

The Effectiveness of the Implementation of the Exercise Activities Program in Enhancing the Physical Fitness of the Key Stage 2 Learners in Cabusao District, Division of Camarines Sur

Teresa S. Portacio¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026	The study examined how teachers rated the implementation of an exercise activities program and its perceived effectiveness for the physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners in Cabusao District during school year 2025–2026. The respondent distribution records 53 Grade 4–6 teachers from eight schools. The reported overall implementation mean was 4.10 (Much Employed), with teacher guidance highest (4.54) and participation frequency lowest (3.74). The perceived physical-fitness effectiveness mean was 4.20 (Much Effective), with cardiorespiratory endurance highest (4.28) and agility lowest (4.09). Reported Kendall concordance tests for the implementation and effectiveness domains did not reach the stated significance threshold. These findings document teacher ratings rather than objective physiological tests or changes attributable to the program.
Keywords: The Exercise Activities Program Philippines School-Based Survey Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance Teacher Perceptions	

1. Introduction

In the Philippine basic education system, the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners is situated at the intersection of classroom practice, school policy and local resource conditions. The way educational practices are organized within a district cannot be inferred from national policy statements alone; information on local implementation and the views of the personnel responsible for delivery is also necessary. The study therefore focused on public elementary schools in Cabusao District, Division of Camarines Sur, a setting in which the routines supporting participation frequency, learner engagement and agility can vary across schools. The phenomenon examined by the study involves more than the presence of a program or institutional requirement. What respondents recognize as frequent, substantial or effective practice may depend on exposure, school size, resource access, the specific indicator being rated and the standards used for judging it. For this reason, evidence about the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners must distinguish the extent of reported implementation from measurable changes in teachers' work or learners' outcomes. The ratings obtained in a cross-sectional questionnaire provide one form of evidence, but not every form required for a causal claim.

The study organized its inquiries around substantive domains rather than a single unqualified effectiveness score. The domains included participation frequency, activity duration, activity variety, learner engagement. Considering these areas separately makes it possible to identify strengths and weaknesses that may be hidden by a favorable overall mean. It also allows school leaders to direct follow-up observation and support toward specific activities instead of treating all facets of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners as interchangeable.

A second analytical concern was whether respondent groups ranked the indicators similarly. Concordance across group rankings addresses the consistency of priorities or perceptions, not the magnitude of implementation or a relationship between an intervention and an educational outcome. Accordingly, the study treated means and ranks as descriptive indicators while interpreting the significance tests within the narrower meaning of Kendall's coefficient of concordance.

The study is also relevant to established educational guidance. The relevant work by UNESCO, 2015 sets out a policy or research framework against which reported practices may be considered. Such guidance offers analytical context without transforming survey responses into direct observational evidence. The research questions therefore concerned the extent of practices in the specified setting, respondent-group agreement about their ordering, and implications for local educational improvement.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study adopted a descriptive–evaluative–correlational questionnaire survey of implementation and perceived effectiveness. It investigated the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners in public elementary schools in Cabusao District, Division of Camarines Sur during the study period. The design was observational. Although the term “correlational” appeared in the design description, the inferential results reported in the study primarily concerned agreement among ranked indicators; the resulting statistics did not estimate causal effects or the strength of a learner-level association.

2.2 Participants and sampling

The reported study participants consisted of 53 Key Stage 2 teachers from eight schools. Respondents were grouped by the school classifications or school groupings shown in the results. Survey estimates should be read in light of the actual respondent composition

rather than as probability-sample estimates for all Philippine schools. Where the study did not provide distinct pupil assessments or repeated measures, teachers' accounts of student development were interpreted as perceptions.

2.3 Instrument and procedure

The study used a structured questionnaire or researcher-made rating scale encompassing the stated domains of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners. Item-level statements were evaluated through the verbal-response categories and weighted-mean interpretation bands displayed with the study tables. The study described instrument preparation and administration through participating schools and used grouped ratings to address the research questions. Reported validity, reliability and response-handling details were not independently reconstructed or substituted where documentation was incomplete.

