

An Examination on Leadership Effectiveness of Implementation of Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Vilma V. Dela Cruz ¹

1 – Public Schools District Supervisor - Department of Education, SDO - Quezon Province
vilma.delacruz@deped.gov.ph

Publication Date: May 3, 2026

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.20001887](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20001887)

Abstract

The study examined the leadership effectiveness of school heads in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in selected public elementary schools in the Schools Division of Quezon. Using a quantitative descriptive-comparative research design, the study involved 100 public elementary school teachers as respondents. Data were gathered through a validated researcher-developed survey questionnaire that measured leadership effectiveness across five domains: leading strategically, managing school operations, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections, along with a profile of age, sex, and length of service. Statistical treatments included mean and analysis of variance.

Findings revealed that most respondents were young- to mid-career teachers aged 20–35, with the largest proportion the 20–25 age group. Female teachers slightly outnumbered males, and most respondents had 11–15 years of teaching experience. School heads were rated as Much Effective across all leadership domains during the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. Strong leadership practices were observed in research-based leadership, instructional supervision, staff mentoring on governance, use of data and feedback, and parent-community partnerships. Lower ratings were noted in collaboration with higher-level education leaders, financial and operational sustainability, data-driven decision-making, the promotion of lifelong learning, and the use of digital platforms. No significant differences in leadership effectiveness were found when grouped by age, sex, and length of service across most domains, except in Developing Self and Others, where age showed a significant difference. Overall, the results indicate consistent leadership effectiveness among school heads, as perceived by teachers, during the early phase of the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.

Keywords: *Leadership Effectiveness; Revised K to 10 Curriculum; School Heads; Instructional Leadership, Significant Differences*

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and rationale

The role of school heads in the Philippines is pivotal in managing school operations, supporting teachers, and overseeing teaching and learning processes. They are crucial during periods of curriculum reform, as they are responsible for adapting instructional practices, aligning assessments, and providing guidance to ensure that educational reforms are successfully implemented. However, studies reveal that many school heads still face significant gaps in both managerial and instructional leadership skills, which hampers their ability to supervise instruction and respond effectively to the demands of reform. The rigid administrative structures and limited capacity to adjust these systems further complicate their leadership efforts (Madamba et al., 2022; Zakaria et al., 2021).

The Department of Education's adoption of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) under DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020, was intended to establish a clear framework for leadership expectations. This framework includes leading strategically, managing school operations, focusing on teaching and learning, and developing self and others. However, despite these well-defined standards, their consistent and effective implementation remains a challenge. Studies show discrepancies between school heads' self-assessments and teachers' perceptions of leadership, particularly regarding supervision and communication. Teachers who are engaged in participatory governance tend to show higher commitment and better evaluations of leadership effectiveness, indicating the importance of inclusive decision-making in improving school leadership (Gonzales & Lingat, 2021; Mercado & Aguinaldo, 2023; Calderaru et al., 2023; Ladra & Gorospe, 2025).

The ongoing curriculum reform in the Philippines, particularly the Revised K to 10 Curriculum introduced through DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024, adds further complexity to the leadership role. School heads are expected to guide teachers through the curriculum transition, but compliance with these expectations remains low. Factors such as inadequate training, unclear implementation guidelines, and insufficient instructional resources exacerbate the challenges school heads face. Evidence suggests that low ratings from teachers are often linked to weak instructional leadership, poor organizational climate, and diminished instructional quality (Prestoza & Naldoza, 2025; Ralebese et al., 2025; Grissom et al., 2021). This gap in leadership effectiveness during early curriculum reform highlights the need for further research to understand how school heads manage their responsibilities and improve their performance during periods of change (OECD, 2020; Ta-Ala, 2025).

Review of related literature

Existing literature consistently shows that teachers and school leaders exhibit wide variation in age, gender, educational attainment, and length of service across local and international contexts. In the Philippines, the teaching force spans early-career to veteran stages, reflecting both workforce renewal and professional stability, a pattern also observed in OECD countries, while Japan faces concerns related to an aging educator population (SciSpace, 2024; Mislang Sison & Junio, 2019; OECD, 2021; MEXT, 2020). Studies further agree on the feminization of the profession, with women dominating teaching roles and, in the Philippine context, holding leadership positions to a greater extent than in Australia and Indonesia (Arsendy et al., 2020; Henebery, 2021; Philippine Commission on Women, 2024). What remains limited, however, is evidence linking these demographic profiles to leadership effectiveness during



periods of major curriculum reform. The current study addresses this gap by examining leadership effectiveness under the Revised K to 10 Curriculum while accounting for demographic groupings, thereby situating leadership performance within the realities of school leadership composition.

Studies consistently describe the Revised K to 10 Curriculum as a reform focused on decongesting content, strengthening foundational skills, and promoting values education through flexible and inclusive instructional approaches (Department of Education, 2024a; Department of Education, 2024b). Pilot and early implementation findings confirm that streamlined competencies improve instructional focus and classroom integration, while regional and division memoranda play a key role in operationalizing national policy at the school level (EDCOM II, 2024; Department of Education – Region VIII, 2024; Department of Education – Schools Division of Bulacan, 2024). Research further agrees that school heads are central to aligning resources, supporting teachers, and sustaining collaboration during curriculum transition (Toledo, 2025; Verano et al., 2024). However, the literature lacks localized empirical evidence directly measuring leadership effectiveness during the early phase of Revised K to 10 implementation. This study responds by assessing how school heads perform key leadership functions—strategic, operational, instructional, and relational—within the specific context of curriculum reform.

