

Predicting Curriculum Fidelity: The Role of Individualized Consideration in Public Secondary School Leadership

Billy Joe M. Nicolas

Program Head, College of Education, World Citi Colleges, Guimba, Nueva Ecija, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100500658>

Received: 23 May 2026; Accepted: 28 May 2026; Published: 10 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This quantitative study investigated the predictive relationship between transformational leadership practices and curriculum fidelity among all public secondary school heads and teachers within the Guimba District, Nueva Ecija.

Methodology: Employing a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from a sample of 9 school heads and 90 teachers. Transformational leadership was evaluated across four dimensions (Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration), while curriculum fidelity was measured through five components (Adherence, Exposure, Quality of Delivery, Participant Responsiveness, and Program Differentiation). Data were analyzed using ANOVA and stepwise multiple regression analysis.

Key Findings: Descriptive results revealed that Idealized Influence achieved the highest mean score among leadership dimensions, indicating that school heads are widely perceived as trusted role models. Within curriculum fidelity, Adherence ranked highest, reflecting a strong organizational emphasis on aligning school operations with national standards. While demographic variations in curriculum fidelity were initially observed based on civil status and experience, ANOVA confirmed that the most significant difference emerged when respondents were categorized by their organizational position ($p = 0.001$).

Regression Results and Conclusion: The overall regression model was statistically robust, explaining 80.4% of the variance in curriculum fidelity ($R^2 = 0.804$, $p = 0.032$). At a 95% confidence level, stepwise multiple regression identified Individualized Consideration as the singular, statistically significant predictor of curriculum fidelity ($\beta = 0.895$, $p = 0.009$). These findings demonstrate that personalized support, coaching, and mentoring provided by school heads are the most critical drivers of faithful curriculum implementation. Consequently, targeted professional development focusing on individualized consideration is highly recommended to sustain high-quality curriculum execution across the district's public secondary schools.

Keywords: Transformational leadership, curriculum fidelity, individualized consideration, public secondary schools, regression analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Effective curriculum implementation represents a fundamental mandate in modern secondary education. However, many schools struggle to implement a new curriculum effectively. Despite continuous and often intensive systemic reforms, such as the introduction of the MATATAG Curriculum in the Philippines [1], educational institutions frequently encounter substantial barriers in achieving curriculum fidelity, the critical principle that requires faithful adherence to the prescribed instructional content, standards, and delivery modalities.

The successful translation of high-level educational policy into consistent classroom practice hinges decisively on the leadership dynamics present within the school setting. School leaders are strategically positioned as the agents responsible for interpreting, championing, and implementing these comprehensive educational reforms.

They are the ones assigned to interpret educational reforms into practice, yet their influence is often overlooked. Consequently, their specific leadership style represents a crucial element that cannot be overlooked. Given that school leaders actively participate in general seminars conducted by school divisions, it is essential to examine how their leadership impacts curriculum implementation. This investigation is therefore intrinsically aligned with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4: Quality Education) [2], which highlights the essential role of robust leadership in cultivating inclusive and equitable learning environments.

Evidence suggests that effective transformational leadership serves as a key prerequisite for attaining and maintaining high fidelity in curriculum execution. Effective transformational leadership is a key factor in realizing fidelity of curriculum implementation. This type of leadership specifically helps change followers' beliefs, interests, and morals to inspire them to perform better and transcend their self-interest [3]. This leadership approach is essential for inspiring and motivating teaching personnel to achieve optimal student learning outcomes and align their daily practices with overarching educational goals.

Curriculum fidelity, on the other hand, plays an important role in ensuring that educational programs achieve their intended outcomes. Teachers' adherence to the prescribed curriculum significantly impacts the effectiveness of instructional delivery and student learning [4]. Their study highlights those various factors, such as teacher beliefs, resource availability, and institutional support, influence fidelity despite them striving to implement curricular innovations. This underscores the need for further research on how leadership styles, particularly transformational leadership, can enhance curriculum fidelity to improve educational outcomes.

The conceptual framework of this study integrates two foundational models: transformational leadership and curriculum fidelity. Transformational Leadership (TL), conceptualized by Bass (1985) [5] and adopted here, is characterized by four behavioral dimensions, often referred to as the Four I's: Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. Curriculum Fidelity (CF), derived from the framework of Dane and Schneider (1998) [6], ensures that programs are delivered precisely as intended by their developers. Its efficacy is measured across five quantifiable dimensions: Adherence (following prescribed content), Exposure (content coverage/duration), Quality of Delivery (teaching effectiveness), Participant Responsiveness (teacher/student engagement), and Program Differentiation (allowing necessary flexibility while maintaining core integrity).