2.4 Data treatment and interpretation

The study reported frequency, percentage, weighted mean, rank, Kendall's W and chi-square. Weighted means described central tendencies in ordinal rating responses, while reported ranks established the relative order of indicators. Kendall's W described concordance in ranks across the specified school groups; related chi-square results were treated according to the reported thresholds. No new significance calculations, sample-based confidence intervals or unreported multivariable estimates were introduced. Tables reproduce printed figures, including any discrepancies requiring verification.

2.5 Ethical and reporting considerations

The study was reported using aggregated responses. Individual-level datasets, consent documentation, and institutional ethics reference numbers were not reproduced in the available study chapters, and none is supplied here as though verified. Interpretation avoids identifying individual teachers or learners and refrains from attributing perceived outcomes to the surveyed practices without appropriate longitudinal or comparative evidence.

3. Results

The tables below retain the study's reported numerical entries and response-scale labels. Domain-level means describe respondent ratings; significance tests refer to group rank concordance.

Table 1. Distribution of Key Stage 2 teacher respondents

Schools	No. of Key Stage 2 Teachers				Percentage
	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Total	
BIG SCHOOLS					
1. Castillo ES	4	3	3	10	19
2. Barcelonita ES	3	3	3	9	17
Sub-Total	7	6	6	19	36
MEDIUM SCHOOLS					
3. Cabusao CS	2	2	2	6	11
4. Camagong ES	2	2	2	6	11
5. Pandan ES	3	3	3	9	17
6. San Pedro ES	2	3	2	7	13
Sub-Total	9	10	9	28	53
SMALL SCHOOLS					
7. Santa Cruz ES	1	1	1	3	6
8. Biong ES	1	1	1	3	6
Sub-Total	2	2	2	6	11
Grand Total	18	18	17	53	100

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners, including operational aspects associated with participation frequency. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of participation frequency would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 2. Exercise program implementation: Participation frequency

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R
1. Structured physical activity sessions are conducted regularly each week.	3.25	I	7.5	3.25	I	10	4.08	MI	10	3.53	MI	9
2. Learners participate in physical activities on scheduled school days.	2.50	I	10	3.42	I	8.5	4.23	MI	6	3.38	I	10
3. Physical activity is consistently integrated into MAPEH lessons.	3.25	I	7.5	3.58	MI	6.5	4.23	MI	6	3.69	MI	7
4. Learners are given frequent opportunities to engage in physical activities.	3.75	MI	3	3.42	I	8.5	4.15	MI	9	3.77	MI	6
5. Physical activity sessions are not frequently cancelled or postponed.	2.75	I	9	3.75	MI	3	4.31	MI	2	3.60	MI	8
6. Participation in physical activities is encouraged daily.	3.75	MI	3	3.58	MI	6.5	4.23	MI	6	3.85	MI	4
7. Learners are actively involved in most physical activity sessions.	4.00	MI	1	3.67	MI	5	4.23	MI	6	3.97	MI	1
8. The school timetable allows regular physical activity engagement.	3.50	MI	5.5	3.75	MI	3	4.23	MI	6	3.83	MI	5
9. Physical activity is consistently implemented across grade levels.	3.75	MI	3	3.75	MI	3	4.31	MI	2	3.94	MI	2
10. Learners show readiness to participate due to regular scheduling.	3.50	MI	5.5	3.83	MI	1	4.31	MI	2	3.88	MI	3
Average	3.40	I		3.60	MI		4.23	MI		3.74	MI	

Legend:

4.50 - 5.00 - Very Much Implemented (VMI)
 3.50 - 4.49 - Much Implemented (MI)
 2.50 - 3.49 - Implemented (I)
 1.50 - 2.49 - Fairly Implemented (FI)
 1.00 - 1.49 - Not at All (NAA)

W_x - Weighted Mean
 VI - Verbal Interpretation
 R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners, including operational aspects associated with participation frequency. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of participation frequency would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 3. Exercise program implementation: Activity duration

