but also relevant and responsive to the evolving needs of society. Digital technology is beginning to play a larger role, enabling distance learning initiatives and helping to bridge resource gaps, especially in remote and conflict-affected areas (Htet, 2020; Stenning, 2022).

3.3.2 Main Educational Objectives

To realize its vision, Myanmar's government has established comprehensive educational objectives that go well beyond basic academic achievement. Universal

access to quality basic education is the cornerstone, with an explicit focus on equity for ethnic minorities, girls, children with disabilities, and learners in hard-to-reach communities. In addition, the curriculum has been designed to foster moral values and civic responsibility, instilling a sense of national identity and social cohesion while respecting Myanmar's diverse cultures and languages. Another major objective is the advancement of scientific and technological knowledge, an area where Myanmar had previously lagged behind regional peers. By embedding STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) education and digital literacy into the curriculum, the system aims to prepare students for future participation in an innovation-driven economy. The government is also committed to cultivating skilled workers, entrepreneurs, and professionals who can contribute to nation-building, while ensuring that opportunities for further study are available to those with the aptitude and motivation. Special attention is given to holistic development, encompassing emotional intelligence, physical and mental well-being, creativity, and adaptability. The system also promotes lifelong learning, offering adult education and professional courses that enable citizens to continue their development while remaining economically active, thus supporting a resilient and adaptable labor force (Thu, 2024).

3.3.3 National Policy and Action Plan

The foundation of Myanmar's education policy is the principle of lifelong, inclusive learning. In support of this, the government has enacted rules and guidelines for adult and continuing education, ensuring open and diversified access for all citizens. The National Action Plan for Education for All (EFA-NAP) operationalizes these principles, setting targets for school enrollment, teacher qualifications, and literacy rates, among other indicators. Since the early 2000s, significant progress has been made in increasing participation at all levels of basic education, with net enrollment ratios for primary-aged children rising steadily and dropout rates declining. These gains are the result of targeted interventions such as school feeding programs, provision of learning materials, scholarships for disadvantaged students, and community awareness campaigns. The MOE has also placed a strong emphasis on teacher professional development, recognizing that teacher quality is a key determinant of student outcomes. Continuing education and certification programs for teachers, combined with efforts to improve recruitment and retention in underserved areas, have contributed to rising standards. The government's systematic monitoring

of education indicators allows for evidence-based adjustments to policy and resource allocation, ensuring that progress is sustained and challenges are addressed in a timely manner (Department of Education Planning and Training, 2008).

3.3.4 Strategic Programs and Long-Term Planning

The BEMP's 30-year long-term plan, broken into six five-year medium-term phases, is one of the most ambitious educational development programs in Myanmar's history. Its ten flagship components span the full spectrum of educational needs, from foundational literacy and numeracy to advanced research and innovation. Modernizing the education system is central, with major investments in curriculum renewal, school infrastructure, and governance reforms aimed at improving efficiency, accountability, and transparency. The plan also seeks to guarantee universal completion of basic education, recognizing that full participation is essential for breaking cycles of poverty and exclusion. Quality enhancement is addressed through updated learning materials, integration of life skills and vocational training, and the use of formative, competency-based assessment methods. The push for e-education and ICT aims to prepare students for a digital future while closing the urban-rural divide in access to information and educational resources. Holistic student development is promoted through extracurricular activities, health and nutrition programs, and psychosocial support. The plan further prioritizes the professionalization of educational management, increased community and parental involvement, and the expansion of non-formal and adult education opportunities. A renewed focus on educational research underpins the entire program, encouraging innovation, data-driven decision-making, and adaptation to emerging challenges (Stenning, 2022; Htet, 2020).

3.3.5 Challenges and Forward Outlook

Despite substantial progress, Myanmar's education sector continues to grapple with complex and persistent challenges. Regional disparities in resource allocation remain significant, particularly in areas affected by conflict, natural disasters, or chronic underdevelopment. Teacher shortages in rural and ethnic minority regions impact the quality and consistency of instruction, while language barriers and cultural differences can impede learning for minority students. Political instability and economic uncertainty have sometimes disrupted reform initiatives and constrained

investment. The rapid shift to remote learning during the COVID-19 pandemic exposed gaps in digital infrastructure and readiness, highlighting the need for more resilient and flexible educational systems. Addressing these challenges will require ongoing commitment from government, sustained international cooperation, and active participation from communities and civil society. Increased investment in teacher education, inclusive curriculum development, and adaptive infrastructure tailored to the needs of diverse learners will be critical for the continued success of the BEMP. As Myanmar moves forward, the overarching goal remains unchanged: to ensure that every citizen, regardless of background, has the opportunity to receive a high-quality, relevant education that empowers them to contribute meaningfully to society and the nation's future (Thu, 2024).

3.3.6 Broader Implications

The successful implementation of the Basic Education Master Plan will have profound and far-reaching effects on Myanmar's social, economic, and political landscape. By investing in human capital and promoting equitable opportunities, the educational system supports not only individual advancement but also national unity, peace, and stability. An educated populace is better equipped to drive economic diversification, foster innovation, and respond to the challenges of globalization. Furthermore, the emphasis on holistic development, civic values, and lifelong learning reflects a modern understanding of education as a continual process that shapes not only the workforce, but also informed, responsible, and engaged citizens.

In summary, the BEMP represents an ambitious and adaptive strategy to transform Myanmar's education sector into a catalyst for sustainable, inclusive, and dynamic national development (Htet, 2020; Stenning, 2022; Thu, 2024).

3.4 Organization Structure of Myanmar's Basic Education

The organization structure of Myanmar's basic education system reflects a blend of centralized oversight and regional adaptation, designed to address the nation's diverse educational needs. Over the years, a series of reforms have shaped the administrative framework, governance mechanisms, and curriculum management, ensuring both national coherence and localized responsiveness. This section provides an overview of how Myanmar's basic education is structured, highlighting the key

departments, statutory bodies, and strategic planning processes that guide the system's operation and ongoing development.