The integration of these constructs provides the foundational problem statement: while transformational leadership offers a mechanism for inspiration, and curriculum fidelity represents the desired implementation outcome, discrepancies consistently remain in how faithfully schools implement mandated curricula. There is currently a lack of studies specifically examining the leadership style that is rooted in curriculum implementation, even if several earlier studies [7] have mostly examined the transformational leadership of school heads and teachers' feeling of effectiveness. This boiled down to the gap where the impact of the said leadership style should also be tailored to the fidelity of curriculum implementation, since leaders are in charge of the execution.

The study was geographically concentrated within the **Guimba District, Schools Division of Nueva Ecija, Philippines**. The selection of this specific locale is relevant because Guimba District serves as a representative administrative unit within the broader Philippine secondary school system, while the researcher's familiarity with the area facilitated essential accessibility and seamless institutional coordination. While there are 11 public secondary high schools operating within the Guimba District, this study is delimited to the 9 public secondary schools whose institutional heads granted official permission and administrative clearance for data collection.

The study aims to bridge the empirical shortfall between leadership and curriculum implementation, ensuring a more holistic approach to educational effectiveness by focusing on this specific context. Specifically, this research applies regression analysis to evaluate the impact of the school heads' transformational leadership styles on the practical fidelity of curriculum execution. Ultimately, this study aimed to (1) describe the transformational leadership practices of school heads, (2) assess the level of curriculum fidelity, and (3) determine which leadership components significantly predict curriculum fidelity. The findings are expected to

inform targeted leadership development and strategic curriculum support programs within public secondary education.

statement of the problems (objectives of the study)

1. Describe the socio-demographic profile of the school-head respondents based on: age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, position (Principal I/II/III/IV/OIC/Head Teacher), and years of experience.
2. Describe the transformational leadership practices of school heads, as assessed by both school heads and teachers, across its four dimensions.
3. Assess the level of curriculum fidelity, as assessed by both school heads and teachers, across its five dimensions.
4. Determine if significant predictive relationships exist between the school heads' profile variables and their perceived transformational leadership style, and between their profile variables and curriculum fidelity.
5. Determine the predictive relationship between transformational leadership as a composite construct and curriculum fidelity.
6. Identify which dimension of transformational leadership significantly predicts curriculum fidelity through stepwise multiple regression analysis.
7. Determine if significant differences exist in curriculum fidelity when school heads are grouped according to their organizational position (Principal I, IV, or Head Teacher III), based on initial statistical findings.
8. Propose evidence-based recommended activities to strengthen transformational leadership practices and consequently enhance curriculum fidelity, grounded in the predictive findings.

MATERIALS, METHODS OF THE STUDY, AND SOURCES OF DATA

Research Design

This investigation employed a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design, culminating in the application of stepwise multiple regression analysis. The descriptive component served to establish the current levels of transformational leadership and curriculum fidelity within the district. The correlational phase quantified the linear relationships between these variables and demographic factors. In alignment with the multi-rater (360-degree) evaluation framework, teacher respondents were utilized as external raters to assess the transformational leadership practices of their respective school heads. This evaluative approach is widely recognized in leadership research as it generates more objective and behaviorally grounded assessments compared to self-report measures, thereby enhancing the validity of the predictive analysis.

The central analytical objective mandated the use of stepwise multiple regression, a sophisticated inferential technique necessary to determine the statistical extent to which specific dimensions of transformational leadership (predictors), as perceived by teachers, significantly predict the variance in curriculum fidelity (outcome variable). This methodology ensured that the analysis was focused on prediction, directly aligned with the primary purpose and premise explicitly stated in the title of the study.

Research Locale

The research setting was the public secondary schools located in Guimba Congressional District I, Nueva Ecija. The locale was selected due to its accessibility and the researcher's affiliation, facilitating easier coordination with school authorities.