Leadership effectiveness literature consistently draws from Systems Theory, Distributed Leadership Theory, and Transformational Leadership Theory, emphasizing leadership as adaptive, collaborative, and vision-driven (Bertalanffy, 1968; Spillane, 2006; Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985). Empirical studies confirm that systems thinking supports coherence and informed decision-making, distributed leadership strengthens collaboration and accountability, and transformational leadership enhances motivation, innovation, and school culture (Agbor, 2025; Nkambule & Mashiane-Nkabinde, 2025; Kalogeratos et al., 2025; Budiman & Fatahillah, 2025). While these frameworks are well established, most studies apply them in stable instructional contexts. Few examine how these leadership approaches function during large-scale curriculum transitions. The present study bridges this gap by operationalizing leadership effectiveness through PPSSH-aligned domains under the Revised K to 10 context, offering evidence on how theory translates into practice during reform.

Research consistently affirms that effective school heads balance strategic leadership, operational management, and instructional supervision to drive school improvement (Jakavonytė-Staškuvienė & Strazdauskienė, 2023; Mapoy et al., 2021). Studies agree that leadership quality influences instructional coherence, teacher performance, and learner outcomes, while weak leadership is often associated with workload pressures, accountability demands, and limited preparation for reform (Yamanaka & Suzuki, 2020; Fedena, 2019). International and local literature also highlights the importance of goal-setting, resource management, crisis preparedness, and stakeholder engagement as core leadership functions (Grand Canyon University, 2023; Hobbs, 2022; Levin & Bradley, 2020). What remains underexplored is how these leadership domains perform collectively during the first year of a national curriculum overhaul.

Studies consistently show that effective instructional leadership involves contextualizing curriculum standards, supervising pedagogy, and supporting teacher development through mentoring and professional learning (Honig & Rainey, 2020; Ikemoto, 2020; Starr, 2022). Leadership effectiveness is also linked to staff recognition, well-being, and collaborative school cultures that promote sustained improvement (Wechsler & Wojcikiewicz, 2023). Moreover,

building strong connections with parents, communities, and external partners enhances transparency and shared accountability (Theoharis, 2024; Stronge & Xu, 2021; Mintrop, 2020; Cuban, 2020). While these elements are well documented, limited research integrates them within the specific demands of Revised K to 10 implementations.

Statement of the problem

In this study, the researcher evaluated the “Leadership Effectiveness of Implementation of Revised K to 10 Curriculum”.

Specifically, this study wanted to seek answers to the following sub-problems:

1. What is the demographic profile of respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1. age;
 - 1.2. sex; and
 - 1.3. length of service?
2. What is the level of perceived leadership effectiveness of school heads in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in terms of
 - 2.1. leading strategically;
 - 2.2. managing school operations;
 - 2.3. focusing on teaching and learning;
 - 2.4. developing self and others; and
 - 2.5. building connections?
3. Is there a significant difference in the level of perceived leadership effectiveness in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when grouped according to respondents’ profiles?

Hypothesis:

There is no significant difference in the level of perceived leadership effectiveness in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when grouped according to respondents’ profile

II. MATERIALS and METHODS

Section of this paper is inclusive of the research design, participants, instrument, procedure, and data analysis.

Research Design

The study utilizes a quantitative descriptive research design, as defined by Creswell and Creswell (2023), to systematically gather and present numerical data that describe teachers' perceptions of school heads' leadership effectiveness in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. This design is appropriate for documenting characteristics, behaviors, or perceptions of a population without establishing causal relationships or manipulating variables. The primary objective is to generate an accurate portrayal of teachers’ demographic characteristics and their assessment of school heads’ leadership across five domains outlined in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). Descriptive statistics, such as frequency counts, percentages, and weighted means, were used to summarize and interpret the collected data, providing an objective picture of leadership effectiveness in various domains.



Participants

The study's participants consisted of 100 elementary teachers from the 2nd Congressional District of the Schools Division of Quezon. The sample was drawn using stratified random sampling to ensure proportional representation from different districts within the region, including Candelaria East, Candelaria West, Dolores, and others. The total population of 131 teachers was reduced to 100 after adjusting for sample size using Cochran's formula, ensuring sufficient representation for analysis. Teachers were selected based on their ability to assess the leadership effectiveness of their school heads in relation to the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. These teachers had varying levels of exposure to training and seminars but shared a common understanding of their school leaders' practices.

Instruments

The study employed a researcher-developed survey questionnaire, designed to collect data on the teachers' perceptions of school heads' leadership effectiveness, based on the PPSSH-OPCRF standards. The questionnaire included two parts: the first part collected demographic information such as age, sex, and years of service, while the second part assessed leadership effectiveness across four key domains: developing self and others, managing school operations, focusing on teaching and learning, and building connections. A five-point Likert scale was used to rate leadership effectiveness, ranging from "Not Effective at All" to "Very Much Effective." To ensure the validity and reliability of the instrument, a two-step validation process was conducted, including expert review and pilot testing, with the latter showing a high internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's alpha = 0.83).

