ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Instructional Leadership Practices and their Influence on Curriculum Implementation in Basic Education

Rhea Vianca O. Molina

Cebu Technological University - Main Campus

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150600183

Received: 04 July 2026; Accepted: 09 July 2026; Published: 20 July 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined instructional leadership practices of school leaders and their influence on curriculum implementation in secondary basic education. Anchored in the premise that school leadership effectiveness is central to improving teaching and learning outcomes, this analysis examines how principals and school heads exercise instructional supervision, set academic goals, support teacher professional development, and foster a conducive learning environment. Using a mixed-methods design, the study gathered qualitative data from interviews with school leaders (4) and quantitative survey responses from teachers (64) to examine leadership practices and curriculum delivery alignment. Findings indicate that strong instructional leadership significantly enhances curriculum implementation when leaders actively engage in classroom observations, provide constructive feedback, and promote collaborative professional learning among teachers. The area of research is instructional leadership and curriculum implementation in secondary basic education. Findings indicate that a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship exists between instructional leadership and effective curriculum implementation when leaders actively engage in classroom observations, provide constructive feedback, and promote collaborative professional learning among teachers. Effective school leadership also strengthens alignment between curriculum standards and classroom practices, improving instructional quality and learner outcomes in secondary basic education. The study's outputs are empirical evidence that proactive instructional leadership marked by regular classroom observation, constructive feedback, and collaborative professional learning has a positive, statistically significant effect on curriculum implementation in secondary basic education, and a set of practical recommendations for school leaders to protect instructional time

Keywords: Educational Management and Development, Descriptive Correlational, Instructional leadership, Curriculum Implementation, Academic performance, Alicia Bohol, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

In the context of secondary basic education, curriculum implementation often presents various challenges such as adapting to curriculum reforms, addressing diverse learning needs of students, and maintaining high standards of teaching. Teachers may encounter difficulties in interpreting curriculum guidelines, integrating new teaching strategies, and assessing student learning effectively. In this regard, the leadership practices of school heads become essential in providing direction, motivation, and professional support to teachers. Through classroom supervision, mentoring, and collaborative decision-making, school heads can help strengthen teachers' capacity to implement the curriculum effectively. Although the educational leadership literature has acknowledged the significance of instructional leadership, it is still necessary to investigate how school heads' instructional leadership practices affect secondary school curriculum implementation. Understanding this link can help improve leadership techniques and raise the standard of curriculum implementation in secondary basic education. In order to improve teaching and learning procedures in schools, this study intends to investigate the instructional leadership practices of school heads and ascertain their impact on curriculum implementation in secondary basic education. The increasing emphasis on instructional leadership as a determinant of effective curriculum implementation has been widely recognized in educational research.

Across global, national, and local contexts, school leaders are expected to transition from administrative managers to instructional leaders who actively shape teaching and learning processes. While numerous studies

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

have examined instructional leadership practices, there remains a significant gap in understanding how these practices concretely influence curriculum implementation, particularly in secondary basic education settings. This study seeks to address these gaps by situating the problem within international, national, local, and environmental contexts.

The impact of instructional leadership on school effectiveness has been thoroughly examined on a global scale. According to academics like Hallinger and Murphy (2001), instructional leadership includes managing instructional programs, defining school mission, and fostering a supportive learning environment. Similarly, research in countries such as the United States, Australia, and Singapore highlights that strong instructional leadership contributes to improved student outcomes and teacher performance. However, despite the breadth of international studies, several gaps persist. First, much of the existing literature focuses on student achievement outcomes rather than the process of curriculum implementation itself. While improved test scores are often attributed to effective leadership, there is limited exploration of how instructional leaders directly influence teachers' interpretation, adaptation, and delivery of the curriculum.