Participants of the Study

The participants of this study consisted exclusively of public secondary school heads from the Guimba District. A total enumeration was initially targeted to include all eleven (11) public secondary schools. However, due to scheduling conflicts and official duties arising from Department of Education (DepEd) directives, such as weeklong trainings and mandatory administrative engagements, only nine (9) schools were able to participate. Thus, the final sample comprised nine (9) public secondary school heads who served as the primary participants of the study.

To obtain a comprehensive and objective assessment of the transformational leadership practices of the school heads and their influence on curriculum fidelity, ten (10) teachers per participating school were purposively selected, resulting in ninety (90) teacher-respondents. The inclusion of teacher participants was not to evaluate their own characteristics, but to serve as evaluators of their respective school heads. This approach aligns with best practices in leadership assessment using a multi-rater (360-degree) evaluation framework, wherein subordinates are considered the most credible sources of data regarding the leadership behaviors they experience directly in instructional supervision, curriculum implementation, and school management.

Research Instrument

The data were gathered using a validated survey questionnaire consisting of two phases: one customized for school heads and one for teachers. The instrument adapted a Transformational Leadership Scale (Acosta, 2022) and incorporated a self-constructed Curriculum Fidelity Scale, both contextualized for the secondary school environment.

The instrument for school heads included a section on Socio-demographic profile, Transformational Leadership Style, and Curriculum Fidelity, while the teacher phase focused only on the latter two, assessing the school head's behavior from the teacher's perspective. Both Transformational Leadership and Curriculum Fidelity were measured on a 4-point rating scale (4—Always/Outstanding to 1—Never/Fair).

The instrument underwent expert validation and pilot testing, confirming its reliability. Reliability analysis using Cronbach's Alpha yielded coefficients indicating excellent internal consistency across all four scales used: Transformational Leadership (School Head: 0.924; Teacher: 0.925) and Curriculum Fidelity (School Head: 0.963; Teacher: 0.950).

Data Gathering Procedures

Data collection was executed between February and March 2025. The procedure commenced with securing formal written permission from the Schools Division Superintendent, followed by endorsements from the respective District Supervisors of Guimba East and Guimba West. The researcher personally visited the participating schools to administer the questionnaires, ensuring participants were fully oriented on the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of their involvement, and the process of data collection.

The study strictly adhered to established ethical guidelines, ensuring informed consent was obtained from all participants. Confidentiality and anonymity were rigorously maintained by collecting anonymized data, preventing the attribution of individual responses to specific participants or schools in any resulting report or publication.

Statistical Treatment

The collected data were subjected to the following quantitative statistical treatments:

- **Descriptive Statistics:** Frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to describe the socio-demographic profile, the levels of transformational leadership, and the levels of curriculum fidelity.
- **Relationship Testing:** Spearman's rho correlation coefficient was utilized to examine the strength and direction of the relationships between the socio-demographic variables and the main study variables.

- **Difference Testing: One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)** was applied to determine whether significant differences in curriculum fidelity existed when school heads were grouped according to their profile characteristics.
- **Predictive Analysis:** Stepwise multiple regression analysis was employed to rigorously analyze the extent to which specific transformational leadership dimensions significantly predict the fidelity of curriculum implementation.

These tools provided robust and detailed insights aligned with the study's objectives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-Demographic Profile of School Head Respondents

The demographic analysis of the nine school head participants revealed a profile indicative of a seasoned, professionally advanced leadership cohort in Guimba District.

The leaders were predominantly female (66.7%). The majority were aged between 41 and 50 years old (66.7%), placing the typical leader in the mid-to-late professional career stage. Academic qualifications were high, with 44.4% having earned units towards a doctoral degree, and an additional 11.1% holding a completed doctorate degree, confirming an experienced and highly educated group. In terms of experience, 55.6% reported having 16 years or more of service as school heads. Position distribution was characterized by a distinct polarization, with 44.4% holding the Principal I rank (entry level) and 44.4% holding the principal IV rank (advanced level), alongside 11.1% in "Other" positions (Head Teacher III).

Levels of Transformational Leadership and Curriculum Fidelity

The assessment of Transformational Leadership (TL) and Curriculum Fidelity (CF) utilized data gathered from the ninety teacher respondents, providing a comprehensive operational view of the school head's behavior and the resulting fidelity levels. The overall findings confirm high ratings for both leadership practices and curriculum implementation, all falling within the "Always" range (3.26–4.00).