Procedure

The data collection process for this study was carried out over six weeks, ensuring a comprehensive approach to gathering responses from the targeted participants. Initially, the researcher sought ethical clearance from the university's ethics committee, which was a necessary step to ensure that the research adhered to ethical standards, especially concerning participant confidentiality and informed consent. Once approval was granted, the researcher proceeded to obtain formal authorization from the Schools Division Superintendent and relevant district supervisors, ensuring that the study complied with the guidelines set forth by the Department of Education. This step was critical to secure institutional support and endorsement for the research. After all approvals were in place, the survey was distributed electronically through Google Forms to the selected teachers. The link to the online survey was conveniently shared via group chats of school heads across the districts, allowing easy access for teachers, irrespective of location. By using a digital platform, the researcher was able to reach a larger pool of respondents efficiently. To ensure maximum participation, the data collection was carefully monitored, with reminders sent to encourage timely responses. The researcher allowed a window of three to five weeks for teachers to complete the survey, ensuring that they had enough time to reflect on their assessments and provide thoughtful responses. Once the survey period concluded, the completed questionnaires were compiled and prepared for statistical analysis, serving as the foundation for analyzing teachers' perceptions of school heads' leadership effectiveness, particularly during the transition to the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.

Data Analysis

The data analysis for this study was structured to offer both descriptive and inferential insights into teachers' perceptions of school leadership. Descriptive statistics were initially employed to analyze the teachers' demographic profiles, including characteristics such as age, gender, and teaching experience. The use of frequency counts and percentages allowed the researcher to systematically summarize these variables and provide a clear overview of the sample population. In addition to demographic analysis, the study used the mean and weighted mean to measure the level of perceived leadership effectiveness, which was based on teachers' assessments of school heads' leadership across five key domains. This quantitative approach helped paint a broad picture of how school leadership was viewed by teachers. To explore potential relationships between teachers' perceptions and their demographic characteristics, inferential statistical methods were applied. The Shapiro-Wilk Test was first conducted to assess the normality of the data, which is a crucial step in determining the appropriate statistical tests for further analysis. With a p-value of 0.921, the data was confirmed to be normally distributed, justifying the use of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). ANOVA was then applied to test the hypotheses regarding differences in perceived leadership effectiveness based on various teacher profiles. This allowed the researcher to explore whether factors such as teaching experience or district location influenced how leadership effectiveness was perceived. The statistical analysis was carried out using Microsoft Excel for basic calculations and SPSS for more advanced analysis, with the significance level set at 0.05 to ensure the reliability of the results.

III. RESULTS

Table 1

Profile of the Respondents According to Age Bracket, Sex, and Length of Service

Age	Frequency	Percentage
20 – 25 years old	21	21
26 – 30 years old	19	19
31 – 35 years old	19	19
36 – 40 years old	11	11
41 – 45 years old	8	8
46 – 50 years old	8	8
51 – 55 years old	8	8
56 – 60 years old	6	6
Total	100	100.00

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	49	49
Female	51	51
Total	100	100.00

Years	Frequency	Percentage
0 – 5 years	21	21
6 – 10 years	18	18
11 – 15 years	38	38
16 – 20 years	11	11
21 years and above	12	12
Total	100	100.00



The table 1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to their age bracket. The results show that the largest group belongs to the 20–25 age range, with 21 respondents (21%), followed by the 26–30 and 31–35 age groups, each with 19 respondents (19%). The smallest group belongs to the 56–60 age range, with 6 respondents (6%). This distribution suggests that the respondent pool is dominated by younger individuals, with a gradual decrease in representation as age increases. The values imply that most of those involved in the Revised K to 10 Curriculum implementation come from early to mid-career stages, while only a small portion comes from late-career or near-retirement groups. Regarding sex, results indicate that 51 respondents (51%) were female and 49 (49%) were male, with an almost equal distribution. Although the difference is minimal, the data reveals a slight predominance of female respondents. This balanced representation suggests that both male and female teachers were actively involved participants in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, which provides a well-rounded perspective on the leadership performance of the school leaders across sexes. In the length of service, results show that the largest group has been in service for 11–15 years, with 38 respondents (38%), followed by those with 0–5 years at 21 respondents (21%), and 6–10 years at 18 respondents (18%). Smaller groups include those with 16–20 years at 11 respondents (11%) and 21 years and above at 12 respondents (12%). This distribution indicates that most respondents are in the mid-career stage, while fewer have either very limited experience or long-term tenure. The overall trend shows a concentration of teacher who have accumulated substantial professional experience without yet reaching end-of-career levels.

Table 2

Summary of the Mean Distribution of the Level of Perceived Leadership Effectiveness of School Heads in the Implementation of Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Revised K to 10 Curriculum Variables	MEAN	VERBAL DESCRIPTION
Leading Strategically	3.93	Much Effective
Managing School Operations	3.97	Much Effective
Focusing on Teaching and Learning	4.02	Much Effective
Developing Self and Others	4.10	Much Effective
Building Connections	4.00	Much Effective
Grand Mean	4.00	Much Effective

Table 2 presents the summary of the mean distribution of the level of perceived leadership effectiveness of school heads in the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. The mean scores for the five variables are as follows: Leading Strategically (3.93), Managing School Operations (3.97), Focusing on Teaching and Learning (4.02), Developing Self and Others (4.10), and Building Connections (4.00). All variables fall under the "Much Effective" category. The grand mean of 4.00 also falls under the "Much Effective" category, indicating the overall effectiveness of school heads in the implementation of the curriculum.

Table 3

Significant Difference on the Respondent's Level of Perceived Leadership Effectiveness of School Heads in the Implementation of Revised K to 10 Curriculum in Terms of Leading Strategically When According to Teachers' Profile

Indicators	Profile	p-value	Decision	Remark
	Age	0.262	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant
	Sex	0.413	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant
Leading Strategically	Length of service	0.906	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant

Note: "If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance (0.05) reject Ho, otherwise failed to reject Ho."