In the context of 21st-century education, school heads are increasingly recognized not only as administrative managers but as key instructional leaders who directly shape the quality of teaching and learning in schools. Instructional leadership has been identified as one of the most significant factors influencing school improvement and student achievement (Hallinger, 2005). In basic education, the effective implementation of the curriculum depends largely on how school leaders guide, support, and monitor instructional practices within their institutions. According to the Department of Education (DepEd), school heads are expected to fulfill roles that include curriculum leadership, instructional supervision, and fostering a culture of professional learning (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020). However, disparities in curriculum implementation across schools suggest variations in the quality of instructional leadership exercised by school heads. Poor curriculum implementation has been linked to insufficient guidance, lack of instructional feedback, and weak alignment of teaching strategies with curricular goals (Bush, 2008). As such, examining the instructional leadership practices of school heads is essential to understanding how these practices influence curriculum delivery in basic education settings. The study's key finding is that school principals actively define and influence the school's instructional mission by fusing official curricular policy objectives with their personal convictions. Principals use their own educational agendas to interpret curriculum improvements rather than merely implementing administrative directives. They then share this vision with teachers at meetings and retreats. This makes it easier to match the goals of curricular modifications with the school's teaching focus (Ralebese, M. D., Jita, L., & Badmus, O. T. 2025).

When school heads demonstrate strong instructional leadership, they enhance teacher motivation, improve instructional quality, and ensure better alignment with curriculum standards, all of which contribute to improved student outcomes. Given these considerations, this study aims to explore the instructional leadership practices of school heads and analyze their influence on curriculum implementation in basic education. The findings are expected to contribute valuable insights to educational policy and leadership development programs, particularly in strengthening the capacity of school leaders to serve as instructional catalysts in their respective schools.

Therefore, instructional leadership practices of school heads, in collaboration with teachers, play a crucial role in shaping the effectiveness of curriculum implementation in secondary basic education. As instructional leaders, school heads are expected to guide, support, and monitor teaching and learning processes, ensuring that curriculum standards are clearly understood and properly executed in the classroom. Through practices such as setting clear academic goals, conducting regular classroom observations, providing constructive feedback, and facilitating continuous professional development, school heads influence how teachers interpret and deliver the curriculum. At the same time, teachers, as direct implementers, translate these leadership directions into actual classroom practices, adapting instructional strategies to meet diverse learner needs. The interaction between leadership practices and teacher engagement determines the extent to which the intended curriculum is faithfully and effectively implemented. Consequently, strong and responsive instructional leadership fosters alignment between policy and practice, enhances teacher competence, and ultimately improves the quality of curriculum delivery in secondary schools.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Statement of the Problem

This research assessed the Instructional leadership practices and the effectiveness of Curriculum Implementation in Secondary Basic Education at Alicia District in Division of Bohol, for school year 2025-2026 as basis for the Enhanced Curriculum Implementation Plan.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:

1.1 Years of service,

1.2 Designation, and

1.3 Civil Status?

2. To what extent do the school heads utilize the different strategies in curriculum implementation?

   2.1 Leadership Support for Teachers Development, and

   2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation of Curriculum Delivery?

3. To extent do the school heads encountered the challenges in implementation?

   3.1 Resource Availability and Allocation, and

   3.2 Teachers Resistance to change?

4.Is there a significant relationship between the dimensions of curriculum implementation strategies and the challenges encountered in implementation?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a descriptive-correlational research design to explore the instructional leadership practices of school heads and assess the status of curriculum implementation in secondary basic education. The descriptive aspect of the research will identify and characterize the leadership practices, while the correlational component will investigate the relationship between these practices and the effectiveness of curriculum implementation. The Descriptive-Correlational design is the most suitable for the research on "Instructional Leadership Practices and Their Influence on Curriculum Implementation in Secondary Basic Education" as it effectively aligns with the study's objectives of describing existing leadership practices and examining their relationship with curriculum implementation.

Design

This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the instructional leadership practices of school heads and their influence on curriculum implementation in secondary basic education. The descriptive component of the design will allow the researcher to systematically describe the prevailing instructional leadership practices demonstrated by school heads, including supervision of instruction, curriculum management, teacher development, and monitoring of student performance. It will also provide a detailed assessment of how the curriculum is implemented in secondary schools under their leadership. The use of a descriptive-correlational research design is appropriate for this study because it allows the researcher to both systematically describe existing conditions and examine the relationships between variables without manipulation. In the context of this study, it is essential first to describe the instructional leadership practices of school heads—such as instructional supervision, curriculum management, teacher professional development, and performance monitoring—as they naturally occur in actual school settings. The descriptive component

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

provides a clear and objective profile of these leadership practices and the current state of curriculum implementation in secondary basic education.