Transformational Leadership (TL) Dimensions

Transformational leadership was rated highly across all four components, suggesting an environment highly conducive to leadership success.

Transformational Leadership Mean Scores (Teacher Perception)

Dimension	Grand Mean	Description	Key High Score	Key Low Score
Idealized Influence	3.65	Always	"Act in a way that earns the respect" (3.77)	"Ensure comfort and ease" (3.54)
Inspirational Motivation	3.68	Always	"Speak optimistically about school's future" (3.73)	"Provide clear direction" (3.59)
Intellectual Stimulation	3.62	Always	"Ensure learning resources are appropriate" (3.68)	"Share innovative strategies" (3.53)
Individualized Consideration	3.70	Always	"Support professional development" (3.76)	"Treat teachers as valued individuals" (3.67)

The highest-rated dimension was Individualized Consideration (mean 3.70), reflecting strong support for professional development. Conversely, the lowest-rated dimension overall was Intellectual Stimulation (mean 3.62). Specifically, the item "Share innovative strategies and techniques to help my teachers adapt to the evolving educational landscape" received the lowest score among all leadership statements (mean 3.53). This finding points to a critical area of functional weakness: while compliance and personal support are prioritized, the emphasis on instructional innovation and pedagogical adaptation appears limited.

Curriculum Fidelity (CF) Dimensions

Curriculum fidelity was also rated highly overall, with a grand mean of 3.71, yet distinct differences in performance across dimensions were observed.

Curriculum Fidelity Mean Scores (Teacher Perception)

Dimension	Grand Mean	Description	Key High Score	Key Low Score
Adherence	3.74	Always	"Ensure strict following of curriculum" (3.78)	"Use position to enforce adherence" (3.70)
Exposure	3.71	Always	"Ensure lessons taught within recommended time" (3.74)	"Leadership ensures uninterrupted delivery" (3.67)
Quality of Delivery	3.68	Always	"Facilitate collaboration to share techniques" (3.72)	"Provide feedback to teachers to improve quality" (3.66)
Participant Responsiveness	3.69	Always	"Motivate active participation" (3.71)	"Address challenges affecting commitment" (3.66)
Program Differentiation	3.71	Always	"Encourage adaptation based on student needs" (3.76)	"Apply academic background in guiding differentiation" (3.67)

Adherence received the highest mean score (3.74), indicating strong success in mandating and achieving compliance with prescribed content and standards. Conversely, **Participant Responsiveness** obtained a high mean (3.69), but the lowest scoring item within this dimension, and among all CF items, was "Address challenges that affect teachers' commitment to implementing the curriculum" (mean 3.66). This suggests that while formal adherence to rules is strong, the underlying level of active, committed engagement from teachers and students remains a comparative challenge, implying a risk of passive compliance rather than intrinsic motivation for quality implementation.

Correlational Findings: Demographics, Differences, and Predictors

A. Relationship Between Demographics and Transformational Leadership

The correlation analysis utilizing Spearman's rho indicated that none of the examined socio-demographic variables (age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, position, and years of experience) had a statistically significant relationship with any of the four dimensions of transformational leadership ($p > 0.05$ for all correlations). This suggests that the display of transformational behaviors is not significantly dependent on the measured background characteristics of the school heads within this sample.

B. Relationship Between Demographics and Curriculum Fidelity

In contrast to the findings for leadership style, specific demographic variables demonstrated significant predictive relationships with certain components of curriculum fidelity.

- **Age and Participant Responsiveness:** Age showed a statistically significant positive correlation with Participant Responsiveness ($r = 0.744, p = 0.022$).
- **Highest Educational Attainment and Participant Responsiveness:** Highest Educational Attainment also displayed a statistically significant positive correlation with Participant Responsiveness ($r = 0.721, p = 0.029$).

These results indicate that school heads who are older and possess higher academic credentials (units or degrees towards advanced studies) are significantly more effective at fostering active engagement, open communication, and addressing commitment barriers among teachers and students. Maturity and advanced scholarly training appear to equip leaders with the strategic communication and psychological skills necessary to cultivate responsiveness.

C. Group Differences in Curriculum Fidelity

The One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if demographic groupings resulted in significant differences in the overall level of curriculum fidelity.

The ANOVA results indicated that there was **no statistically significant difference** in curriculum fidelity when school heads were grouped by Age, Sex, Civil Status, Educational Attainment, or Years in Service (all $p > 0.05$).