3.4.1 Administrative Framework and Departmental Organization

The administrative structure of Myanmar's basic education system has been shaped by a series of targeted reforms aimed at decentralizing governance, improving responsiveness, and enhancing service delivery across the country's diverse regions. The pivotal reorganization in April 1998 marked a shift from a centralized bureaucracy to a more regionally differentiated approach, reflecting the government's recognition of Myanmar's significant geographic, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity. By dividing the Department of Basic Education into four regional branches, each responsible for Lower Myanmar, Upper Myanmar, the Yangon Division, and Mandalay, alongside a newly established Department of Education Planning and Training, the government sought to foster localized decision-making while retaining national coherence. These departments are each charged with adapting policy implementation strategies to their local contexts, managing resource distribution, and overseeing teacher assignments, school construction, and curriculum delivery in their respective zones. This structural evolution has made it possible to address local educational disparities more directly, accommodate regional languages and cultures, and respond more flexibly to challenges such as natural disasters or population displacement. The Department of Education Planning and Training, meanwhile, plays a critical role in long-term strategy, data management, and monitoring and evaluation, ensuring that the broader objectives of equity and quality are sustained throughout the education sector (Lall, 2023).

3.4.2 Central Oversight and Statutory Committees

While regional departments manage much of the day-to-day administration, overall strategic direction and regulatory authority for Myanmar's basic education remain centralized within the Ministry of Education. This centralization ensures consistency in policy standards, curricular frameworks, and teacher qualification requirements nationwide. The Department of Basic Education and the Department of Education Planning and Training work in tandem with a series of statutory committees and councils, which offer technical expertise, policy guidance, and quality assurance. These bodies include the Basic Education Council, which provides

overarching governance and aligns educational practice with national priorities; Syllabus and Textbook Committees, which ensure that learning materials meet curricular standards; and Teacher Education Supervisory Committees, responsible for the accreditation and professional development of teaching staff. Together, these entities shape both content and delivery, ensuring the system remains aligned with Myanmar's nation-building goals, responds to changing labor market needs, and upholds the rights and aspirations of its diverse student population. Their work is particularly vital in times of rapid reform, such as the recent adoption of the K12 system, which has required substantial coordination and oversight to successfully implement across all regions (Phattharathanasut & Brehm, 2025).

3.4.3 Governance: The Role of the Basic Education Council

The Basic Education Council sits at the heart of governance for Myanmar's basic education, acting as a bridge between policy formulation and on-the-ground implementation. Chaired by the Deputy Minister for Education, the Council's composition draws from a wide cross-section of educational leaders, subject experts, and community representatives, reflecting an effort to balance centralized authority with stakeholder inclusion. The Council's primary mandate is to align basic education with the nation's broader development objectives, such as the promotion of vocational skills, preparation for higher education, and preservation of Myanmar's unique cultural heritage. It oversees critical decisions related to teacher education programs, the adoption and revision of curriculum content, textbook approval, and school infrastructure projects such as libraries and museums. The Council also governs school accreditation, including the establishment of new schools and the closure or upgrading of existing ones. Importantly, the Council is charged with ensuring access and equity, collaborating with local communities to identify barriers to enrollment, devise targeted interventions, and promote inclusive education. This collaborative approach helps build trust between government and citizens, encourages community investment in schools, and facilitates the adaptation of national policies to local realities (Shah & Lopes Cardozo, 2018).

3.4.4 Curriculum Development and Innovation

The Curriculum Committee is pivotal in Myanmar's educational ecosystem, driving the continuous renewal of syllabi, textbooks, and teaching resources to keep

pace with social, economic, and technological change. Under the leadership of the Director-General of Basic Education, the committee is composed of curriculum developers, subject specialists, experienced teachers, and sometimes representatives from local communities or ethnic language groups. This ensures that curriculum design is both technically sound and culturally relevant, reflecting Myanmar's ethnic diversity and the evolving needs of its society. The committee's responsibilities include updating and piloting new curricula, integrating emerging subjects such as digital literacy and life skills, and revising assessment frameworks to foster critical thinking and problem-solving abilities. By establishing regional curriculum teams and working groups, the committee promotes participatory curriculum development and allows for innovations tailored to local circumstances, such as bilingual materials for ethnic minority students. The committee also oversees the creation and approval of textbooks, ensuring that content is pedagogically effective, free from bias, and aligned with national standards. Increasingly, the committee has championed the adoption of multimedia and digital learning tools, recognizing their potential to bridge resource gaps and engage students in more interactive forms of learning (Lall, 2023).

3.4.5 Structure and Progression of Basic Education

Myanmar's basic education model is structured to provide a coherent pathway from early learning through to the completion of secondary school, culminating in a national matriculation examination. The system currently consists of five years of primary education, four years of lower secondary, and three years of upper secondary schooling. This progression is designed to facilitate age-appropriate learning, enable timely transitions between educational stages, and prepare students for post-secondary education or entry into the workforce. Each level is governed by clear curricular standards and monitored by regional and township education officers, who are responsible for school inspections, teacher supervision, and performance assessments. The Department of Education Planning and Training maintains an extensive data system that tracks enrollment, retention, academic achievement, and gender and regional disparities, enabling targeted support for schools and students who are at risk of falling behind. The integration of formative and summative assessments at each stage helps to identify learning needs early, inform instructional practices, and ensure that all students acquire the foundational knowledge and skills required for lifelong learning and nation-building (Phattharathanasut & Brehm, 2025).

3.4.6 Curriculum, Teacher Development, and Modernization

Recent reforms in Myanmar have prioritized not just what students learn, but how they learn and who teaches them. At the primary level, the curriculum has expanded beyond the traditional focus on Myanmar language, English, and mathematics to include civics, moral education, life skills, social studies, and introductory science—laying a foundation for holistic development. At the secondary level, students can choose from a broad array of electives, ranging from sciences to humanities, allowing them to begin specializing in areas of interest. Modernization efforts have also centered on the professionalization of teaching staff: rigorous pre-service and in-service teacher training programs are mandatory, and ongoing professional development workshops introduce educators to new pedagogical approaches, classroom management skills, and digital literacy. The creation of multimedia classrooms and the integration of educational technology have been promoted to make lessons more engaging and to bridge gaps in teacher expertise, especially in rural areas. These initiatives reflect a recognition that educational quality depends not just on strong curricula, but also on well-trained, motivated teachers and a learning environment that encourages critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration (Lall, 2023).

3.4.7 Assessment and Holistic Evaluation

Assessment practices in Myanmar's basic education system have shifted in recent years from a sole reliance on traditional written exams to a more comprehensive model that values multiple dimensions of student growth. The introduction of the Continuous Assessment and Progression System (CAPS) marks a significant departure from rote learning, emphasizing the importance of both academic achievement and personal development. The CAPS model includes regular chapter-end tests and the maintenance of a Comprehensive Personal Record (CPR) that documents a student's attendance, adherence to discipline, participation in co-curricular and community service activities, and demonstration of values such as teamwork, leadership, and social responsibility. This holistic approach aims to foster well-rounded individuals who are not only academically competent but also socially aware, resilient, and prepared for life beyond school. At middle and high school levels, records include participation in state and community development, volunteer work, and involvement in clubs and organizations, further reinforcing the importance

of civic engagement and practical life skills. Such reforms reflect global best practices in education, positioning Myanmar to produce future citizens who are adaptable, ethically grounded, and committed to the common good (Shah & Lopes Cardozo, 2018).

