

# The Utilization of the Educational Management Practices in the Implementation of the Revised K To 12 Curriculum of the Public Secondary School Heads in Nabua Districts, Division of Camarines Sur

Jay D. Basagre<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines, Iriga City, Philippines

| ARTICLE INFORMATION                                                                                                                                                       | ABSTRACT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Article history:</b><br>Published: October 2026                                                                                                                        | The study examined the utilization of educational management practices in implementing the Revised K to 12 Curriculum in public secondary schools in Nabua Districts, Division of Camarines Sur, during School Year 2025–2026. The reported analysis described planning, organizing, leading, and controlling and examined agreement in indicator rankings across big, medium, and small schools using Kendall's coefficient of concordance and chi-square tests. Organizing had the highest reported weighted mean, 4.02, followed by leading and controlling, both 3.98, and planning, 3.97; all were classified as Much Utilized. Planning ratings by school category were 4.01, 3.99, and 3.91, respectively. Curriculum design, instructional delivery, assessment and evaluation, and professional development were also classified as Much Utilized. All reported rank-order agreement tests were classified as nonsignificant at the 0.05 level. Selected technology, questioning, and professional-development follow-up indicators received means of 3.96, with inconsistent utilization and effectiveness labels. The sample size, formal design, instrument, sampling procedure, and administration details were not specified. The findings describe favorable perceptions and reported ranking concordance rather than demonstrated effects on curriculum implementation or learner achievement. Recommendations emphasize planning review, coordinated instructional support, professional learning, and monitoring. |
| <b>Keywords:</b><br>Educational Management<br>Curriculum Implementation<br>School Leadership<br>Public Secondary Schools<br>Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance<br>Nabua |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

## 1. Introduction

Curriculum implementation requires more than the distribution of curriculum guides. School leaders must translate expectations into plans, coordinate personnel and resources, support instruction, and review evidence of progress. These activities link administrative decisions with the conditions under which teachers work. Their contribution depends on how they are enacted in particular schools, making it useful to examine management practices alongside the instructional processes they are intended to support. A favorable description of management, however, should be distinguished from independently demonstrated improvement in teaching or learning.

The study organized educational management into planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. Planning concerns the establishment and review of goals and priorities. Organizing concerns the coordination of responsibilities and resources. Leading concerns direction, communication, motivation, and professional support. Controlling concerns monitoring, evaluation, and corrective action. These functions are conceptually related, but a high rating in one does not establish equivalent practice in the others. Their numerical ordering can identify relative emphasis without demonstrating that one function is inherently more important or more effective.

Hallinger (2011) frames leadership for learning as context-sensitive and connected to school processes and conditions. This perspective provides a rationale for examining how management is experienced in schools of different sizes. It also cautions against assuming that a practice has the same meaning or consequences in every organizational setting. In the present study, school size was the basis for the reported grouping, but the meaning of each size category and its relationship to resources or instructional demands were not specified. The grouping therefore supports a descriptive comparison, not a measured explanation of contextual differences.

Robinson et al. (2008) distinguish leadership practices with different relationships to student outcomes and identify teacher learning as an important area of leadership activity. Their findings support attention to instructional and professional processes rather than administrative activity alone. The comparison is relevant to curriculum implementation because school plans and supervision need to connect with what teachers learn and do. It does not imply that the study measured the same leadership constructs or reproduced the effects found in that literature. Professional development is especially relevant when curriculum expectations require teachers to adapt lessons, assessments, and instructional resources. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) identify content focus, active learning, collaboration, modeling, coaching, feedback, reflection, and sustained duration as recurring features of effective professional learning. In the Philippines, the Learning Action Cell policy establishes school-based collaborative professional development as a mechanism for improving teaching and learning (Department of Education, 2016). These perspectives make follow-up, application, and review important considerations when interpreting a favorable professional-development rating.

The study examined educational management in the public secondary schools of Nabua Districts, Division of Camarines Sur, during School Year 2025–2026. Its curriculum-related domains were curriculum design, instructional delivery, assessment and evaluation, and professional development. These domains locate management within the work of planning instruction, supporting classroom

practice, using assessment evidence, and developing staff capability. They do not, by themselves, provide direct measures of learner attainment or evidence of the fidelity of classroom implementation.