However, the analysis revealed a **statistically significant difference** in curriculum fidelity when school heads were grouped according to their organizational **Position** ($F=25.847, p=0.001$). This compelling result confirms that the institutional rank or level of the school head (Principal I, Principal IV, etc.) is a systemic factor that significantly influences the implementation outcomes of the curriculum.

D. Correlation Between Transformational Leadership and Curriculum Fidelity

The bivariate analysis between TL dimensions and CF dimensions yielded specific, significant linear associations:

- **Idealized Influence and Adherence:** A statistically significant positive correlation was found ($r=0.228, p=0.005$).
- **Individualized Consideration and Adherence:** A statistically significant positive correlation was found ($r=0.183, p=0.024$).
- **Idealized Influence and Quality of Delivery:** Notably, a statistically significant **negative** correlation was observed ($r=-0.198, p=0.015$).

The positive correlations confirm that respected leadership (Idealized Influence) and supportive leadership (Individualized Consideration) both contribute to teachers' adherence to curriculum rules. The negative correlation with Quality of Delivery, however, suggests a potential organizational tension: the environment of high respect for the school head may promote compliance but inadvertently restrict the instructional risk-taking, pedagogical innovation, or autonomy required for maximizing the quality of lesson delivery.

Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis: Predicting Curriculum Fidelity

The core objective of the study was addressed using stepwise multiple regression to identify the strongest predictors of curriculum fidelity.

A. Model Summary and Predictive Strength

The regression model summary demonstrated a remarkably high degree of predictive utility.

Regression Model Summary

Statistic	Value
R (Multiple Correlation)	0.896
R ² (Coefficient of Determination)	0.804
F-statistic	6.816
Significance (p-value)	0.032

The multiple correlation coefficient (R) of 0.896 signifies a strong overall positive relationship between the transformational leadership components and curriculum fidelity. Crucially, the coefficient of determination (R²) of **0.804** indicates that 80.4% of the total variance observed in curriculum fidelity across the district can be statistically explained by the combined influence of the transformational leadership predictor variables.

included in the final model. The F-statistic of 6.816, significant at $p=0.032$, confirms that the regression model, as a whole, is a powerful and reliable predictor of curriculum fidelity outcomes.

B. Significant Predictor Variables

The stepwise regression process systematically identified which specific TL dimensions made unique, significant contributions to predicting the outcome variable (Curriculum Fidelity).

Regression Analysis of Curriculum Fidelity and Transformational Leadership Components

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized Beta (B)	Standardized Beta (β)	p-level	Significance
Individualized Consideration	0.975	0.895	0.009	Significant Predictor
Inspirational Motivation	0.554	0.385	0.137	Not Significant
Intellectual Stimulation	-0.017	-0.024	0.919	Not Significant

The analysis confirmed that **Individualized Consideration** is the only statistically significant predictor of curriculum fidelity ($B=0.975$, $\beta=0.895$, $p=0.009$). The unstandardized coefficient ($B=0.975$) indicates that for every one-unit increase in the level of individualized consideration displayed by the school head, curriculum fidelity increases by nearly one full unit, holding other factors constant. The exceptionally high standardized coefficient ($\beta=0.895$) demonstrates that Individualized Consideration possesses an overwhelming relative strength compared to the other leadership dimensions in determining the outcome of fidelity.

Neither Inspirational Motivation nor Intellectual Stimulation was found to be a significant predictor, as their p-values exceeded the 0.05 threshold. This result establishes that while vision and intellectual challenges may be beneficial aspects of leadership, they do not statistically translate into effective implementation fidelity outcomes in this context; rather, personalized, tangible support is the critical driver.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Interpretation of Leadership and Fidelity Levels

The descriptive results highlight a strong baseline of transformational leadership in Guimba District, characterized primarily by high **Idealized Influence** and **Individualized Consideration**. Leaders are respected role models who prioritize supportive mentoring. This positive leadership presence is mirrored in the curriculum outcomes, where **Adherence** to prescribed standards is the highest-rated dimension of fidelity. This suggests that the existing moral authority and personal support mechanisms are highly effective in ensuring compliance with external mandates.