Table 3 presents the significant difference in the respondents' level of perceived leadership effectiveness of school heads in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when grouped according to teachers' profile variables in terms of age, sex, and length of service for the domain of Leading Strategically. The results show that age ($p = 0.262$), sex ($p = 0.413$), and length of service ($p = 0.906$) did not yield statistically significant differences, as all computed p-values exceeded the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected. These findings indicate that teachers, regardless of demographic background, held generally consistent perceptions of school heads' strategic leadership during the early phase of the Revised K to 10 implementations.

Table 4

Significant Difference on the Respondent's Level of Perceived Leadership Effectiveness of School Heads in the Implementation of Revised K to 10 Curriculum in Terms of Managing School Operations When According to Teachers' Profile

Indicators	Profile	p-value	Decision	Remark
Managing School Operations	Age	0.234	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant
	Sex	0.657	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant
	Length of service	0.096	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant

Note: "If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance (0.05) reject Ho, otherwise failed to reject Ho."

Table 4 presents the significant difference in the respondents' level of perceived leadership effectiveness of school heads in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when grouped according to teachers' profile variables in terms of age, sex, and length of service for the domain of Managing School Operations. The results show that age ($p = 0.234$), sex ($p = 0.657$), and length of service ($p = 0.096$) did not yield statistically significant differences, as all p-values were greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This indicates that teachers, regardless of demographic differences, shared similar perceptions of school heads' effectiveness in managing school processes, resources, and operational requirements during the early phase of the Revised K to 10 implementations.

Table 5

Significant Difference on the Respondent's Level of Perceived Leadership Effectiveness of School Heads in the Implementation of Revised K to 10 Curriculum in Terms of Focusing on Teaching and Learning When According to Teachers' Profile

Indicators	Profile	p-value	Decision	Remark
Focusing on Teaching and Learning	Age	0.278	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant
	Sex	0.540	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant
	Length of service	0.681	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant

Note: "If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance (0.05) reject Ho, otherwise failed to reject Ho."

Table 5 presents the significant difference in the respondents' level of perceived leadership effectiveness of school heads in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when grouped according to teachers' profile variables in terms of age, sex, and length of service for the domain of Focusing on Teaching and Learning. The results indicate that age ($p = 0.278$), sex ($p = 0.540$), and length of service ($p = 0.681$) did not yield statistically significant differences, as all computed p-values exceeded the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This finding suggests that teachers shared similar perceptions of school heads' instructional leadership regardless of their demographic characteristics during the early implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum.

Table 6

Significant Difference on the Respondent's Level of Perceived Leadership Effectiveness of School Heads in the Implementation of Revised K to 10 Curriculum in Terms of Developing Self and Others When According to Teachers' Profile

Indicators	Profile	p-value	Decision	Remark
Developing Self and Others	Age	0.019	Reject null hypothesis	Significant
	Sex	0.094	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant
	Length of service	0.092	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant

Note: "If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance (0.05) reject Ho, otherwise failed to reject Ho."

Table 6 presents a significant difference in respondents' perceived leadership effectiveness of school heads in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, when grouped by teachers' profile variables, for the Developing Self and Others domain. The results show that age yielded a statistically significant difference ($p = 0.019$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. In contrast, sex ($p = 0.094$) and length of service ($p = 0.092$) did not produce significant differences, as their p-values exceeded the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that teachers' perceptions of school heads' effectiveness in professional growth, mentoring, and



capacity development varied according to age, while remaining consistent across sex and length of service.

Table 7

Significant Difference on the Respondent's Level of Perceived Leadership Effectiveness of School Heads in the Implementation of Revised K to 10 Curriculum in Terms of Building Connections When According to Teachers' Profile

Indicators	Profile	p-value	Decision	Remark
	Age	0.905	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant
	Sex	0.372	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant
Building Connections	Length of service	0.891	Failed to Reject null hypotheses	Not Significant

Note: "If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance (0.05) reject Ho, otherwise failed to reject Ho."

In Table 7 presents the significant difference in the respondents' level of perceived leadership effectiveness of school heads in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when grouped according to teachers' profile variables in terms of age, sex, and length of service for the domain of Building Connections. The findings reveal that age ($p = 0.905$), sex ($p = 0.372$), and length of service ($p = 0.891$) did not yield statistically significant differences, as all p-values exceeded the 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This indicates that teachers held generally similar perceptions of school heads' effectiveness in establishing partnerships, engaging stakeholders, and strengthening school–community linkages regardless of demographic characteristics.

IV. DISCUSSION

The age distribution of teachers reveals a predominance of early- to mid-career professionals, which influences their performance across the PPSSH–OPCRF domains. Younger teachers tend to excel in areas such as Leading Strategically and Building Connections, driven by their adaptability and openness to reforms, but may struggle with Managing School Operations and Developing Self and Others, which require more experience. Mid-career teachers perform better in Focusing on Teaching and Learning due to their growing competence in instructional supervision. The smaller number of older teachers highlights a gap in senior leadership, likely due to retirement or limited promotions, suggesting a transition toward younger leaders assuming broader roles. This shift underscores the need for mentoring and structured development programs, especially for younger teachers who will play a key role in the ongoing curriculum implementation. To address this, schools must balance fresh perspectives with the wisdom of more experienced educators, fostering collaborative engagement and capacity-building to ensure effective leadership and continuity in the Revised K to 10 Curriculum..