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R
1. Physical activity sessions provide sufficient time for warm-up activities.	3.25	I	10	4.00	MI	4.5	4.38	MI	1.5	3.88	MI	4
2. The duration of activities allows learners to complete tasks effectively.	3.50	MI	4.5	3.92	MI	6.5	4.00	MI	10	3.81	MI	7
3. Activities are long enough to improve physical fitness.	3.50	MI	4.5	3.83	MI	9	4.08	MI	7.5	3.80	MI	8
4. Time allotment supports skill practice and mastery.	3.50	MI	4.5	3.67	MI	11	4.00	MI	10	3.72	MI	11
5. Learners are not rushed during physical activities.	3.50	MI	4.5	3.83	MI	9	4.00	MI	10	3.78	MI	9
6. Activity duration matches learners' physical capacity.	3.50	MI	4.5	4.08	MI	3	4.23	MI	4.5	3.94	MI	3
7. Time provided sustains learner interest and effort.	3.25	I	10	3.92	MI	6.5	4.08	MI	7.5	3.75	MI	10
8. Lessons allow cool-down activities after exertion.	3.50	MI	4.5	3.83	MI	9	4.15	MI	6	3.83	MI	6
9. Activity time aligns with curriculum standards.	3.50	MI	4.5	4.17	MI	1.5	4.23	MI	4.5	3.97	MI	2
10. Physical activities maximize active movement time.	3.25	I	10	4.00	MI	4.5	4.31	MI	3	3.85	MI	5
11. Time allocation supports quality participation.	3.50	MI	4.5	4.17	MI	1.5	4.38	MI	1.5	4.02	MI	1
Average	3.43	I		3.95	MI		4.17	MI		3.85	MI	

Legend:

4.50 - 5.00 - Very Much Implemented (VMI)
 3.50 - 4.49 - Much Implemented (MI)
 2.50 - 3.49 - Implemented (I)
 1.50 - 2.49 - Fairly Implemented (FI)
 1.00 - 1.49 - Not at All (NAA)

W_x - Weighted Mean
 VI - Verbal Interpretation
 R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners, including operational aspects associated with activity duration. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of activity duration would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 4. Exercise program implementation: Activity variety

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	W _s	VI	R	W _s	VI	R	W _s	VI	R	W _s	VI	R
1. Different types of physical activities are provided.	3.25	I	12	4.08	MI	10.5	4.38	MI	12	3.91	MI	13
2. Activities target various fitness components.	3.50	MI	7.5	4.08	MI	10.5	4.46	MI	8.5	4.01	MI	9
3. Learners experience both individual and group activities.	3.25	I	12	4.17	MI	7	4.46	MI	8.5	3.96	MI	12
4. Lessons include games, drills, and exercises.	3.25	I	12	4.25	MI	4.5	4.54	VMI	3.5	4.01	MI	9
5. Activities prevent monotony and boredom.	3.50	MI	7.5	4.08	MI	10.5	4.54	VMI	3.5	4.04	MI	6
6. Tasks are developmentally appropriate.	3.50	MI	7.5	4.08	MI	10.5	4.46	MI	8.5	4.01	MI	9
7. Activities vary in intensity levels.	3.50	MI	7.5	4.08	MI	10.5	4.54	VMI	3.5	4.04	MI	6
8. Learners are exposed to new movement skills.	3.50	MI	7.5	4.25	MI	4.5	4.38	MI	12	4.04	MI	6
9. Activities integrate fun and learning.	3.75	MI	2.5	4.25	MI	4.5	4.46	MI	8.5	4.15	MI	4
10. Lessons include both indoor and outdoor activities.	3.50	MI	7.5	4.08	MI	10.5	4.38	MI	12	3.99	MI	11
11. Activities accommodate diverse learner abilities.	3.75	MI	2.5	4.25	MI	4.5	4.54	VMI	3.5	4.18	MI	3
12. Variety encourages learner participation.	3.75	MI	2.5	4.33	MI	1.5	4.54	VMI	3.5	4.21	MI	1.5
13. Activities are aligned with learning objectives.	3.75	MI	2.5	4.33	MI	1.5	4.54	VMI	3.5	4.21	MI	1.5
Average	3.52	MI		4.18	MI		4.48	MI		4.06	MI	