Flow of the Study

This study was conducted in four public secondary schools within Alicia District, DIvision of Bohol. These schools were chosen based on accessibility, school performance data, and administrative willingness to participate.

Input. In the Input phase, the study considers three major elements: improve teaching performance, enhance student learning outcomes, and support teachers through professional development.

Process. The Process involves the systematic collection of data using validated research instruments, followed by the application of appropriate statistical treatments such as descriptive analysis and correlational testing. Through this process, the study identifies patterns and relationships among the variables, allowing for a deeper understanding of how learning strategies and challenges influence academic achievement.

Output. The Output of this study is the development of an Curriculum implementation specifically designed for School Principals. This plan will be informed by the actual data gathered and analyzed, ensuring that the recommendations are context-based, relevant, and applicable to classroom realities. The enhancement plan is expected to serve as a practical tool for teachers, school administrators, and other education stakeholders in designing interventions that strengthen learner performance at the foundational level.

Environment

The study was conducted in four secondary schools, all public basic education institutions, located in Alicia, Bohol. Alicia is a fourth-class municipality in the province of Bohol, situated in the Central Visayas region of the Philippines. The town is primarily residential and agricultural, with a growing community that relies heavily on education to provide opportunities for its youth. The selected schools operate under the supervision and guidance of the Department of Education (DepEd) Division of Bohol, following national policies, curriculum standards, and instructional programs mandated by the DepEd. These schools are the municipality's main providers of secondary basic education, serving students from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds. These schools are perfect places to study the instructional leadership practices of school heads and their impact on curriculum implementation because of their close-knit teacher-student relationships, collaborative teaching methods, and active involvement of school heads in curriculum planning and instructional supervision.

Respondents

For this study the sample was evenly allocated so that each of the four participating schools in the Alicia District — Katipunan High School, Cayacay High School, La Hacienda National High School, and Alicia Technical Vocational High School — contributes 16 respondents, yielding a total sample of 64 respondents. The 16 per-school quota is filled by randomly selecting 1 school head and 15 teachers at each site, which preserves parity across institutions and reduces selection bias while still focusing the inquiry on those directly responsible for curriculum delivery and leadership. This balanced design makes comparisons between schools straightforward, helps ensure that differences in findings reflect real variation in instructional leadership and curriculum implementation rather than unequal sample sizes, and supports clearer reporting of school-level patterns.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the profile of the respondents in terms of years of service, designation, and civil status. Understanding these characteristics provides a clearer view of the respondents' background and their context in relation to curriculum implementation.

Years of Service

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Years of service describe the length of teaching experience of the respondents, reflecting their level of professional exposure, familiarity with curriculum implementation, and capacity to adapt to instructional and educational changes.

Table 2

Years of Service

Years of Service	Frequency	Percentage
16 years above	8	12.50
11-15	10	15.62
6-10	34	53.12
1-5	12	18.75
Total	64	100.00

Table 2 shows that the majority of respondents have 6–10 years of service, comprising 53.12% of the total, followed by those with 1–5 years (18.75%), 11–15 years (15.62%), and 16 years and above (12.50%). This indicates that most respondents are in their mid-level teaching experience, suggesting that they have already developed foundational teaching skills while still being open to professional growth and innovation.

Designation

This refers to the professional rank or position held by the respondents, indicating their level of responsibility, teaching experience, and involvement in curriculum implementation and school-related instructional practices.

Table 3

Designation

Designation	Frequency	Percentage
TIII	26	40.62
TII	9	14.06
TI	29	45.31
Total	64	100.00

Table 3 shows that the largest group of respondents are Teacher I, with 45.31%, followed closely by Teacher III at 40.62%, while Teacher II comprises 14.06%. This indicates that most respondents are in the entry and advanced teaching ranks, suggesting a mix of relatively newer and more experienced teachers in the school. The presence of a large proportion of Teacher I and Teacher III respondents implies that curriculum implementation is being carried out by teachers with varying levels of professional experience and responsibilities.

Civil Status

Civil status describes the personal background of the respondents in terms of marital condition, which may influence their perspectives, responsibilities, and level of engagement.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Table 4

Civil Status

Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	17	26.56
Married	44	68.75
Widowed	3	4.69
Total	64	100.00

Table 4 shows that the majority of respondents are married, comprising 68.75%, followed by single respondents at 26.56%, and a small proportion of widowed respondents at 4.69%. Result indicate that most teachers have family responsibilities, which may influence their time management, workload balance, and professional engagement.