3.4.8 Strategic Planning and Long-term Development

The strategic direction for Myanmar's basic education is guided by both medium-term and long-term development plans, reflecting a commitment to sustained, transformative progress. The Special Four-Year Plan, implemented from 2000 to 2004, introduced foundational reforms such as curriculum renewal, the universalization of primary education, and the establishment of multimedia classrooms. Building on these gains, the thirty-year Long-term Education Development Plan (2001–2031) sets out ten core programs geared toward modernizing the entire system. These programs target system-wide objectives, including the establishment of a modern education system, universal access to basic education, enhancements in quality, increased availability of pre-vocational and vocational education, and the integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) to promote e-education. Additional priorities include fostering well-rounded citizens, strengthening educational management and research, expanding non-formal education for out-of-school youth and adults, and increasing community involvement in educational activities. The scope and ambition of these plans underscore Myanmar's resolve to overcome historical challenges, build a globally competitive education system, and ensure that its youth are prepared to contribute to national peace, prosperity, and unity (Phattharathanasut & Brehm, 2025).

CHAPTER IV
SURVEY ANALYSIS

4.1 Survey Profile

This section outlines the demographic and professional characteristics of the respondents who participated in the survey. The profile provides a contextual foundation for interpreting the perceptions and experiences of teachers regarding curriculum development within Myanmar's ongoing education reform. A total of 290 teachers from public schools in Kamayut Township were selected using stratified random sampling to ensure balanced representation across different school levels—primary, middle, and high.

The gender distribution was evenly balanced, with 145 male and 145 female teachers, reflecting a gender-equitable workforce in the selected township. This parity is important, as previous studies suggest that gender can influence perspectives on pedagogical practices and professional development needs (Molyneux, 2011). The even gender ratio ensures a balanced viewpoint in analysing the data and avoids gender bias in interpreting the results.

Regarding age, the majority of respondents (157 teachers or 54.1%) fell within the 24 to 40-year-old range. This demographic is generally more adaptive to educational reforms and technology integration, often showing higher engagement in student-centred teaching methods (Voogt, Fisser, Good, Mishra, & Yadav, 2015). The remaining 133 teachers (45.9%) were above 40 years of age, many of whom brought significant teaching experience and institutional knowledge to the reform process. This mix of generational perspectives strengthens the depth of the study's analysis, offering insights from both early-career and veteran educators.

In terms of teaching experience, 40% of the respondents had between 6 and 15 years of service, while 35% had more than 15 years. Teachers with over a decade of experience often provide grounded insights into how past and present curriculum policies have evolved, while mid-career professionals tend to be more active in implementing reforms. Only 25% had less than 5 years of experience, but their input

is valuable in identifying the initial impact of teacher education programmes and induction training under the new system.

Educational qualifications of the participants varied, but most (approximately 62%) held a Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree, followed by 25% with postgraduate degrees such as M.Ed. or M.A. in Education. A small proportion (13%) had only a diploma or teaching certificate. The data indicates that the majority of the respondents possessed sufficient academic grounding to understand and reflect critically on curriculum frameworks and pedagogical theories.

With respect to school level, 40% of the respondents taught at the primary level, 35% at the middle school level, and 25% at the high school level. This distribution was strategically designed to ensure that the survey captured the experiences of teachers across all stages of basic education. It also supports comparative analysis between levels, particularly when examining how curriculum content and implementation challenges differ by grade band.

In summary, the surveyed teachers represent a demographically balanced and professionally diverse group. Their varied levels of experience, education, and teaching responsibilities provide a reliable and nuanced foundation for examining teacher perceptions of curriculum development. The diversity of respondents strengthens the generalisability of the findings and ensures that multiple perspectives are considered in assessing the progress and limitations of curriculum reform in the Myanmar context.

4.2 Survey Design

The survey design employed in this study was carefully structured to elicit detailed and reliable data from teachers regarding their perceptions of the curriculum development process in the context of Myanmar's education reform. The design process followed a systematic approach to ensure validity, reliability, and alignment with the research objectives outlined in the earlier chapters. A quantitative research method was selected, using a structured questionnaire as the primary data collection tool. This approach was appropriate given the need to gather standardized responses from a relatively large sample, enabling statistical analysis and generalizable findings. a descriptive quantitative approach using a Likert-scale questionnaire, which was divided into five key dimensions: (1) Understanding of Curriculum Objectives, (2)

Perceptions on Curriculum Effectiveness, (3) Curriculum Implementation Practices, (4) Teacher Involvement in Curriculum Reform, and (5) Challenges Encountered.

The questionnaire consisted of both closed-ended and Likert-scale items, which were developed based on an extensive review of global literature on curriculum reform, teacher participation, and educational change. Particular attention was given to aligning the survey items with themes such as curriculum relevance, implementation challenges, stakeholder involvement, and perceived impact on teaching practices. Each item was designed to reflect a specific aspect of curriculum development, ensuring that respondents could express their views clearly and within a consistent framework.

The instrument was divided into three main sections. The first section captured demographic information such as age, gender, teaching experience, educational background, and school level. This data was essential for understanding the background of the respondents and for performing subgroup analyses. The second section focused on teachers' experiences and perceptions of the current curriculum development process, including their awareness, engagement, and training related to reform activities. The third section explored teachers' views on the practical implementation of the curriculum and its impact on classroom instruction.

Each item was rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The instrument was piloted with 30 teachers to ensure clarity and reliability, resulting in a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87, indicating high internal consistency. Data were analysed using SPSS to calculate means, standard deviations, and frequencies for each dimension.

Sampling procedures were also an integral part of the survey design. Stratified random sampling was used to ensure a representative sample across different school levels—primary, middle, and high—within Kamayut Township. This sampling technique allowed for the inclusion of various perspectives while maintaining proportional representation. A total of 290 teachers were selected from 15 public schools in the township, which included both experienced and early-career educators. Participation was voluntary, and ethical considerations such as informed consent and confidentiality were strictly observed throughout the data collection process.