However, a comparative analysis reveals an inherent tension. The lowest score in transformational leadership was observed in the capacity to foster innovation (**Intellectual Stimulation**). This deficit is reflected in the comparative weakness in **Participant Responsiveness**, where addressing teacher and student commitment challenges scored lowest. The pattern suggests that the high level of adherence achieved is largely driven by formal requirements and respect for authority, potentially resulting in passive compliance rather than intrinsic motivation and active pedagogical excellence.

Analysis of Predictive Dynamics: Individualized Consideration as the Core Lever

The finding that **Individualized Consideration** ($\beta=0.895$, $p=0.009$) is the sole statistically significant predictor of curriculum fidelity is the most critical result of this study. It profoundly underscores that the operational strategy most effective for promoting faithful curriculum implementation is the **personalized support, coaching, and mentoring** provided by school heads. The strong standardized coefficient ($\beta=0.895$) demonstrates the powerful, direct impact of the school head's commitment to individualized teacher development on the ultimate fidelity of curriculum execution.

This result aligns with the literature confirming the predictive power of transformational leadership in educational settings. The positive correlation between Idealized Influence and Adherence, alongside the predictive role of Individualized Consideration on Adherence, suggests that when school leaders act as trusted, respected role models who also provide tailored support, teachers are more likely to willingly and faithfully adhere to curriculum mandates. This connection reinforces the findings [8], [9] both of whom revealed positive correlations between transformational leadership and aspects of curriculum implementation fidelity or adherence.

The fact that the overall transformational leadership model accounted for a large variance (80.4%) in curriculum fidelity demonstrates that leadership strength significantly drives teacher quality and adherence to educational standards, as emphasized [10].

Addressing the Paradox of Idealized Influence: The observed negative correlation between **Idealized Influence** and the **Quality of Delivery** ($r=-0.198$, $p=0.015$) suggests a potential trade-off or challenge: while teachers respect the leader (Idealized Influence) and adhere to the curriculum (Adherence), that respect and compliance alone do not guarantee high-quality, effective instructional delivery. High-quality instruction requires intellectual stimulation and personalized development, which is why **Individualized Consideration** emerges as the more powerful predictive factor.

The significant difference in curriculum fidelity based on the **school head's position** is a key finding, indicating that the formal designation and corresponding authority (e.g., Principal IV versus a Head Teacher) may inherently affect the perception and subsequent implementation of fidelity. This variance linked to the formal leadership approach echoes the findings [11] who found significant differences in teacher professional development engagement based on the school heads' leadership styles. Furthermore, the significant relationship between **Age and Educational Attainment** with **Participant Responsiveness** supports findings [12] show that demographic variables impact leadership styles, which in turn affect the quality of program outcomes.

Demographics and Group Differences

The lack of significant predictive power exerted by demographic variables on Transformational Leadership suggests that these leadership behaviors are primarily driven by learned skills and institutional culture rather than fixed personal traits. Conversely, the finding that **Age and Highest Educational Attainment** correlate significantly with **Participant Responsiveness** indicates that seasoned, highly educated leaders are better equipped to handle the complex human factors of curriculum implementation, such as motivational challenges and communication gaps. Their experience allows them to strategically use personalized support to engage teachers and students effectively.

The statistically significant difference in curriculum fidelity based on the school head's **Position** ($p=0.001$) confirms that organizational hierarchy matters. It is plausible that leaders in higher ranks (Principal IV) possess greater accumulated resources, broader administrative autonomy, or have undergone more advanced, sustained leadership training associated with promotion, which collectively enhances their overall capability to ensure comprehensive fidelity across all five dimensions.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Theoretical Implications: This investigation validates the applicability of Bass's (1985) Transformational Leadership theory within the distinct framework of curriculum implementation fidelity. By isolating Individualized Consideration as the dominant predictor, the study effectively refines the model's relevance in high-compliance educational systems. It demonstrates that the practical, supportive components of TL are functionally superior to the inspirational or intellectual components in guaranteeing successful educational program adoption (CF).

Practical Implications: The findings present a clear directive for leadership development: programs aimed at improving curriculum fidelity must strategically pivot their focus. Generalized seminars on vision-casting or

charismatic leadership (Inspirational Motivation) should be secondary to intensive, skills-based training in **mentoring, personalized coaching, and constructive feedback provision** (Individualized Consideration). Furthermore, interventions must explicitly target the identified innovation deficit (low Intellectual Stimulation) to ensure curriculum execution progresses beyond mere rule-following to genuine instructional quality.