Extent do the School Heads Utilize the Different Strategies in Curriculum Implementation

This section presents the extent to which school heads utilize the different strategies in curriculum implementation as perceived by the respondents. The results are shown using mean, standard deviation, and verbal description.

Leadership Support for Teachers Development

Leadership support for teachers' development reflects the role of school heads in promoting professional growth, enhancing instructional competencies, and providing opportunities for continuous learning.

Table 5

Leadership Support for Teachers Development

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Description
The school head encourages teachers to participate in professional development programs such as seminars and workshops.	4.66	0.57	Strongly Agree
The school head provides opportunities for teachers to attend training relevant to their teaching field.	4.61	0.63	Strongly Agree
The school head supports teachers in pursuing further studies or graduate education.	4.64	0.6	Strongly Agree
The school head allocates time for teachers to participate in professional learning activities.	4.62	0.63	Strongly Agree
The school head provides guidance to improve teachers' instructional strategies.	4.61	0.61	Strongly Agree
The school head provides adequate instructional materials to support teachers' professional growth.	4.56	0.61	Strongly Agree

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

The school head ensures that teachers have access to teaching resources and learning technologies.	4.61	0.58	Strongly Agree
The school head provides support for teachers to attend conferences or professional meetings.	4.69	0.56	Strongly Agree
The school head motivates teachers to improve their teaching competencies.	4.62	0.6	Strongly Agree
The school head promotes a positive environment that encourages continuous professional learning.	4.69	0.59	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.63	0.6	Strongly Agree

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

Table 5 shows that the respondents strongly agree that school heads provide substantial leadership support for teachers' development, as reflected in the grand mean of 4.63 and standard deviation of 0.60. This indicates that school heads are highly supportive in encouraging teachers to attend seminars and workshops, pursue further studies, access instructional materials and technologies, and participate in professional learning activities.

The highest-rated indicators, "The school head provides support for teachers to attend conferences or professional meetings" and "The school head promotes a positive environment that encourages continuous professional learning," both obtained a mean of 4.69, showing that professional growth and a supportive learning climate are strongly emphasized.

These findings affirm that school heads play an active role in strengthening teacher competence, which is consistent with the view that effective school leadership promotes teacher learning and improves instructional practice (Leithwood et al., 2020).

Likewise, leadership that prioritizes professional development helps build teachers' capacity to respond to curriculum demands and instructional improvement (Fullan, 2020). The findings imply that school heads should continue sustaining professional development initiatives, access to learning opportunities, and supportive leadership practices, as these are essential in enhancing teacher performance and ensuring effective curriculum implementation.

Monitoring and Evaluation of Curriculum Delivery

Monitoring and evaluation of curriculum delivery refer to the processes used by school heads to supervise instruction, assess teaching effectiveness, and ensure alignment with curriculum standards.

Table 6

Monitoring and Evaluation of Curriculum Delivery

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Description
The school regularly monitors the delivery of the curriculum across all subjects.	4.62	0.58	Strongly Agree
Teachers are provided with feedback regarding the effectiveness of their curriculum delivery.	4.56	0.64	Strongly Agree

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

There is a clear schedule for regular monitoring of curriculum implementation in classrooms.	4.58	0.61	Strongly Agree
The school leadership ensures that all teachers follow the prescribed curriculum guidelines.	4.59	0.53	Strongly Agree
Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their teaching practices regularly.	4.61	0.55	Strongly Agree
Teachers have opportunities to evaluate their own performance in delivering the curriculum.	4.59	0.61	Strongly Agree
Teachers are provided with time for self-assessment and curriculum delivery improvements.	4.59	0.58	Strongly Agree
Teachers are actively involved in the evaluation process of their curriculum delivery.	4.52	0.64	Strongly Agree
Teachers are supported in adjusting their teaching methods based on evaluation outcomes.	4.5	0.69	Strongly Agree
Students' performance is regularly assessed to evaluate the effectiveness of curriculum delivery.	4.59	0.61	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.58	0.6	Strongly Agree

Table 6 shows that the respondents strongly agree on the effective monitoring and evaluation of curriculum delivery, as reflected in the grand mean of 4.58 and standard deviation of 0.60. This indicates that school heads consistently ensure that curriculum implementation is regularly monitored, teachers receive feedback, and classroom practices are aligned with prescribed curriculum standards.