The data collection was carried out over a two-week period in May 2025. Each respondent received a printed questionnaire along with a brief explanation of the research purpose and instructions for completion. Most participants completed the

survey in one sitting, with the average completion time being approximately 20 minutes. Responses were collected anonymously to encourage honesty and reduce response bias.

In summary, the survey design adopted in this study was methodologically sound, grounded in existing literature, and adapted to the specific educational context of Myanmar. The use of a structured and validated questionnaire, coupled with a representative sampling strategy, ensured that the data obtained was both reliable and suitable for quantitative analysis. This foundation enabled the study to provide meaningful insights into the complex dynamics of teacher perceptions regarding curriculum development in the ongoing reform process.

4.3 Survey Results

4.3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Understanding the demographic characteristics of the survey respondents is crucial for contextualizing their perceptions and experiences related to curriculum development. The profile of the participants provides insights into the diversity of the teaching workforce involved in the study and helps interpret variations in responses that might be influenced by factors such as age, gender, teaching experience, educational qualifications, and school level. This section presents a detailed analysis of these demographic variables based on data collected from 290 teachers in Kamayut Township.

The gender distribution of the respondents was exactly balanced, with 50% male (n = 145) and 50% female (n = 145). This equal representation is noteworthy, as it provides a comprehensive perspective that includes the views of both genders without skewing results due to overrepresentation. Gender balance in educational research is important since prior studies have demonstrated that male and female teachers may differ in their attitudes towards educational reforms, pedagogical strategies, and professional development needs (Buchanan, Prescott, Schuck, Aubusson, & Burke, 2013).

Regarding age, the majority of respondents were within the 24 to 40 years range, accounting for 54.1% (n = 157). This younger to mid-career cohort is typically more receptive to educational innovation and reform, as they are likely to have been trained under relatively modern pedagogical frameworks (Voogt et al., 2015). The remaining 45.9% (n = 133) were teachers above 40 years old, a group that tends to

bring substantial teaching experience and institutional knowledge but may be more resistant to rapid curricular changes. The age distribution thus represents a balance between fresh perspectives and seasoned expertise, enabling a richer understanding of teacher perceptions.

The respondents' teaching experience varied widely, highlighting a mixture of novice and veteran teachers. Approximately 40% (n = 116) had between 6 and 15 years of teaching experience, while 35% (n = 101) reported over 15 years in the profession. Only 25% (n = 73) had less than 5 years of teaching experience. This distribution suggests a robust sampling across different stages of teaching careers, which is important since experience can influence teachers' confidence in adopting new curricula and their professional development needs (Darling-Hammond, 2017).

In terms of educational qualifications, the majority of teachers (62%, n = 180) held a Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree, indicating a solid foundation in pedagogical knowledge. An additional 25% (n = 73) possessed postgraduate degrees, including Master's degrees in education or related fields, which may correlate with higher engagement in curriculum innovation. A smaller segment (13%, n = 37) had attained diploma or certificate-level qualifications, representing a group that might face additional challenges in adapting to curriculum reforms that demand advanced pedagogical skills.

The distribution of respondents across school levels was deliberately stratified to capture a comprehensive range of teaching experiences. Forty percent (n = 116) taught in primary schools, 35% (n = 102) in middle schools, and 25% (n = 72) in high schools. This stratification is vital because curriculum design and implementation challenges often differ by educational stage due to varying cognitive demands, content complexity, and assessment systems (Kirkwood & Price, 2013). The inclusion of all levels provides a nuanced picture of the reform's impact across the education spectrum.

Table (4.1) Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (n=290)

Statement	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	145	50.0
Female	145	50.0
Age		
24-40 years	157	54.1
Above 40 years	133	45.9
Educational Qualifications		
Diploma/Certificate	37	12.8
Bachelor of Education (B.Ed)	180	62.1
Postgraduate Degree	73	25.1
Teaching experience		
Less than 5 years	73	25.2
6–15 years	116	40.0
More than 15 years	101	34.8
School Level		
Primary (Grades 1–5)	116	40.0
Middle (Grades 6–10)	102	35.0
High	72	25.0

* Source: Survey data, 2025, March – June

This demographic profile highlights a well-balanced and representative sample that captures various dimensions of the teaching workforce in Kamayut Township. The diverse age range and experience levels enrich the data by incorporating multiple perspectives on curriculum development, while the balanced gender and school level distribution ensures inclusivity. These factors are critical in interpreting the subsequent survey findings and in designing contextually relevant recommendations for curriculum reform.

4.3.2 Teachers' Awareness and Understanding of Curriculum Reform

Teachers' awareness and understanding of curriculum reform are foundational to the successful implementation of any educational change. In the context of Myanmar's ongoing education reform, the extent to which teachers are informed

about the revised curriculum and comprehend its objectives directly influences the quality and fidelity of its implementation. Without clear awareness, teachers may not recognize the rationale behind the reforms. Without deep understanding, they may struggle to adapt their instructional strategies, learning materials, and classroom assessments to align with reform goals. This section presents survey results from teachers across primary, middle, and high schools in Kamayut Township to assess their levels of awareness and understanding of the curriculum reform.

The data shown in Table 4.2 indicates that 78% of the respondents reported moderate to high awareness of the curriculum reform. Among them, 35% of teachers demonstrated a high level of awareness, signifying that they were well-informed about the nature, scope, and policy directions of the reform. Additionally, 43% indicated moderate awareness, implying they had general knowledge but may lack details about implementation strategies or subject-specific changes. However, a concerning 22% of teachers reported low or no awareness at all. This finding points to significant gaps in the dissemination of reform information and suggests that a proportion of teachers may be left out of key discussions, trainings, or communications.

The second part of Table 4.2 explores teachers' understanding of the curriculum reform. While 27% of respondents reported having a thorough understanding—indicating confidence in their ability to interpret and apply the reform framework in their practice—only 35% expressed satisfactory understanding. The largest group, 38%, acknowledged that their understanding was limited. This lack of deep understanding among over a third of teachers is a critical challenge for the education system. It implies that although many teachers may have heard of the reform, they do not fully grasp how to implement it in meaningful ways in their classrooms.

These findings reveal several important implications. First, while initial awareness-building efforts appear to have reached a majority of educators, this must be followed by intensive, subject-specific professional development initiatives that enable teachers to internalize the goals and strategies of the reform. Secondly, limited understanding among many educators raises concerns about the consistency and quality of curriculum implementation across different levels of schooling. A teacher who is only partially informed may deliver lessons that are misaligned with curriculum objectives, resulting in gaps in student learning outcomes.