Legend:
 4.50 – 5.00 – Very Much Implemented (VMI)
 3.50 – 4.49 – Much Implemented (MI)
 2.50 – 3.49 – Implemented (I)
 1.50 – 2.49 – Fairly Implemented (FI)
 1.00 – 1.49 – Not at All (NAA)

W_s – Weighted Mean
 VI – Verbal Interpretation
 R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners, including operational aspects associated with activity variety. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools. The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories. For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of activity variety would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 5. Exercise program implementation: Learner engagement

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	W _s	VI	R	W _s	VI	R	W _s	VI	R	W _s	VI	R
1. Learners actively participate during activities.	4.00	MI	11	4.50	VMI	1	4.85	VMI	1	4.45	MI	1
2. Learners show enthusiasm during physical activities.	4.00	MI	11	4.17	MI	9.5	4.00	MI	12	4.06	MI	12
3. Activities motivate learners to stay involved.	4.00	MI	11	4.17	MI	9.5	4.62	VMI	2.5	4.26	MI	10.5
4. Learners demonstrate focus during sessions.	4.25	MI	5	4.17	MI	9.5	4.46	MI	10.5	4.29	MI	9
5. Activities encourage cooperation among learners.	4.25	MI	5	4.17	MI	9.5	4.54	VMI	6.5	4.32	MI	8
6. Learners show enjoyment while participating.	4.25	MI	5	4.00	MI	12	4.54	VMI	6.5	4.26	MI	10.5
7. Learners follow instructions willingly.	4.25	MI	5	4.25	MI	6	4.54	VMI	6.5	4.35	MI	6
8. Engagement is sustained throughout the session.	4.25	MI	5	4.25	MI	6	4.54	VMI	6.5	4.35	MI	6
9. Learners exert effort in completing tasks.	4.25	MI	5	4.25	MI	6	4.62	VMI	2.5	4.37	MI	3
10. Activities stimulate interest in physical fitness.	4.25	MI	5	4.33	MI	3	4.54	VMI	6.5	4.37	MI	3
11. Learners display positive attitudes toward activities.	4.25	MI	5	4.33	MI	3	4.46	MI	10.5	4.35	MI	6
12. Participation improves learner confidence.	4.25	MI	5	4.33	MI	3	4.54	VMI	6.5	4.37	MI	3
Average	4.19	MI		4.24	MI		4.52	VMI		4.32	MI	

Legend:
 4.50 – 5.00 – Very Much Implemented (VMI)
 3.50 – 4.49 – Much Implemented (MI)
 2.50 – 3.49 – Implemented (I)
 1.50 – 2.49 – Fairly Implemented (FI)
 1.00 – 1.49 – Not at All (NAA)

W_s – Weighted Mean
 VI – Verbal Interpretation
 R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners, including operational aspects associated with learner engagement. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of learner engagement would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 6. Exercise program implementation: Teacher guidance

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R
1. Teachers clearly explain activity objectives.	4.00	MI	11	4.67	VMI	6	4.25	MI	5.5	4.31	MI	11
2. Instructions are easy for learners to understand.	4.92	VMI	1	4.83	VMI	1	4.25	MI	5.5	4.67	VMI	1
3. Teachers demonstrate correct movement techniques.	4.75	VMI	7.5	4.67	VMI	6	4.00	MI	11	4.47	MI	9
4. Teachers provide timely feedback.	4.58	VMI	10	4.50	VMI	11	4.25	MI	5.5	4.44	MI	10
5. Safety guidelines are consistently emphasized.	4.83	VMI	3.5	4.67	VMI	6	4.25	MI	5.5	4.58	VMI	3.5
6. Teachers monitor learner performance.	4.83	VMI	3.5	4.67	VMI	6	4.25	MI	5.5	4.58	VMI	3.5
7. Corrections are given constructively.	4.75	VMI	7.5	4.67	VMI	6	4.25	MI	5.5	4.56	VMI	7
8. Teachers motivate learners during activities.	4.75	VMI	7.5	4.67	VMI	6	4.25	MI	5.5	4.56	VMI	7
9. Guidance ensures inclusive participation.	4.83	VMI	3.5	4.67	VMI	6	4.25	MI	5.5	4.58	VMI	3.5
10. Teachers manage activities effectively.	4.83	VMI	3.5	4.67	VMI	6	4.25	MI	5.5	4.58	VMI	3.5
11. Teacher support enhances learner performance.	4.75	VMI	7.5	4.67	VMI	6	4.25	MI	5.5	4.56	VMI	7
Average	4.71	VMI		4.67	VMI		4.23	MI		4.54	VMI	