The highest-rated indicator, "The school regularly monitors the delivery of the curriculum across all subjects," obtained a mean of 4.62 and a standard deviation of 0.58, suggesting that systematic supervision is a common practice in the school.

This finding supports the view that instructional monitoring and feedback are essential leadership functions that improve teaching quality and ensure curriculum fidelity (Hallinger, 2021). The findings imply that school heads should continue sustaining strong monitoring and evaluation systems, as these are important in maintaining curriculum quality, guiding instructional adjustments, and improving overall teaching effectiveness.

Challenges Encountered in the Implementation

The challenges encountered in implementation refer to the difficulties experienced by school heads in carrying out curriculum implementation effectively. These challenges may arise in terms of resource availability and allocation, as well as teachers' resistance to change. Understanding these concerns provides insight into barriers that may affect the successful delivery and sustainability of curriculum implementation

Resource Availability and Allocation

Resource availability and allocation refer to the provision, accessibility, and distribution of instructional materials, financial support, and teaching resources necessary for curriculum implementation.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

Table 8

Resource Availability and Allocation

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Description
The school provides enough instructional materials such as textbooks, workbooks, and guides.	4.23	0.77	Strongly Agree
There is a sufficient number of technological tools (e.g., computers, television, etc.) to aid in teaching.	4.17	0.83	Agree
The school provides adequate science, arts, and physical education resources for teachers.	3.98	0.77	Agree
Resources are allocated fairly among different departments in the school.	4.31	0.87	Strongly Agree
The allocation of resources is based on the needs of the teachers and students.	4.39	0.79	Strongly Agree
The school leadership ensures that resource allocation is transparent and well-communicated.	4.41	0.71	Strongly Agree
The school allocates a sufficient budget for professional development and training of teachers.	4.41	0.73	Strongly Agree
The school has a clear plan for the allocation and utilization of financial resources.	4.44	0.73	Strongly Agree
Students' performance is regularly assessed to evaluate the effectiveness of curriculum delivery.	4.53	0.62	Strongly Agree
Students' can describe the actual experiences and strategies	4.41	0.71	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.28	0.78	Strongly Agree

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

Table 8 shows that the respondents strongly agree on the adequacy of resource availability and allocation, as reflected in the grand mean of 4.28 and standard deviation of 0.78. This indicates that the school generally provides instructional materials, allocates resources fairly, and maintains clear plans for the distribution and utilization of funds needed for curriculum implementation. The highest-rated indicator, "Students' performance is regularly assessed to evaluate the effectiveness of curriculum delivery," obtained a mean of 4.53 and a standard deviation of 0.62, while indicators on transparency, budget allocation, and fairness in resource distribution also received strong agreement. However, the indicators related to the sufficiency of technological tools and specialized resources for science, arts, and physical education were rated relatively lower, suggesting areas that still need improvement.

This finding is consistent with the view that access to adequate instructional resources and learning materials is essential to support teaching quality and curriculum implementation (UNESCO, 2021). It also supports the argument that strategic resource management enables schools to create more effective and equitable learning environments (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020). The findings imply that school heads should continue

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

strengthening resource planning and transparent allocation while prioritizing technological and subject-specific resources to improve curriculum delivery and support better teaching and learning outcomes.

Teachers Resistance to Change

Teachers' resistance to change refers to the hesitation or reluctance of teachers to adopt new teaching methods, innovations, and curriculum reforms.