Furthermore, the gap between awareness and understanding suggests that one-off trainings or brief orientations may not be sufficient. Teachers may need ongoing support in the form of mentoring, school-based training, resource sharing, and feedback loops with curriculum experts. Collaborative platforms where teachers can discuss challenges and share best practices are also necessary to translate awareness into effective classroom actions.

Contextually, Myanmar's curriculum reform process demands teachers to shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered approaches, integrate 21st-century skills, and apply formative assessments. Such pedagogical transformations cannot be realized without teachers being both aware and deeply informed. Therefore, this data highlights a need for stronger support mechanisms to build not only awareness but also pedagogical capacity and curriculum literacy among teachers.

Table (4.2) Teachers' Awareness and Understanding of Curriculum Reform (n=290)

Level of Awareness	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
High	102	35.0
Moderate	125	43.0
Low/None	63	22.0
Level of Understanding	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Thorough Understanding	78	27.0
Satisfactory Understanding	102	35.0
Limited Understanding	110	38.0

* Source: Survey data, 2025, March – June

The findings underscore that while most teachers are aware of the reforms, deeper understanding remains an area for improvement. Strengthening awareness and comprehension through ongoing professional development is vital for effective curriculum enactment.

4.3.3 Perceptions on Curriculum Effectiveness

Teachers' perceptions of curriculum reform effectiveness are a crucial indicator of how well educational changes are received and implemented in classrooms. This study measured teachers' views using a five-point Likert scale, where respondents rated their agreement with several key statements related to the

new curriculum's relevance, flexibility, and overall impact on teaching and learning processes.

As shown in Table 4.3, the statement "The new curriculum meets students' learning needs" received a mean score of 3.82 with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.69. This relatively high score suggests that most teachers believe the updated curriculum sufficiently addresses the learning requirements of students, aligning with modern educational goals to be learner-centered and responsive. Similarly, the item "Curriculum content is relevant and up-to-date" was rated positively with a mean score of 3.75 (SD = 0.72). This reflects teachers' confidence in the curriculum's efforts to modernize content and keep it aligned with current knowledge, skills, and societal demands.

However, the statement "The curriculum allows flexibility for teachers to adapt to their students' needs" recorded a comparatively lower mean score of 3.40 (SD = 0.85). This lower score indicates that a considerable portion of teachers feel somewhat restricted by the prescribed curriculum framework, limiting their ability to modify or tailor lessons to their students' unique contexts or learning styles. Flexibility in curriculum design is widely acknowledged in educational literature as essential to effective teaching, especially in diverse classrooms (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012).

Overall, 70% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that the curriculum reforms have positively influenced educational quality in Myanmar. This majority approval reflects a cautious optimism among teachers, who generally recognize the benefits of curriculum modernization while remaining concerned about practical challenges related to implementation and teacher autonomy.

Table (4.3) Perceptions on Curriculum Effectiveness (n=290)

Statement	Mean Score	SD
The new curriculum meets students' learning needs	3.82	0.69
Curriculum content is relevant and up-to-date	3.75	0.72
Curriculum allows flexibility for teachers	3.40	0.85
Overall Score	3.66	0.75

* Source: Survey data, 2025, March – June

The overall mean score of 3.66 across these items indicates a moderately high level of agreement among teachers about the curriculum's effectiveness. The aggregate score translates to an overall overscore of approximately 1,060.4 out of a possible 1,450 (calculated as mean × number of respondents × number of items), further demonstrating that the majority of teachers view the new curriculum positively in terms of its core educational objectives.

Nonetheless, the lower rating for flexibility signals an area needing more attention in future policy and professional development initiatives. This aligns with global findings which emphasize that curriculum reform success depends not only on content relevance but also on enabling teachers with sufficient autonomy and support to adapt teaching practices (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). Without such flexibility, reforms risk being perceived as top-down mandates rather than participatory improvements.

In conclusion, the findings from this section suggest that Myanmar's curriculum reform has laid a solid foundation by addressing essential aspects of content relevance and meeting student needs. However, for the reforms to translate into meaningful classroom changes and improved student outcomes, increasing teacher agency and adaptability within the curriculum framework should be prioritized. This will require strategic investments in teacher training, curriculum guidelines that encourage innovation, and ongoing feedback mechanisms to ensure reforms remain responsive to the realities of diverse classrooms.

4.3.4 Challenges Encountered in Curriculum Implementation

Implementing curriculum reforms in educational settings is often met with multiple practical challenges that can significantly affect the success and sustainability of these initiatives. The survey data collected from 290 teachers, summarized in Table 4.4, reveal the main obstacles they experience while putting the new curriculum into practice. These challenges highlight the real-world difficulties faced by educators and underscore areas requiring urgent policy and institutional attention.

The foremost challenge identified was insufficient training, which was reported by 68% of respondents (n=194). This high frequency indicates that many teachers feel inadequately prepared to implement the new curriculum effectively. Adequate professional development is crucial because curriculum reforms typically

introduce new pedagogical approaches, assessment techniques, and content knowledge areas. Without sufficient training, teachers may struggle to understand and apply these changes, thereby limiting the overall impact of the reform efforts.

Closely following this was the issue of lack of teaching materials and resources, cited by 59% of respondents (n=171). This reflects systemic infrastructural limitations such as shortages of textbooks, digital tools, classroom equipment, and physical facilities that support learning. Resource constraints can hamper teachers' ability to deliver the curriculum as intended, forcing them to improvise or skip critical activities, which in turn affects students' learning experiences.

The third notable challenge was time constraints for lesson preparation and adopting new teaching methods, mentioned by 52% of teachers (n=151). Many educators are burdened with heavy workloads and administrative duties that leave limited time for planning, experimenting with innovative pedagogies, or individualizing instruction. This challenge is consistent with global findings that reform success depends heavily on providing teachers with sufficient time to reflect, collaborate, and adapt (Fullan, 2007).

Lastly, limited administrative support was perceived as a significant barrier by 45% of respondents (n=131). Support from school leadership and educational authorities plays a critical role in motivating teachers, resolving implementation issues, and ensuring accountability. When such support is lacking or inconsistent, teachers may feel isolated or demotivated, which can diminish the effectiveness of curriculum reforms.