The collective findings substantiate the crucial need to strengthen the most impactful dimension of transformational leadership, individualized consideration, to guarantee consistent, high-quality curriculum execution. Given that Individualized Consideration is the most important component, leadership development efforts must pivot to focus heavily on enhancing supportive and personalized strategies among school heads, aligning with the suggestions of [13] for enhancing school effectiveness.

CONCLUSIONS

1. **Level of Transformational Leadership:** The transformational leadership practices of public secondary school heads in Guimba District are determined to be **highly evident**.
2. **Highest TL Dimension:** Among the four dimensions, **Idealized Influence** is the most pronounced practice, signifying that school heads are widely perceived as respected and trusted role models by their teachers.
3. **Level of Curriculum Fidelity:** The overall level of curriculum fidelity in the public secondary schools of Guimba District is consistently **high**.
4. **Highest CF Component:** Specifically, **Adherence** is the highest-rated component of curriculum fidelity, reflecting the teachers' strong commitment to following prescribed national standards and instructional outlines.
5. **Profile-Leadership Relationship:** The socio-demographic profiles of the school heads (age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, position, and years of experience) were **not significantly related** to their overall transformational leadership styles.
6. **Profile-Fidelity Relationship:** Certain demographic factors were significantly related to curriculum outcomes: **Organizational Position** showed a significant difference in overall curriculum fidelity, while **Age** and **Highest Educational Attainment** were significantly related to **Participant Responsiveness**.
7. **Predictive Power of TL:** The overall transformational leadership model is **highly predictive** and statistically significant, successfully explaining 80.4% of the observed variance in curriculum fidelity ($R^2=0.804$).
8. **Most Significant Predictor:** Among all leadership dimensions, **Individualized Consideration** is the sole, statistically significant predictor of curriculum fidelity ($\beta=0.895$, $p=0.009$). This underscores that personalized support, coaching, and mentoring are the most potent mechanisms for promoting faithful curriculum implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are proposed, flowing directly from the study's conclusions and addressing the needs identified across the school head's profile, leadership style, and curriculum practice:

1. **Focus on Individualized Consideration:** Given its established role as the sole significant predictor (Conclusion 8), school heads, in collaboration with the Schools Division Office, must prioritize professional development that enhances **Individualized Consideration** skills. This should include structured **one-on-one mentoring, needs assessment surveys, and differentiated coaching** to cater to the unique professional growth needs of each teacher and boost overall curriculum fidelity.

2. **Sustain Idealized Influence and Adherence:** Since both TL and CF are high (Conclusions 1, 2, 3, and 4), efforts should be implemented to sustain the high level of **Idealized Influence** through **leadership training and immersion programs** that reinforce exemplary conduct. Similarly, **Adherence** must be maintained by regularly updating implementation checklists and sharing best practices.
3. **Address Profile-Related Differences:** Since **Organizational Position** affects fidelity (Conclusion 6), the Schools Division Office should utilize this finding to refine criteria for appointment, promotion, and professional development programs, ensuring that leadership training is specifically tailored to the responsibilities and challenges of each administrative level.
4. **Enhance Participant Responsiveness:** To leverage the positive impact of school head **Age** and **Educational Attainment** (Conclusion 6), training programs should be developed by senior, highly educated leaders to mentor younger or less experienced school heads on strategies for fostering engagement, interaction, and responsiveness among teachers and learners.
5. **Conduct Further Research:** Subsequent studies should be conducted in different educational contexts (e.g., other municipalities, private schools) to validate the generalizability of **Individualized Consideration** as a predictor of curriculum fidelity (Conclusion 8). Future research should also explore the contextual reasons why **Inspirational Motivation** and **Intellectual Stimulation** were not significant predictors in this specific setting.

Based directly on the predictive strength of Individualized Consideration and the identified weaknesses in Intellectual Stimulation and Participant Responsiveness, the following evidence-based action plan is proposed for policymakers and practitioners in Guimba District.

Evidence-Based Action Plan: Strengthening Leadership Levers for Fidelity

The recommendations are structured to target the specific dimensions of Transformational Leadership and Curriculum Fidelity that require enhancement, aligning directly with the quantitative findings.