Near-equal distribution between male and female respondents suggests that leadership expectations within the PPSSH–OPCRF domains are applied consistently regardless of gender, though gender-related trends in leadership experience may still influence performance. Female



teachers typically excel in Building Connections and Developing Self and Others, reflecting a collaborative and relational leadership style, while male teachers may show strengths in Managing School Operations due to their focus on operational tasks. With both sexes almost equally represented, the data highlights that leadership effectiveness is more influenced by experience and training than gender alone. The slightly higher proportion of female teachers aligns with broader trends in the Philippine education system, where women hold a significant share of teaching and leadership roles. This underscores the need for career development programs that support both male and female teachers in leadership roles, ensuring equal access to mentoring, coaching, and succession planning, while also incorporating gender-responsive approaches that acknowledge the different leadership strengths, communication styles, and support needs of each gender.

Teachers' experience plays a significant role in shaping how school heads meet expectations across the PPSSH–OPCRF domains, particularly in areas like Managing School Operations and Leading Strategically. Teachers with 11–15 years of service, benefiting from their extended exposure to instructional supervision and teacher development, are more effectively managed by school heads in domains such as Focusing on Teaching and Learning and Developing Self and Others. In contrast, newer teachers with 0–5 years of experience tend to excel in more adaptable areas like Building Connections, yet may require further support in navigating complex administrative tasks. Teachers with 20 or more years of experience bring strong decision-making and organizational management skills, allowing them to handle more demanding leadership responsibilities and meet higher PPSSH–OPCRF expectations. The study also suggests that mid-career teachers, who make up the largest group, would benefit from advanced leadership certification and strategic planning training to prepare them for greater responsibilities. On the other hand, early-career leaders could benefit from foundational mentoring and administrative coaching, while veteran leaders can help ensure continuity by mentoring younger teachers, preserving institutional knowledge, and strengthening succession planning.

Findings of this study reflect the overall effectiveness of school heads in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, as demonstrated by the "Much Effective" ratings across all leadership domains. This is consistent with previous studies, such as those by Mapoy et al. (2021), Samimi et al. (2022), and Hobbs (2022), who noted that strategic leadership and operational management play key roles in successful curriculum implementation. While school heads generally excelled in areas such as strategic leadership, school operations, and teaching supervision, there were areas for improvement, especially in terms of policy influence and financial management. The study suggests that there is a need to focus on enhancing the leadership skills of school heads, particularly in external collaboration and financial sustainability, to address the challenges posed by the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. However, limitations of the study include its reliance on self-reported data from teachers, which may introduce response biases, and the limited focus on only one geographical region, which may not fully represent the diverse leadership dynamics found in other areas of the Philippines. Future research could explore these areas further and broaden the scope of leadership effectiveness studies to include multiple regions and more diverse sample populations.



The study aimed to test the hypothesis regarding the significant differences in teachers' perceptions of school heads' leadership effectiveness in implementing the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, based on teachers' demographic profiles. The results from show that, across several leadership domains—Leading Strategically, Managing School Operations, Focusing on Teaching and Learning, Developing Self and Others, and Building Connections—no significant differences were found in terms of age, sex, or length of service, as indicated by p-values exceeding the 0.05 threshold in most cases. These findings suggest that, regardless of demographic characteristics, teachers generally shared similar perceptions of their school heads' effectiveness in implementing the curriculum. However, a significant difference was observed in the Developing Self and Others domain when grouped by age, with younger and older teachers perceiving leadership practices differently. This aligns with previous studies that highlighted the varying leadership development needs across generational cohorts (Yamanaka & Suzuki, 2020; Jakavonytė-Staškuvienė & Strazdauskienė, 2023). The study's findings emphasize the need for differentiated leadership approaches that consider the professional growth expectations of teachers at different career stages. The implications for practice and policy suggest the importance of tailored leadership development programs and mentoring systems that address these differences. While the study provides valuable insights into leadership effectiveness, its limitations include a focus on a single geographical region and reliance on self-reported data, which may introduce bias. Future research could explore broader regional contexts and include observational data to further validate these findings.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Respondents were largely teachers in the early to mid-stages of their careers, with nearly equal representation of male and female teachers and a generally similar length of service, typically 11-15 years. School heads demonstrated effective leadership across all domains examined, namely leading strategically, managing school operations, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. Leadership practices were consistently evident in strategic planning, operational management, instructional supervision, professional development, and stakeholder engagement. Generally, there is no significant difference on the level of leadership effectiveness in the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum when grouped according to teachers' profiles.

To enhance leadership effectiveness during the continued implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum, Schools Division Offices should develop tailored leadership capacity-building programs for young and mid-career teachers and school heads, focusing on professional development, mentoring, and instructional supervision, while emphasizing financial development and collaboration. District Offices of DepEd should intensify technical assistance and monitoring through regular coaching, peer mentoring, and leadership clinics to reinforce strategic planning and instructional leadership. School heads must sustain effective practices by strengthening mentoring systems, feedback mechanisms, and age-responsive professional development strategies, particularly in the Developing Self and Others domain, where differences in teacher perceptions were noted. Teacher Education Institutions should incorporate leadership preparation aligned with the curriculum, focusing on instructional supervision, reflective practice, and collaborative leadership. DepEd Offices may consider institutionalizing



leadership support systems to enhance competencies in data-driven decision-making, digital communication, and stakeholder engagement, addressing areas with lower ratings. Future leadership programs should emphasize mentoring, coaching, and lifelong learning to cater to teachers at different career stages. Finally, future research could expand across divisions or regions to provide localized evidence on leadership effectiveness during curriculum reform and further explore age-related differences in leadership perceptions using qualitative or mixed methods approaches.