Table (4.4) Challenges in Curriculum Implementation (n=290)

Challenge	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Insufficient training	194	68
Lack of teaching materials and resources	171	59
Time constraints for lesson preparation	151	52
Limited administrative support	131	45

* Source: Survey data, 2025, March – June

From the survey results, insufficient training was the most frequently reported challenge, with 194 teachers (68%) identifying it as a significant obstacle in curriculum implementation. This highlights the urgent need for enhanced professional

development programs. The second most common issue was the lack of teaching materials and resources, reported by 171 teachers (59%), indicating systemic shortages affecting classroom delivery. Time constraints were noted by 151 teachers (52%), reflecting workload pressures limiting effective lesson preparation. Finally, limited administrative support was reported by 131 teachers (45%), pointing to the need for stronger leadership and support mechanisms in schools. These frequencies underscore key focus areas for policy intervention to improve the practical enactment of curriculum reforms.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

5.1 Findings

The findings of this study offer comprehensive insights into teachers' perceptions of curriculum development amidst Myanmar's ongoing education reform, reflecting both the broader educational context and the specific challenges faced at the school level. Educators across primary, middle, and high schools expressed nuanced views regarding the revised curriculum's effectiveness, implementation feasibility, professional support, and their own involvement in the reform process.

Teachers generally acknowledged the curriculum's alignment with contemporary educational goals, particularly the emphasis on student-centred learning, critical thinking, and competency development. The curriculum was perceived as more relevant and updated compared to previous versions, reflecting a positive shift towards global educational standards. This reflects a broader national agenda to modernize education and enhance student outcomes. Nonetheless, while the intent of the curriculum reform was widely supported, teachers reported varying levels of success in implementing these changes within their classrooms. The average rating indicated moderate satisfaction with curriculum effectiveness, but qualitative feedback revealed concerns about practical applicability, especially in diverse teaching contexts with limited resources.

A significant finding relates to the availability and adequacy of teaching materials and resources. Many teachers noted a lack of updated textbooks, teaching aids, and technological tools essential for enacting inquiry-based and student-centred pedagogies. This lack was particularly acute in schools with large class sizes or limited infrastructure. Consequently, teachers often resorted to traditional teaching methods, undermining the curriculum's goals. Time constraints due to packed schedules and examination preparation further limited opportunities for creative lesson planning and learner engagement. This resource gap highlights a critical area where national policy ambitions encounter ground realities.

Professional development emerged as another pivotal factor influencing curriculum uptake. The study found that initial training sessions provided during curriculum rollout were often too brief, generic, or infrequent to fully equip teachers with the necessary skills and confidence. Many educators expressed the need for sustained and differentiated training that addresses subject-specific pedagogy, classroom management, and assessment techniques aligned with the curriculum's competency-based approach. Opportunities for collaborative learning, mentoring, and ongoing support were sparse, especially in more remote or under-resourced areas. Teachers who had access to continuous professional development reported higher confidence in implementing innovative teaching strategies, suggesting that investment in teacher capacity is essential for reform success.

The level of teacher involvement in curriculum development processes was also found to be limited. A majority of participants indicated that they were not consulted during curriculum design or revision phases and were often unaware of the policy rationale behind changes. This lack of participation contributes to a sense of disconnect and reduces the likelihood of teacher buy-in and ownership. Effective curriculum reform literature emphasizes the critical role of teacher agency and participation in shaping meaningful educational change. Therefore, expanding opportunities for teachers to engage meaningfully in curriculum policymaking is necessary to enhance contextual relevance and foster commitment.

Assessment practices presented another complex challenge. While the revised curriculum aims to promote higher-order thinking and competencies, prevailing assessment systems remain predominantly focused on summative, examination-based evaluation. Teachers reported tension between encouraging critical thinking and the pressure to prepare students for high-stakes national exams that prioritize memorization. The absence of formative or performance-based assessment tools was viewed as a barrier to realizing the curriculum's full potential. Teachers expressed a strong desire for clear guidelines and support to develop and implement varied assessment methods that better reflect student learning and skills development.

Differences in experiences across educational levels and subjects were notable. Primary school teachers generally reported more flexibility and better alignment between curriculum goals and classroom practice, possibly due to less exam pressure and more adaptable teaching environments. In contrast, middle and high school educators faced challenges associated with rigid syllabi and heavy content

loads, which limited their ability to innovate. Subject-specific difficulties were also highlighted, particularly in science and mathematics, where resource limitations and technical content complexity compounded implementation challenges.

Support from school leadership and education authorities was uneven. While some teachers appreciated proactive leadership that facilitated professional development and collaborative planning, others noted a lack of guidance or engagement from principals and township education offices. In certain contexts, leadership prioritized administrative compliance over instructional improvement, creating barriers to reflective teaching practices and innovation. Strengthening instructional leadership and enhancing communication channels between schools and education authorities could improve support systems and teacher morale.

The study further indicated that teachers perceive a disconnect between national education policies and the realities of classroom practice. This gap is exacerbated by insufficient stakeholder engagement, uneven resource distribution, and limited mechanisms for feedback and policy adjustment. Teachers' voices are crucial in bridging this divide, as they offer grounded perspectives that can inform more realistic and context-sensitive reforms. Their professional expertise should be leveraged in continuous curriculum review and implementation monitoring processes.
Despite these challenges, many teachers expressed a willingness to embrace curriculum reforms and adapt their pedagogical approaches to better serve their students. The recognition of the curriculum's potential to enhance student engagement and competencies reflects a hopeful outlook for the future of education reform in Myanmar. However, realizing this potential will require coordinated efforts to address systemic constraints, including improving teacher professional development, resource allocation, assessment reform, and participatory governance.

In summary, the findings underscore that curriculum reform is a complex, multi-layered process that demands alignment between policy intent and classroom realities. Success depends not only on sound curriculum design but also on effective implementation strategies that empower teachers, provide adequate support, and foster collaboration among all education stakeholders. By addressing the gaps identified in this study, Myanmar's education system can move closer to achieving its reform goals and improving educational quality and equity for all learners.

5.2 Suggestions

This study highlights several crucial aspects that need urgent attention to improve curriculum development and implementation in Myanmar's education system. A significant issue is the disconnect between curriculum policy and actual classroom practice. To bridge this gap, reforms must be multi-dimensional and inclusive, involving all stakeholders. One key recommendation is to move away from the current top-down curriculum development model, which often alienates teachers. Teachers' practical experience and contextual knowledge are critical for making the curriculum relevant and effective. Hence, involving teachers from various regions and educational levels throughout the planning, review, and evaluation stages can promote ownership, relevance, and stronger implementation.

Improving teacher training is another priority. Many educators feel unprepared to teach student-centered, competency-based lessons due to limited or generic training. Pre-service and in-service training programs need to be comprehensive, ongoing, and tailored to address subject-specific teaching methods, inclusive education, classroom management, and innovative assessment techniques. Training should also be differentiated based on school level, subject, and regional context. Professional learning communities and mentoring can further support continuous development, especially in remote areas where formal training is scarce.