Legend:

4.50 - 5.00 - Very Much Implemented (VMI)
 3.50 - 4.49 - Much Implemented (MI)
 2.50 - 3.49 - Implemented (I)
 1.50 - 2.49 - Fairly Implemented (FI)
 1.00 - 1.49 - Not at All (NAA)

W_x - Weighted Mean
 VI - Verbal Interpretation
 R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners, including operational aspects associated with teacher guidance. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of teacher guidance would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 7. Summary of implementation of exercise activities

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R
1. Participation Frequency	3.40	I	5	3.60	MI	5	4.23	MI	3	3.74	MI	5
2. Activity Duration	3.43	I	4	3.95	MI	4	4.17	MI	4	3.85	MI	4
3. Activity Variety	3.52	MI	3	4.18	MI	3	4.48	MI	2	4.06	MI	3
4. Learner Engagement	4.19	MI	2	4.24	MI	2	4.01	MI	5	4.32	MI	2
5. Teacher Guidance	4.23	MI	1	4.67	VMI	1	4.71	VMI	1	4.54	VMI	1
Average	3.75	MI		4.13	MI		4.32	MI		4.10	MI	

Legend:

4.50 - 5.00 - Very Much Implemented (VMI)
 3.50 - 4.49 - Much Implemented (MI)
 2.50 - 3.49 - Implemented (I)
 1.50 - 2.49 - Fairly Implemented (FI)
 1.00 - 1.49 - Not at All (NAA)

W_x - Weighted Mean
 VI - Verbal Interpretation
 R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes. An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting muscular strength, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 8. Rank concordance of exercise-program implementation indicators

Indicators	Participation Frequency	Activity Duration	Activity Variety	Learner Engagement	Teacher Guidance
Sum of Squares of the difference	381	349.5	881.5	367	284
Number of Cases	10	11	13	12	11
Number of Groups of Respondents	3	3	3	3	3
Coefficient of Concordance	0.51	0.35	0.54	0.29	0.29
Computed χ^2 Value	13.77	10.5	19.44	9.57	8.7
Degree of Freedom	9	10	12	11	10
Tabular χ^2 value					
0.05	16.92	18.31	21.03	19.68	18.31
0.025	19.68	21.16	23.34	22.62	21.16
0.01	21.67	23.21	26.22	24.72	23.21
0.005	23.59	25.19	28.30	26.76	25.19
0.001	27.88	29.59	32.91	31.26	29.59
Decision on Null Hypothesis (H_0)	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance of Agreement	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on muscular endurance could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

Table 9. Perceived fitness outcomes: Cardiorespiratory endurance

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	W_x	VI	R	W_x	VI	R	W_x	VI	R	W_x	VI	R
1. Learners can sustain physical activity for longer periods.	4.00	ME	6.5	4.42	ME	4.5	4.38	ME	6	4.27	ME	6
2. Learners show improved stamina.	4.00	ME	6.5	4.25	ME	9	4.31	ME	7.5	4.19	ME	8.5
3. Activities enhance heart and lung endurance.	4.25	ME	1.5	4.42	ME	4.5	4.62	VME	1.5	4.43	ME	1
4. Learners recover faster after exertion.	4.00	ME	6.5	4.25	ME	9	4.15	ME	10	4.13	ME	10
5. Endurance improves through regular participation.	4.25	ME	1.5	4.25	ME	9	4.46	ME	5	4.32	ME	5
6. Learners show less fatigue during activities.	4.00	ME	6.5	4.33	ME	6.5	4.31	ME	7.5	4.21	ME	7
7. Activities promote continuous movement.	4.00	ME	6.5	4.50	VME	2	4.54	VME	3.5	4.35	ME	3.5
8. Learners perform aerobic activities effectively.	4.00	ME	6.5	4.33	ME	6.5	4.23	ME	9	4.19	ME	8.5
9. Endurance supports overall physical performance.	4.00	ME	6.5	4.50	VME	2	4.62	VME	1.5	4.37	ME	2
10. Learners demonstrate improved breathing control.	4.00	ME	6.5	4.50	VME	2	4.54	VME	3.5	4.35	ME	3.5
Average	4.05	ME		4.38	ME		4.42	ME		4.28	ME	