REFERENCES

- Agbor, O. G. (2025). *Rebuilding the culture of school-plant planning in Nigerian secondary schools*. Berkeley Journal of Educational Research and Practice. <https://berkeleypublications.com/bjerp/article/download/448/400>
- Arong, L. (2024). *Impact of the elementary school heads' leadership behavior on the teacher's morale in school districts of Pilar*. JPAIR Institutional Research. <https://www.philair.ph/index.php/irj/article/download/891/1845>
- Arsendy, S., Sukoco, G. A., & Purba, R. E. (2020). Indonesian female school heads: why so few and why we need more?. <https://theconversation.com/indonesian-female-school-heads-why-so-few-and-why-we-need-more-135939>
- Asadov, F. (2025). *Enhancing emotional intelligence: Theoretical frameworks and practical interventions*. European Science Review. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/enhancing-emotional-intelligence-theoretical-frameworks-and-practical-interventions>
- Banua, E. I., Iglesia, N. S., & Muarip, V. C. (2024). *School administrators' instructional leadership: Basis for pedagogical enhancement*. International Journal of Health Sciences. <https://www.academia.edu/download/109770839/7942.pdf>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.
- Bičkienė, R. (2025). *Transformacinės lyderystės ir mikroklimato sąsajos švietimo organizacijoje*. <https://epublications.vu.lt/object/elaba:229584368>
- Budiman, A. M., & Fatahillah, M. (2025). *Strategic management practices in Pesantren: Innovations for enhancing educational quality and organizational sustainability*. Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management. <http://mojes.um.edu.my/index.php/MOJEM/article/view/60692>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Caballes, M. (2021). *School Heads' Competence and Teachers' Performance in the Light of Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers*. <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/school-heads-competence-and-teachers-performance-in-the-light-of-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers/>
- Cabigao, J. R. (2021). *The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) Indicators*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350617203_The_Philippine_Professional_Standards_for_School_Heads_PPSSH_Indicators
- Caldararu, A., David, O., & Cazan, A. M. (2023). Transformational school leadership and teacher engagement: The mediating role of participatory governance. *Educational*

Management Administration & Leadership, 51(2), 263–280.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221113497>

Canalita, N. R., & Labrador, J. A. (2025). *The influence of leadership skills and instructional supervision on quality instruction in non-formal education*. East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research. <https://mtiformosapublisher.org/index.php/eajmr/article/download/103/97>

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2021). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Cuban, L. (2020). *Chasing Success and Confronting Failure in American Public Schools*. Harvard Education Press. ISBN: 9781682534540

Cunningham, W. G., & Cordeiro, P. A. (2020). *Educational leadership: A problem-based approach* (5th ed.). Pearson.

Davies, B., & Davies, B. J. (2020). *Strategic leadership in the school: Practical approaches to school leadership and management*. Routledge.

Dellomas, J.L., & Deri, R.A. Leadership Practices of School Heads in Public Schools. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Leadership-Practices-of-School-Heads-in-Public-Dellomas-Deri/a27c6bf220127ca3fb359b56c27a5a223fde401f>

Department of Education – Region VIII. (2024, July 24). *Regional Memorandum No. 834, s. 2024: Regional virtual orientation on the policies relative to the Revised K to 10 Curriculum implementation*. [https://depedro8.azurewebsites.net/2024/07/26/july-24-2024-rm-834-s-2024-regional-virtual-orientation-on-the-policies-relative-to-the-REVISED K TO 10-curriculum-implementation/](https://depedro8.azurewebsites.net/2024/07/26/july-24-2024-rm-834-s-2024-regional-virtual-orientation-on-the-policies-relative-to-the-REVISED-K-TO-10-curriculum-implementation/)

Department of Education – Schools Division of Bulacan. (2024). *Division Memorandum No. 282, s. 2024: School-based training of teachers on Revised K to 10 Curriculum for Kindergarten, Grades 1, 4, and 7*. [https://bulacandeped.com.ph/division-memorandum-no-282-s-2024-school-based-training-of-teachers-on-REVISED K TO 10-curriculum-for-kindergarten-grades-1-4-and-7/](https://bulacandeped.com.ph/division-memorandum-no-282-s-2024-school-based-training-of-teachers-on-REVISED-K-TO-10-curriculum-for-kindergarten-grades-1-4-and-7/)

Department of Education (2020). DepEd Order No. 024. s. 2020 - National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf

Department of Education. (2020). *DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 – National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/09/07/september-7-2020-do-024-s-2020-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-school-heads/>