Core Dimension/ Weakness	Objective	Recommended Activities	Persons Involved	Timeframe	Rationale/Link to Findings
Individualized Consideration (Strongest Predictor)	To enhance recognition of individual teacher needs and aspirations and deliver targeted support.	Conduct Mandatory Quarterly One-on-One Mentoring and professional needs assessment surveys, leading to differentiated coaching and the formulation of individualized development plans (IDPs).	School Heads, Master Teachers	Quarterly	Directly reinforces the single most statistically significant predictive factor ($\beta=0.895$) found to drive curriculum fidelity.
Intellectual Stimulation (Innovation Deficit)	To foster a culture of inquiry, critical analysis, and innovative instructional practice.	Institutionalize Pedagogical Innovation Forums and Professional Learning Community (PLC) sessions specifically dedicated to challenging traditional methods	School Heads, Subject Coordinators, Teachers	Monthly/Quarterly	Addresses the lowest-rated TL dimension (mean 3.62) to mitigate the risk of pedagogical stagnation often resulting from overly stringent compliance.

		and actively sharing diverse instructional strategies and techniques.			
Participant Responsiveness (Lowest CF Score)	To increase active teacher and student engagement and address commitment challenges.	Implement Collaborative Problem-Solving Workshops focused on commitment and communication. Older and more highly educated school heads should be tasked with leading these sessions, leveraging their demographic correlation with greater responsiveness skills.	School Heads, Teachers, Guidance Counselors	Biannually	Targets the lowest-rated functional aspect of implementation (addressing commitment challenges, mean 3.66).
Adherence and Quality of Delivery (Ensuring Quality)	To ensure consistent, high-quality execution while promoting instructional autonomy.	1. Develop Implementation Checklists and Objective Fidelity Audits for formalized, non-punitive monitoring. 2. Integrate a Peer Observation Protocol that mandates feedback focusing specifically on instructional differentiation techniques.	Monitoring Team, Department Heads, Teachers	Every Grading Period/Monthly	Reinforces high adherence (a strength) while explicitly elevating accountability for instructional quality, counteracting the negative correlation between Idealized Influence and Quality of Delivery.

REFERENCES

1. Arcillo, M., Kilag, O. K. T., Guanzon, R. S., Navarro, R. B., Paez, A. T., & Pareja, J. Y. C. (2024). The Evolution of Curriculum Reform in the Philippines: The MATATAG Curriculum and its Role in the 21st Century. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, 1(10), 217–221.
2. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education*. UNESCO.
3. Ali, A., Khan, R., & Javed, F. (2024). Transformational leadership and teacher performance. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 15(2), 45–60.
4. Suer, S., & Kinay, I. (2022). Investigation of primary teachers' curriculum fidelity. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, 12(1), 191-214. <https://doi.org/10.31704/ijocis.2022.009>
5. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
6. Dane, A. V., & Schneider, B. H. (1998). Program integrity in primary and early secondary prevention: Are implementation effects out of control? *Clinical Psychology Review*, 18(1), 23–45.
7. Rodulfa, L. (2022). School Heads' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Sense of Efficacy in the Implementation of Blended Teaching Modality in Sarangani Province. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 2(1), 294–312. <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v2i1.35>
8. Wu, Y., & Dapat, R. O. (2025). Exploring the relationship of transformational leadership on teaching effectiveness and commitment towards teachers' empowerment program. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384543811>
9. Zhang, J., Huang, Q., & Xu, J. (2022). Transformational leadership and teacher well-being: A systematic review. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372823618>
10. Rashid, S. N. A. B. M., & Wahab, J. L. A. (2024). Transformational Leadership Practices of Headmasters in Forming the Quality of Teachers in Transformation Schools 2025. *Special Education [SE]*, 2(1), Article 31.
11. Daria, I. P., & Gaytos, C. E. G. (2025). Transformational leadership style and teachers' continuing professional development participation: Basis for an intervention program. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 14(2), 22–36. <https://journals.indexcopernicus.com/api/file/viewByFileId/2317291>
12. Boshra, A. Y., & Almutairi, J. A. (2025). The impact of transformational leadership and demographic factors on quality of nursing care: An empirical study in Riyadh. *Middle East Journal of Health Sciences*, 9(2), 176–189. <https://mjhs-mu.org/index.php?fulltxt=227008&fulltxtj=176>
13. Academia, J. R. (2025). Transformational leadership skills of head teachers: Their influence on school effectiveness. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388586918>