Table 9

Teachers Resistance to Change

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Description
I prefer to continue using the teaching methods I am already familiar with.	4.31	0.81	Strongly Agree
I believe that change can lead to better teaching and learning outcomes if it is implemented properly.	4.72	0.52	Strongly Agree
I feel that adopting new teaching methods will require too much effort and time.	4.39	0.79	Strongly Agree
I believe that changes in teaching methods may negatively affect the learning outcomes of my students.	3.7	1.31	Agree
I feel unsure about my ability to implement new teaching strategies effectively.	3.64	1.15	Agree
I am afraid that I will not be able to keep up with the demands of new teaching technologies.	3.41	1.34	Moderately Agree
I am concerned that I will not be able to successfully adapt to new curriculum changes.	3.48	1.25	Agree
I observe that most of my colleagues are reluctant to adopt new teaching methods.	3.55	1.21	Agree
I am motivated to change my teaching methods if the new strategies align with my educational values.	4.44	0.73	Strongly Agree
Students' performance is regularly assessed to evaluate the effectiveness of curriculum delivery.	4.5	0.73	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	4.01	0.98	Agree

Table 9 shows that the respondents agree that teachers' resistance to change is a challenge in curriculum implementation, as reflected in the grand mean of 4.01 and standard deviation of 0.98. This indicates that while teachers generally recognize the value of change, they still experience hesitation in adopting new methods, technologies, and curriculum adjustments. The highest-rated indicator, "I believe that change can lead to better teaching and learning outcomes if it is implemented properly obtained a mean of 4.72 and a standard deviation of 0.52, suggesting that teachers are not entirely opposed to change but are more concerned about how it is Introduced and supported. At the same time, indicators related to effort, uncertainty, and adaptation to new technologies also received notable agreement, showing that resistance may stem from perceived difficulty and

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

lack of confidence rather than refusal alone. This supports the view that educational change is more likely to succeed when teachers are given adequate support, clarity, and capacity-building opportunities (Fullan, 2020). It also aligns with research showing that teachers' beliefs, confidence, and access to support influence their willingness to adopt new practices (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010). The findings imply that school heads should provide continuous guidance, training, and encouragement to help teachers manage change more confidently and reduce resistance during curriculum implementation.

Significant Relationship Between the Dimensions of Curriculum Implementation Strategies and Challenges Encountered in Implementation

The significant relationship between the dimensions of curriculum implementation strategies and the challenges encountered in implementation was examined to determine whether the extent of leadership support and monitoring practices is associated with resource-related concerns and teachers' resistance to change.

Table 11

Relationship between the Dimensions of Curriculum Implementation Strategies and Challenges Encountered in the Implementation

Variables	rho-value	p-value	Degree of Relationship	Remarks	Decision
Curriculum Implementation Strategies and Challenges Encountered in Implementation	0.657	<0.001	Moderate positive	Significant	Reject the Null Hypothesis

Table 11 presents the relationship between the dimensions of curriculum implementation strategies and the challenges encountered in implementation. The result revealed a significant relationship, with a rho-value of 0.657 and a p-value less than 0.001, indicating a moderate positive relationship. This means that as the extent of curriculum implementation strategies such as leadership support and monitoring practices increases, the challenges encountered, particularly in terms of resource availability and teachers' resistance to change, also tend to increase. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This finding suggests that as school heads become more actively involved in implementing strategies, they also become more aware of and engaged with the challenges present in the process. It supports the idea that increased leadership involvement does not eliminate challenges but rather exposes areas that require attention and improvement. This is consistent with the perspective that educational leaders play a critical role in identifying and addressing implementation barriers (Spillane, 2020). Moreover, it aligns with findings that intensified instructional leadership often brings greater recognition of systemic and operational challenges in schools (Hallinger, 2021). The findings imply that school heads should not only strengthen curriculum implementation strategies but also develop proactive approaches in managing emerging challenges. Addressing issues related to resources and resistance to change through planning, support systems, and capacity-building initiatives can lead to more effective and sustainable curriculum implementation.

Summary

This study determined the profile of the respondents in terms of years of service, designation, and civil status. It also examined the extent to which school heads utilize curriculum implementation strategies in terms of leadership support for teachers' development and monitoring and evaluation of curriculum delivery. Further, it identified the challenges encountered in implementation in terms of resource availability and allocation and teachers' resistance to change. Finally, the study determined the significant relationship between curriculum implementation strategies and the challenges encountered in implementation. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed using a structured questionnaire. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the profile of the respondents, while weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the extent of strategies utilized and challenges encountered. Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient was used to test the significant relationship between the variables.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

FINDINGS

The profile of the respondents shows that most teachers have six to ten years of service, indicating that the majority are already in their mid-level teaching experience. In terms of designation, Teacher I comprised the largest group, followed closely by Teacher III, while Teacher II represented the smallest proportion. With respect to civil status, most respondents were married, followed by single respondents, with only a small number of widowed teachers. These findings suggest that the respondents represent a mix of relatively experienced teachers with varying professional ranks and personal responsibilities.