- Department of Education. (2020). *DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 – National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/09/07/september-7-2020-do-024-s-2020-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-school-heads/>
- Department of Education. (2022). *Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) Manual for School Heads*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/OPCRF-Manual.pdf>
- Department of Education. (2024). *DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024 – Policy guidelines on the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/DO_s2024_010.pdf
- Department of Education. (2024). *DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2024 – Amendment to DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024 (Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum)*. <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1984864/deped-issues-new-guidelines-for-REVISED-K-TO-10-curriculum-implementation>
- EDCOM II. (2024, January 19). *DepEd, PIDS conduct assessment of REVISED K TO 10 pilot implementation*. Education Commission 2. <https://edcom2.gov.ph/deped-pids-conduct-assessment-of-REVISED-K-TO-10-pilot-implementation/>
- Fedena, M. (2019). *Top Challenges Faced by School Principals*. <https://fedena.com/blog/2019/04/top-challenges-faced-by-school-principals.html>
- Gallos, J. V., & Bolman, L. G. (2021). *Reframing academic leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gamala, J. J. & Marpa, E. P. (2022). *School Environment and School Heads' Managerial Skills: Looking into their Relationships to School's Performance*. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 4(2), 218-235. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonses.285>
- Grand Canyon University (2023). *Becoming a Principal: Daily Duties and How To Become One*. <https://www.gcu.edu/blog/teaching-school-administration/becoming-principal-daily-duties-how-become-one>
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research*. The Wallace Foundation. <https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/How-Principals-Affect-Students-and-Schools.pdf>
- Gümüş, S., Bellibaş, M. Ş., Esen, M., & Gümüş, E. (2021). *A systematic review of studies on leadership models in educational research from 1980 to 2014*. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(1), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219876060>
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2021). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press.

- Henebery, B. (2021). Why private schools need a gender balance in principalship. <https://www.theeducatoronline.com/k12/news/why-private-schools-need-a-gender-balance-in-principalship/276093>
- Hobbs, M. (2022). The importance of school principals. <https://ed.unc.edu/2022/08/31/edge-the-importance-of-principals/>
- Honig, M., & Rainey, L. R. (2020). *Supervising Principals for Instructional Leadership – A teaching and Learning Approach*. Harvard Education Press.
- Ikemoto, G. (2020). *Principal Preparation Guidebook – The school leadership style*. George W. Bush Institute. <https://gwbcenrimgix.net/Publications/Resources/gwbi-principal-preparation-guidebook-12152020.pdf>
- Jakavonytė-Staškuvienė, D., & Strazdauskienė, V. (2023). Signs of a manager's leadership in a quality educational institution: cases of the city and district centre of Lithuania. *Social Sciences*, 12(3), 138. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12030138>
- Jeremiah, F. (2025). *Exploring action bias in the pursuit of innovation*. Lincoln Research Archive. <https://researcharchive.lincoln.ac.nz/items/386e922b-45c6-4953-9efc-c8be64fc29e1>
- Kalogeratos, G., Travlou, C., & Tseremegklis, C. (2025). *Enhancing educational leadership through gamification: Theory and practice in primary schools*. INTED2025 Proceedings. <https://library.iated.org/view/KALOGERATOS2025ENH>
- Katsikas, A. (2025). *Leadership style in education: Advantages and challenges*. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education. <https://iejee.com/index.php/IEJEE/article/view/2406>
- Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2020). *Foundations of behavioral research* (5th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Ladra, S. Y., & Gorospe, J. D. (2025). Principal leadership, good governance, and teachers' commitment to organizational change. *Mindoro Journal of Social Sciences and Development Studies*, 2(1), 12–19. <https://journal.omsc.edu.ph/index.php/mjssds/article/view/28>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. National College for School Leadership.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(5), 737–770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20933908>
- Levenson, N. (2022). *Smarter Budgets, Smarter Schools, Second Edition*. Harvard Education Press. ISBN: 9781682537411

- Levin, S., & Bradley, K. (2020). Understanding and Addressing Principal Turnover. Learning Policy Institute. https://www.nassp.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/nassp_edit06-WEB.pdf
- Lopez, J. (2020). *The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads Based on Instructional Management Competencies*. <https://www.instabrightgazette.com/blog/the-philippine-professional-standards-for-school-heads-based>
- Madamba, D. M., Fredolin, P. J., & Educardo, T. B. (2022). Capability enhancement plan for school heads anchored on the national competency-based standards. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(4), 169-179. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v1i4.666>
- Mapoy, A. J., Manguerra, A. M., Evangelista, A. J., Lusterio, MN. I., & Fortes, N. (2021). Pinoy Leadership Style: Filipinos in the Workplace and School. <https://mentalhealthph.org/11-10/>
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2020). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. ASCD.
- Mintrop, R. (2020). *Design-based school improvement: A practical guide for education leaders*. Harvard Education Press.
- Mislang-Sison, D., & Junio, A. (2019). School Heads' Supervision Practices and Teachers' Instructional Performance: Basis for a Proposed Mentoring Program. *ASEAN Multidisciplinary Research Journal*. Volume 3. <https://paressu.org/online/index.php/aseanmrj/article/view/237>
- Mohd Ali, H. B., & Zulkipli, I. B. (2019). Validating a Model of Strategic Leadership Practices for Malaysian Vocational College Educational Leaders. *Ejtd* 43, 21–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-03-2017-0022>
- Nizam, Z., Rahman, R., & Wei, S. (2025). *The influence of principal transformational leadership on teacher performance*. *International Journal of Educational Networking*. <https://www.journal.ypidathu.or.id/index.php/ijen/article/view/2154>
- Nkambule, B., & Mashiane-Nkabinde, B. (2025). *Principals' intergenerational knowledge-sharing practices in a professional learning community: A case of a South African education circuit*. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education*. <https://sciendo.com/pdf/10.2478/dcse-2025-0006>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2021). Education at a Glance 2021: OECD Indicators. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2021_b35a14e5-en