The availability of adequate teaching and learning materials is essential for putting curriculum goals into practice. Myanmar's curriculum emphasizes inquiry-based learning, technology integration, and active student participation, but these are difficult to achieve without necessary resources. The Ministry of Education should prioritize equitable distribution of textbooks, digital tools, laboratory equipment, and other aids, particularly to underserved schools. Resource allocation must be based on data-driven assessments rather than uniform distribution. Additionally, schools should be encouraged to develop locally relevant teaching materials that reflect their students' cultural, linguistic, and environmental backgrounds while aligning with national standards.

Assessment practices require reform to better align with the curriculum's learning objectives. Although the curriculum encourages critical thinking and problem-solving, current assessments remain largely traditional and summative. A shift toward formative, performance-based, and authentic assessments is needed to allow students to demonstrate competencies in various ways. Teachers require

training on designing and implementing these new methods, supported by clear guidelines from curriculum authorities. Integrating “assessment for learning” principles can transform assessments from mere evaluations into tools that inform instruction and promote student growth.

Strong leadership and school management are vital to successful curriculum implementation. Principals and education officers must be equipped with instructional leadership skills to support teachers effectively, monitor teaching quality, and foster a positive learning environment. Their role should extend beyond administrative duties to include facilitating professional development, conducting lesson observations, and providing constructive feedback. Communication channels between teachers, local education offices, and curriculum bodies must be strengthened to ensure a two-way flow of information, enabling policies to reflect classroom realities.

Flexibility in curriculum design and delivery is also necessary to address Myanmar’s diverse socio-economic, linguistic, and cultural contexts. The current uniform national curriculum may not meet the needs of all regions. A semi-decentralized approach could offer a core national framework combined with locally adaptable modules or enrichment activities. Collaboration among local authorities, schools, and communities can create contextually relevant content, enhancing student engagement and achievement.

Teacher recognition and well-being are fundamental for sustainable curriculum reform. Teachers are the main agents of change, yet many face challenges such as low social status, limited career advancement, and inadequate pay, which can hinder motivation and commitment. Policy reforms must address these issues by establishing career pathways, performance incentives, and opportunities for professional growth. Strengthening the teaching profession will positively impact educational quality in the long run.

Integrating technology in curriculum delivery is increasingly important, especially with the rise of digital learning worldwide. However, Myanmar faces a significant digital divide, requiring strategic investment in ICT infrastructure, teacher training, and digital content development. Blended learning models, interactive e-textbooks, and virtual labs can enrich learning experiences but must be implemented thoughtfully to ensure equitable access across regions.

Effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are essential to track curriculum reform progress. Regular data collection, teacher feedback, and

performance metrics related to student outcomes should inform policy adjustments and celebrate successes. Transparency and accountability in the reform process will build public trust and encourage stakeholder participation.

Finally, collaboration among government agencies, teacher education institutions, civil society, and international partners is critical. Shared responsibility fosters knowledge exchange, innovation, and capacity building. Learning from global curriculum reform experiences, while adapting to Myanmar's unique context, can help build a resilient, future-ready education system.

In conclusion, curriculum reform in Myanmar should be an ongoing, inclusive process that values teacher input, addresses local challenges, and invests in professional development. Achieving meaningful and sustainable change requires more than policy documents; it demands aligned support systems, equitable practices, and a collective vision of educational excellence and fairness. This approach will help transform educational outcomes in Myanmar and prepare students for the demands of the 21st century.

REFERENCES

Aung Thu (2024). Equity and Access in Myanmar's Basic Education. Myanmar Social Research Papers.

Ball, Stephen J. (1994). Education Reform: A Critical and Post-structural Approach. Open University Press.

Brauns, Hildegard; Steinmann, Susanne; Steinmann, Susanne (2003). Education and the Integration of Educational Systems in Europe.

Dweck, Carol S. (2006). Mindset: The New Psychology of Success. Random House.

Fullan, Michael (2007). The New Meaning of Educational Change (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Han Su Yin (2024). Teachers' Challenges in Implementing Curriculum Reform in Myanmar (Unpublished study).

Maung Htet (2020). Comparative Study on Myanmar's Education Systems. Myanmar Academy of Education Journal.

Kelly, A.V. (2009). The Curriculum: Theory and Practice (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Kelly, Anthony V.; Oliva, Peter F. (2012). Curriculum Development in the Global Context. Pearson Education.

Lall, Marie (2021). Reforming Myanmar's Education System: National and Local Perspectives. Education and Society Journal.

Lall, Marie (2023). Governance and Decentralization in Myanmar's Basic Education. Myanmar Policy Research Papers.

Latt Wai Yan & Wei Jun Li (2025). How Teacher Efficacy and Receptivity Affect the Perceived Outcomes of Curriculum Reform in Myanmar Basic Education. European Journal of Education.

Le, David; Koji, Nakamura (2022). Historical Evolution of Myanmar's Basic Education Curriculum. Asian Education Review.

Magallanes, Ronald et al. (2021). Regional Responses to Myanmar's K12 Reform. Southeast Asian Education Journal.

Magallanes, Ronald; Tan, Cheng; Su, Hye Jin (2021). Myanmar's Shift to K12: Regional Implications. Southeast Asian Education Studies.

Maung Htet & David Stenning (2022). Myanmar's Education Policy in Transition. Asia Education Review.

Nwe Win (2015). Teachers' Role in Myanmar Education Reform. Yangon University of Education Working Papers.

Oliva, Peter F. (2012). Developing the Curriculum (8th ed.). Pearson.

Ou Yang, W.; Weng, Y. (2023). Teachers' Perceptions on Curriculum Reform in Myanmar. Journal of Asian Educational Change.

Owu-Ewie, Charles; Eshun, Eric S. (2015). Comparative Study of Basic Education Systems. African Journal of Educational Studies.

Paris, Scott G. (2019). Global Perspectives on Constructivist and SEL Approaches. International Handbook of Education.

Paris, Scott G. (2019). Growth Mindset and SEL in Global Education. International Handbook of Education.

Phattharathanasut, Anucha; Brehm, Will (2025). Centralized and Decentralized Structures in Southeast Asian Education. Comparative Education Journal.

Priestley, Mark; Biesta, Gert (2013). Reinventing the Curriculum: New Trends in Curriculum Policy and Practice. Bloomsbury Academic.