The findings revealed that school heads highly utilize curriculum implementation strategies. Leadership support for teachers' development was rated strongly agree, indicating that school heads are highly supportive in encouraging professional growth, providing access to training, and motivating teachers to improve their competencies. Similarly, monitoring and evaluation of curriculum delivery also obtained a strongly agree rating, showing that school heads consistently supervise instruction, provide feedback, and ensure alignment with curriculum standards.

The findings further showed that school heads encountered challenges in curriculum implementation, particularly in terms of resource availability and allocation and teachers' resistance to change. Resource availability and allocation was rated strongly agree, indicating that concerns related to instructional materials, technology, and resource planning were strongly felt. Teachers' resistance to change was rated agree, which suggests that although teachers generally recognize the value of change, hesitation in adopting new methods, technologies, and curriculum adjustments still exists. These findings imply that both resource concerns and resistance to change remain important issues in the implementation process.

The test of relationship revealed a significant relationship between curriculum implementation strategies and the challenges encountered in implementation. The result indicated a moderate positive relationship, which means that as the extent of curriculum implementation strategies increases, the challenges encountered in implementation also tend to increase. This suggests that stronger leadership support and more intensive monitoring practices may also be associated with greater recognition of implementation barriers such as resource constraints and teachers' resistance to changes.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the respondents are generally mid-career teachers occupying different professional ranks and mostly carrying family responsibilities. School heads highly utilize curriculum implementation strategies, particularly in supporting teachers' professional development and in monitoring and evaluating curriculum delivery. At the same time, implementation is affected by challenges related to resource availability and allocation and, to a lesser extent, teachers' resistance to change. The significant relationship between curriculum implementation strategies and the challenges encountered implies that the implementation process becomes more complex as school heads intensify their efforts in curriculum delivery. Thus, effective curriculum implementation requires not only strong leadership practices but also deliberate actions to address resource limitations and reduce resistance to change.

Recommendation

School heads are encouraged to continuously strengthen instructional leadership support for teachers' professional development by sustaining seminars, training programs, mentoring activities, and other learning opportunities that enhance teacher competence and instructional effectiveness. Schools may also reinforce their monitoring and evaluation systems through regular classroom supervision, structured feedback mechanisms, and reflective practices that promote continuous improvement in curriculum delivery. In addition, school administrators may prioritize effective resource planning and transparent allocation of instructional materials, technological tools, and subject-specific resources to ensure the effective implementation of the curriculum. Moreover, interventions such as orientation sessions, coaching, and capacity-building programs may be provided to increase teachers' confidence and reduce resistance to curriculum changes and the integration of new teaching technologies.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VI, June 2026

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership. Journal of Educational Administration, 38(2), 130–141. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320082
2. Bush, T. (2008). Leadership and management development in education. SAGE Publications.
3. Department of Education. (2020). Guidelines on the provision of learning resources and learning tools and equipment for public schools (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020).
4. Gao, C., Khalid, S., Cai, L., & Tadesse, E. (2023). Integrated leadership for coherent school improvement in Ethiopia: The moderating role of transformational leadership on the relationship between instructional leadership and student academic achievement mediated by the school improvement process. Psychology in the Schools, 61(2), 455–474.
5. Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4(3), 221–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793
6. Hallinger, P. (2021). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 49(1), 20–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219896074
7. Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217–247.
8. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 40(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077
9. Ralebese, M. D., Jita, L., & Badmus, O. T. (2025). Examining primary school principals' instructional leadership practices: A case study on curriculum reform and implementation. Education Sciences, 15(1), 70. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010070
10. Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(5), 635–674.
11. Southworth, G. (2002). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. School Leadership & Management, 22(1), 73–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430220143042
12. Sumamo, Y. M. (2026). The contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices in governmental secondary schools of Wolaita Zone, South Ethiopia Regional State. Research on Humanities and Social Sciences. https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/RHSS/article/view/63768
13. Tian, M., Risku, M., & Collin, K. (2020). A meta-analysis of distributed leadership from 2002 to 2017: Theory development, empirical evidence, and future research focus. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 48(1), 116–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218781063