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Curriculum reform: A literature review*. OECD Education Working Papers. [https://one.oecd.org/document/EDU/WKP\(2020\)27/En/pdf](https://one.oecd.org/document/EDU/WKP(2020)27/En/pdf)
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2020). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Prestoza, M. J. R., & Naldoza, N. D. (2025). Challenges and practices of instructional leadership: A qualitative inquiry of principals' and teachers' experiences. *The Normal Lights*, 19(1), 1–24.
- Ralebese, M. D., Jita, L., & Badmus, O. T. (2025). Examining primary school principals' instructional leadership practices during curriculum reform implementation. *Education Sciences*, 15(1), 70. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010070>
- Reyes, A., Jocson, J. V., Lampos, M. I., Gonong, G. O., & Pegg, J. (2020). *Development of the Results-based Performance Management System aligned with the Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders*. <https://rune.une.edu.au/web/handle/1959.11/52042>
- Rezai-Rashti, G. M., & Segeren, A. (2023). The game of accountability: perspectives of urban school leaders on standardized testing in Ontario and British Columbia, Canada. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 26(2), 260-277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1808711>
- Robertson, J. (2020). *Coaching leadership: Building educational leadership capacity through partnership* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Ruben, B. D., De Lisi, R., & Gigliotti, R. A. (2023). A guide for leaders in higher education: Concepts, competencies, and tools. amazonaws.com
- Sagragao, M. U., Salva, C. R., & Fernal, E. S. (2025). *School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance in the Division of Valencia City*. ICCEPH Conference Proceedings. <https://icceph.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/SCHOOL-HEADS-LEADERSHIP.pdf>
- Samimi, M., Cortes, A. F., Anderson, M. H., & Herrmann, P. (2022). What is strategic leadership? Developing a framework for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(3), 101353. [HTML]
- Samudio, I. P., & Alvarez, J. S. (2025). *School head's leadership capability: Its implications to teacher's promotion*. *International Journal of Research Publications*. <https://www.ijrp.org/paper-detail/7691>
- SciSpace (2024). What is the common age of Filipino teacher? <https://typeset.io/questions/what-is-the-common-age-of-filipino-teacher-1w6j100sbn>

- SciSpace (2024). What is the majority gender of teachers in the Philippines? <https://typeset.io/questions/what-is-the-majority-gender-of-teachers-in-the-philippines-307agnl6af>
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Johnson, L. (2023). Teachers' perceptions of school leadership effectiveness in times of change: The role of experience and age. *Current Psychology*, 42, 17845–17858. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04421-9>
- Spiegelman, M., Taie, S., & Lewis, L. (2022). Characteristics of 2020–21 Public and Private K–12 School Principals in the United States. Institute of Education Sciences. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2022/2022112.pdf>
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Starr, J. P. (2022). *Equity-Based Leadership*. Harvard Education Press. ISBN: 9781682537282
- Stronge, J. H., & Xu, X. (2021). *Qualities of effective principals*. ASCD.
- Ta-Ala, L. P. (2025). *School heads' readiness, attitude, and experiences in the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum among public integrated schools* (Doctoral dissertation). International Journal of Science and Management Studies.
- Teacher.Org (2024). How to Become a Principal. <https://www.teacher.org/career/principal/>
- Tefera, B., Admas, F., & Desta, M. (2025). *Early childhood development and education (ECDE) system coherence in Ethiopia: A critical analysis*. Ethiopian Journal of Business and Social Sciences. <https://ejol.aau.edu.et/index.php/ejobs/article/download/11660/8805>
- Theoharis, G. (2024). *The school leaders our children deserve: Seven keys to equity, social justice, and school reform*. Teachers College Press.
- Toledo, W. A. (2025). *Resource Management Strategies of School Head in Supporting Revised K to 10 Curriculum and Performance of Teachers and Learners*. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies. <https://www.ijams-bbp.net/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/WELFE-A.-TOLEDO.pdf>
- Ugochukwu, A. C. (2025). *Effect of integrated personnel payroll and information systems on transparency in payroll administration in Nigerian universities*. Rapid Journals. https://rapidjournals.com/wp-content/uploads/journal/published_paper/volume-2/issue-4/rjip_GSQc5qHT.pdf
- Verano, V. S., Grande, H. R., Pore, N. O., & Cagape, W. E. (2024). *Lived Experiences of School Heads with Administrative Tasks and Multiple Ancillary Functions*. International Journal of Research Publications. <https://ijrp.org/paper-detail/7214>
- Wang, G., & Bai, H. (2025). *Harnessing the power of distributed leadership: Promoting Chinese teachers' ICT use in instruction through a chain-mediated model of teacher collaboration*



and ICT competence. Education and Information Technologies.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10639-025-13532-6>

Watson, S. D. (2025). *An action research study on how professional learning communities foster teacher agency and learner achievement in alternative settings*. ProQuest Dissertations.
<https://search.proquest.com/openview/21bafcba983cce6441b47ef2076507d9/1>

Wechsler, M. E. & Wojcikiewicz, S. K. (2023). *Preparing Leaders for Deeper Learning*. ISBN: 9781682538401. Harvard Education Press.

Yamanaka, S., & Suzuki, K. H. (2020). Japanese education reform towards twenty-first century education. *Audacious education purposes: How governments transform the goals of education systems*, 81-103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41882-3>

Zakaria, I. B., Nor, M. Y. B. M., Alias, B. S. B., & A.Hamid, A. H. (2021). The Influence of Principals' Strategic Leadership on Learners' Outcome. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(2), 407-417.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v11-i2/8844>