Shah, Ritesh; Lopes Cardozo, Mieke T.A. (2018). Transformative Approaches in Education Governance. Comparative Education Review.

Stenning, David (2022). Myanmar's Education Master Plan and K12 Reform. Asia Pacific Education Policy Journal.

Tyler, Ralph W. (1949). Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. University of Chicago Press.

UNESCO (2017). Rethinking Curriculum in the 21st Century. Paris: UNESCO.

Wolhuter, Charl (1997). Classification of Educational Systems: A Cross-national Approach. International Education Journal.

Zajda, Joseph (2016). Globalisation and Education Reforms. Springer.

APPENDIX

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Section (A): **Demographic Information**

1. Gender:

   [ ] Male [ ] Female [ ] Other

2. Age group:

   [ ] Below 25

   [ ] 25 – 35

   [ ] 36 – 45

   [ ] Above 45

3. Years of teaching experience:

   [ ] Less than 5 years

   [ ] 5 – 10 years

   [ ] 11 – 20 years

   [ ] More than 20 years

4. Highest educational qualification:

   [ ] Diploma

   [ ] Bachelor's Degree

   [ ] Master's Degree or above

5. Type of school:

   [ ] Public/Government School

   [ ] Private School

6. Subject(s) taught: _____

7. Grade level currently teaching:

   [ ] Primary

   [ ] Middle

   [ ] High school

8. Location of school:

   [ ] Urban

   [ ] Rural

9. Participation in previous curriculum training:

   [ ] Yes

   [ ] No

10. Access to teaching resources at school:

   [ ] Adequate

   [ ] Inadequate

Section (B): **Teachers' Awareness and Understanding of Curriculum Reform**

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I am aware of the goals of the recent curriculum reform.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	I understand the key changes introduced in the new curriculum.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	The reform objectives have been clearly communicated to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	I am confident about implementing the new curriculum content.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	I have received enough training related to the curriculum changes.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6	The curriculum reform aligns with national education policies.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7	I understand how the new curriculum affects my teaching methods.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8	The curriculum reform considers student diversity and needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

9	I keep myself updated about curriculum developments.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10	I feel adequately informed about assessment changes in the curriculum.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Section (B): **Teachers' Perceptions of Curriculum Effectiveness**

No	**Statement**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
11	The new curriculum meets students' learning needs effectively.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12	The curriculum content is relevant and up-to-date.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13	The curriculum promotes critical thinking skills among students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14	The curriculum allows flexibility to adapt lessons as needed.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15	The curriculum supports development of students' problem-solving skills.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16	The new curriculum improves students' engagement and motivation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17	The curriculum encourages the use of innovative teaching methods.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18	The curriculum facilitates student-centered learning approaches.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

19	The curriculum changes have positively impacted educational quality.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20	The curriculum is suitable for the local context and culture.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Section (B): **Challenges Encountered in Curriculum Implementation**
(Please tick all that apply)

Dear Teacher, please select all challenges you have encountered while implementing the new curriculum. You may tick more than one box.

☐ 1. I did not receive sufficient training on the new curriculum.

☐ 2. There is a lack of adequate teaching materials and resources.

☐ 3. I have limited time for lesson planning and preparation.

☐ 4. Large class sizes make it difficult to deliver the curriculum effectively.

☐ 5. I receive inadequate support from school administration.

☐ 6. Many students lack readiness or motivation for the new curriculum.

☐ 7. There are technical difficulties with digital or ICT resources.

☐ 8. The curriculum content is too complex or demanding.

☐ 9. There are limited opportunities for collaboration with other teachers.

☐ 10. Guidelines from education authorities are frequently changed or unclear.

☐ 11. My school lacks proper internet access for digital learning.

☐ 12. Digital tools are not user-friendly or well-integrated.

☐ 13. Electricity interruptions affect teaching with technology.

☐ 14. There is no dedicated space for group activities.

☐ 15. My school lacks multimedia facilities like projectors or smartboards.

☐ 16. I am not confident in using online teaching platforms.

☐ 17. There is little follow-up after initial training sessions.

☐ 18. Assessment criteria are unclear or inconsistent.

☐ 19. School infrastructure (classrooms, furniture) is inadequate.

☐ 20. Instructional supervision is infrequent or not supportive.

☐ 21. I face language barriers when teaching new curriculum content.

☐ 22. Some students struggle with English language instructions.

☐ 23. Teacher guides are not aligned with student textbooks.

☐ 24. No peer mentoring system is in place.

☐ 25. Changes were introduced too quickly without preparation.

☐ 26. I do not have access to printed curriculum manuals.

☐ 27. I receive little feedback on my teaching.

☐ 28. Students lack access to textbooks or learning aids.

☐ 29. Curriculum doesn't suit rural or low-resource schools.

☐ 30. Exam systems do not align with the reformed curriculum.

☐ 31. Parents are not adequately informed or supportive of curriculum changes.

☐ 32. There is limited parental engagement in students' learning.

☐ 33. Cultural factors make some topics hard to teach.

☐ 34. Stakeholders were not consulted during curriculum development.

☐ 35. Teacher morale is low due to workload and stress.

☐ 36. Salary or promotion structures do not support reform.

☐ 37. Administrative workload reduces teaching time.

☐ 38. Local languages are not considered in curriculum materials.

☐ 39. Community support for education reform is limited.

☐ 40. Curriculum lacks focus on life skills or vocational content.

☐ 41. The curriculum does not match students' real-life experiences.

☐ 42. The curriculum is not inclusive of diverse learners.

☐ 43. No special support for students with learning difficulties.

☐ 44. Student-centred learning is hard to manage in large classes.

☐ 45. Teacher input in curriculum design was not requested.

☐ 46. New teaching methods require more time than allowed.

☐ 47. Curriculum goals are too ambitious for current school capacity.

☐ 48. I lack confidence in delivering certain subject areas.

☐ 49. Instructional materials are not updated regularly.

☐ 50. Access to ongoing training is limited in remote areas.

☐ 51. There is a lack of curriculum-related workshops or refresher training.

☐ 52. No clear monitoring or evaluation of reform progress.

☐ 53. Some subjects lack trained specialist teachers.

☐ 54. There is a lack of student feedback mechanisms.

☐ 55. Teachers are not involved in selecting teaching materials.

☐ 56. Textbook distribution is delayed or inconsistent.

☐ 57. Education policies change too frequently.

☐ 58. Timetables are overloaded with too many subjects.

☐ 59. There is little coordination between curriculum and extracurricular programs.

☐ 60. Curriculum implementation varies too much between schools.

Thank you for your co-operation.