Legend:

4.50 - 5.00 - Very Much Effective (VME)
 3.50 - 4.49 - Much Effective (ME)
 2.50 - 3.49 - Effective (E)
 1.50 - 2.49 - Fairly Effective (FE)
 1.00 - 1.49 - Not at All (NAA)

W_x - Weighted Mean
 VI - Verbal Interpretation
 R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners, including operational aspects associated with cardiorespiratory endurance. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools. The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of cardiorespiratory endurance would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 10. Perceived fitness outcomes: Agility

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R
1. Learners change direction quickly.	3.75	ME	10.5	4.00	ME	9	4.00	ME	10.5	3.92	ME	11
2. Activities improve speed and coordination.	4.00	ME	7	4.00	ME	9	4.00	ME	10.5	4.00	ME	10
3. Learners respond quickly to movement cues.	4.00	ME	7	4.00	ME	9	4.08	ME	7.5	4.03	ME	9
4. Agility tasks enhance motor skills.	4.00	ME	7	4.08	ME	6	4.08	ME	7.5	4.05	ME	7.5
5. Learners show better balance during movement.	3.75	ME	10.5	4.25	ME	1	4.31	ME	1.5	4.10	ME	5.5
6. Activities develop quick body control.	4.25	ME	2.5	4.17	ME	3	4.08	ME	7.5	4.16	ME	3
7. Learners perform agility drills effectively.	4.25	ME	2.5	4.17	ME	3	4.15	ME	4.5	4.19	ME	2
8. Agility improves sports performance.	4.00	ME	7	4.08	ME	6	4.08	ME	7.5	4.05	ME	7.5
9. Learners move efficiently during games.	4.25	ME	2.5	3.92	ME	11	4.15	ME	4.5	4.11	ME	4
10. Activities enhance reaction time.	4.00	ME	7	4.08	ME	6	4.23	ME	3	4.10	ME	5.5
11. Agility supports overall physical fitness.	4.25	ME	2.5	4.17	ME	3	4.31	ME	1.5	4.24	ME	1
Average	4.05	ME		4.08	ME		4.13	ME		4.09	ME	

Legend:

4.50 - 5.00 - Very Much Effective (VME)
 3.50 - 4.49 - Much Effective (ME)
 2.50 - 3.49 - Effective (E)
 1.50 - 2.49 - Fairly Effective (FE)
 1.00 - 1.49 - Not at All (NAA)

W_x - Weighted Mean
 VI - Verbal Interpretation
 R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners, including operational aspects associated with agility. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of agility would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 11. Summary of perceived effectiveness across physical fitness domains

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R	W _x	VI	R
1. Cardiorespiratory Endurance	4.05	E	3.5	4.38	ME	1	4.42	ME	1	4.28	ME	1
2. Muscular Strength	4.09	E	1	4.27	ME	2	4.31	ME	3	4.22	ME	3
3. Muscular Endurance	3.96	ME	5	4.26	ME	3	4.32	ME	2	4.18	ME	4
4. Flexibility	4.06	ME	2	4.25	ME	4	4.01	ME	5	4.23	ME	2
5. Agility	4.05	ME	3.5	4.08	VME	5	4.13	VME	4	4.09	VME	5
Average	4.04	ME		4.25	ME		4.24	ME		4.20	ME	

Legend:

4.50 - 5.00 - Very Much Effective (VME)
 3.50 - 4.49 - Much Effective (ME)
 2.50 - 3.49 - Effective (E)
 1.50 - 2.49 - Fairly Effective (FE)
 1.00 - 1.49 - Not at All (NAA)

W_x - Weighted Mean
 VI - Verbal Interpretation
 R - Rank

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes. An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting participation frequency, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 12. Rank concordance of perceived physical fitness outcomes

Indicators	Cardiorespiratory Endurance	Muscular Strength	Muscular Endurance	Flexibility	Agility
Sum of Squares of the difference	334.5	356.5	637	638.5	498
Number of Cases	10	11	13	12	11
Number of Groups of Respondents	3	3	3	3	3
Coefficient of Concordance	0.45	0.36	0.39	0.50	0.50
Computed χ^2 Value	12.15	10.80	14.04	16.50	15
Degree of Freedom	9	10	12	11	10
Tabular χ^2 value					
0.05	16.92	18.31	21.03	19.68	18.31
0.025	19.68	21.16	23.34	22.62	21.16
0.01	21.67	23.21	26.22	24.72	23.21
0.005	23.59	25.19	28.30	26.76	25.19
0.001	27.88	29.59	32.91	31.26	29.59
Decision on Null Hypothesis (H_0)	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance of Agreement	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on activity duration could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

4. Discussion

Taken together, the findings suggest a differentiated profile of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners within public elementary schools in Cabusao District, Division of Camarines Sur. Some domains were rated more favorably than others, but the study's comparisons concerned respondents' evaluations of program activity or practice. The interpretation should therefore emphasize the organization and visibility of those practices rather than unobserved changes in educational outcomes.

The domains must also be considered conceptually. For example, participation frequency and agility involve different operational demands even when they appear in the same questionnaire. An overall rating cannot establish that schools have equivalent capacity, resources or instructional conditions. Follow-up should identify the precise activities behind each item and test whether respondents applied a shared meaning to the measurement scale.

The study's rank-concordance analysis makes an additional contribution by examining alignment in the order assigned to indicators. Kendall's W is sensitive to patterns of ranking among the selected groups; it does not assess causation, pupil-level correlations or improvements over time. A statistically significant result should therefore be explained as concordance of ordered profiles, while nonsignificant outcomes should not be called evidence that a practice was ineffective.

The cited scholarship and policy provide context but should not be treated as validating the local mean scores. Guidance from UNESCO, 2015, World Health Organization, 2020 highlights the importance of clearly specified practices, appropriate pedagogical support or relevant educational standards. Applying such guidance requires attention to local implementation, documentation and direct assessment rather than reliance on favorable response categories alone.

Implications for school administrators include establishing observable criteria for high-priority activities, checking participation and resource access across schools, and using professional conversations to determine why some dimensions received lower assessments. If the objective is to understand effects on actual teacher or learner performance, a subsequent design should add independent outcome data, repeated observations and an appropriate comparison framework.

The main limitations arise from the local scope of the respondents, reliance on reported ratings, the unequal or limited respondent groups in some analyses, and incomplete access to item-level observations for independent verification. In addition, the underlying survey cannot by itself separate the contribution of agility from other school, family, learner or policy influences. The conclusions therefore remain descriptive and context-specific; extension beyond the study setting requires additional evidence.

5. Conclusion

The study documented the reported status of the exercise activities program and physical fitness of Key Stage 2 learners in public elementary schools in Cabusao District, Division of Camarines Sur. Its domain-level results and agreement tests offer an account of local respondent perceptions, areas of comparatively stronger implementation and aspects warranting closer attention. Reported means and statistical decisions were retained as presented, without reinterpretation as experimental effects.

The findings support evidence-informed review of participation frequency, cardiorespiratory endurance and agility. Implementation monitoring, clearer criteria for rating performance, and direct observational or learner-level evidence are suitable priorities for further research. The study does not demonstrate that an individual practice caused an improvement in school, teacher or learner outcomes.

References

- [1] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015). Quality physical education (QPE): Guidelines for policy-makers. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000231101>
- [2] World Health Organization. (2020). WHO guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240015128>