The research questions addressed the extent of utilization of the four management functions, agreement in their indicator rankings, the perceived role of management practices in the four curriculum-related domains, and agreement in those rankings. A final objective was the formulation of policy recommendations. The study's central analytical distinction is between the level of a reported rating and agreement about the ordering of indicators. A high weighted mean and a nonsignificant concordance result can occur together because they describe different properties of the responses. Neither establishes a causal contribution to curriculum implementation.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Study scope and analytical orientation

The study examined reported educational management practices in implementing the Revised K to 12 Curriculum in public secondary schools in Nabua Districts, Division of Camarines Sur. The stated period was School Year 2025–2026. The narrative also referred to Nabua East and West Districts. The formal research-design designation was not specified. The reported evidence consisted of weighted-mean summaries, qualitative descriptions of management and curriculum practices, and Kendall concordance results. No intervention allocation, comparison condition, or repeated measurement of implementation outcomes was reported.

The curriculum revision was identified by the wording Revised K to 12 Curriculum. The specific policy issuance, curriculum version, grade-level coverage, and implementation phase were not specified. The study is therefore discussed using its stated curriculum designation without assigning it to an unreported reform or assuming a particular implementation schedule.

### 2.2 Respondents and school categories

The planning findings identified teachers as raters of school heads' practices and grouped schools as big, medium, and small. Other passages described school heads as respondents, and a curriculum-summary passage referred to big and medium schools while the agreement analysis referred to three school categories. The precise respondent roles and grouping structure therefore remain unresolved. No sample size, number of schools, role-specific count, or distribution across the size categories was reported.

The definitions of big, medium, and small schools, the sampling frame, recruitment method, eligibility criteria, number invited, and response rate were not specified. The available results consequently cannot establish sample representativeness or support population estimates. No unreported participant counts or school-level sample sizes were inferred from the statistical values.

### 2.3 Measures and data collection

The management domains were planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. The curriculum-related domains were curriculum design, instructional delivery, assessment and evaluation, and professional development. The results used weighted means and verbal classifications, chiefly Much Utilized, while selected instructional and professional-development passages used effectiveness terminology. The response options, scoring anchors, classification thresholds, and procedures for aggregating ratings were not specified.

The data-collection instrument, its development and validation, reliability estimates, administration mode, collection dates, and procedures for missing responses were not reported. Accordingly, a questionnaire type, pilot test, expert-validation process, or reliability coefficient is not asserted. Ethics review, institutional permission, consent, confidentiality, and data-management procedures were likewise not specified. These omissions limit the assessment of measurement quality and reproducibility.

The numerical presentation retains the reported values and their associated labels. Only planning has reported group-specific weighted means. Full indicator sets and group-level ranks were not available, so the study does not present reconstructed values for unreported cells. Selected statements are linked to means only when the narrative explicitly makes that connection. Indicator numbers without an explicit wording-to-value link are retained as numbered indicators rather than assigned an inferred statement.

### 2.4 Statistical analysis and interpretation

The reported analyses used weighted means and Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W), with corresponding chi-square statistics, to examine agreement in rank orders. The significance level was 0.05. Reported probability inequalities are retained rather than converted into exact probabilities. The narrative described rejection of the alternative hypothesis for all agreement tests; that reported decision is preserved without substituting a different hypothesis formulation.

Kendall's W addresses concordance in rankings. It does not test equality of weighted means, estimate the association between management utilization and implementation outcomes, or demonstrate an effect on learner achievement. No direct management–implementation correlation or regression coefficient was reported. Nonsignificant concordance is interpreted as the absence of statistically supported agreement under the reported analysis, rather than proof that groups differed significantly or that implementation was ineffective.

The number of ranked indicators for every domain, the group-level rankings, treatment of ties, degrees of freedom, statistical software, and complete critical-value specification were not provided. Several numerical strings and labels are ambiguous. The statistical tables retain these entries, and no test statistic, p-value, or missing composite mean was recalculated. The results should be interpreted within these reporting limits.

## 3. Results

The findings are presented in seven tables. Each table is followed by interpretation addressing the associated research question. The tables include only explicitly reported values or classifications; they do not reproduce unreported full indicator sets. The absence of a numerical entry is distinguished from a zero score or an unfavorable rating.

Table 1. Utilization of educational management practices

| Management practice | Weighted mean | Classification |
|---------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Planning            | 3.97          | Much Utilized  |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

|             |      |               |
|-------------|------|---------------|
| Organizing  | 4.02 | Much Utilized |
| Leading     | 3.98 | Much Utilized |
| Controlling | 3.98 | Much Utilized |

Note. MU = Much Utilized. The values are the reported management-domain means; no new overall composite has been calculated.

Table 1 indicates a favorable descriptive assessment across all four management functions. Organizing had the highest reported mean, while leading and controlling had identical reported values. Planning occupied the lower end of a narrow profile. Because all four means shared the same verbal classification, their ordering is best interpreted as relative numerical emphasis within that profile. It is not evidence that planning was inadequate or that organizing produced stronger implementation outcomes.

The organizing result is consistent with the study's discussion of coordination, allocation of instructional resources, clarification of roles, and scheduling. Leading and controlling were discussed in relation to instructional direction, feedback, supervision, and use of performance information. These descriptions locate management within school operations, but the study did not provide independent observations or records demonstrating how consistently each practice occurred. The numerical findings therefore support statements about the reported ratings, not verified administrative effectiveness.

The narrative also described leadership as receiving the greatest emphasis despite identifying organizing as numerically highest. That verbal interpretation is not supported by the reported ordering. The table preserves the means and allows the contradiction to remain unresolved rather than relabeling the functions or changing a result. A defensible practical reading is that respondents rated all four functions favorably, with limited descriptive separation and no reported test of differences among their mean levels.

Table 2. Selected planning and controlling indicators with explicitly reported means

| Practice or indicator  | Reported practice description                                                                                                 | Weighted mean | Reported rank |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Planning: Indicator 7  | Review and update the school's long-term educational plan at least annually to reflect current realities and performance data | 4.13          | First         |
| Planning: Indicator 3  | Forecast resource requirements                                                                                                | 4.07          | Second        |
| Planning: Indicator 6  | Align departmental plans with the school's vision                                                                             | 4.07          | Second        |
| Planning: Indicator 1  | Wording not explicitly linked to this reported value                                                                          | 3.80          | Tenth         |
| Planning: Indicator 10 | Wording not explicitly linked to this reported value                                                                          | 3.87          | Ninth         |
| Controlling            | Monitor allocated budget expenditures frequently to prevent overspending and ensure full financial accountability             | 3.86          | Lowest        |

Note. All listed means were classified as Much Utilized. Practice descriptions summarize explicitly linked statements. The planning domain contained ten indicators. The complete indicator-to-value mapping was not reported.

Table 2 identifies planning review, resource forecasting, and departmental alignment as prominent reported practices. Reviewing a long-term plan is different from merely possessing one: it implies an opportunity to reconsider whether goals and priorities remain appropriate. The high rating for annual review therefore points to a perceived emphasis on revisiting direction. The study did not, however, provide plan versions, review records, or evidence that revised priorities changed classroom implementation.

Resource forecasting and departmental alignment shared the reported second position. These practices connect institutional intentions with the coordination of work. Their favorable ratings suggest that planning was perceived to involve both anticipated requirements and coherence across departments. The two lower-ranked planning values remain classified as Much Utilized, but their statements cannot be assigned securely from the numerical passage. It would be inappropriate to use surrounding discussion of contingency planning or fiscal priorities to invent a missing indicator-to-score relationship.

The controlling item on budget monitoring was the lowest-rated item within its reported context, yet it retained a favorable utilization classification. This result should not be interpreted as evidence of overspending, weak accountability, or financial noncompliance. It identifies a relative position in the reported ratings without an audit or expenditure analysis. The practical implication is to examine how financial monitoring supports instructional priorities while preserving the distinction between a perceived management practice and independently verified financial performance.

Table 3. Planning utilization by reported school-size category

| School-size category | Average weighted mean | Classification |
|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Big schools          | 4.01                  | Much Utilized  |
| Medium schools       | 3.99                  | Much Utilized  |
| Small schools        | 3.91                  | Much Utilized  |

Note. The school-size definitions and numbers of respondents and schools in each category were not reported.

Table 3 shows that planning received the same verbal classification in each school-size category. The reported means fall within a narrow interval, with big schools at the upper end and small schools at the lower end. This pattern supports a limited descriptive statement that planning was favorably rated across the categories. It does not show that school size explains planning quality or that the categories differed significantly in mean utilization.

The study discussed differences in resources, learner needs, administrative responsibilities, and organizational conditions as explanations for variation in practice. These are plausible considerations for local inquiry, but they were not accompanied by measures or analyses of those characteristics. The table therefore cannot establish that larger schools had stronger planning systems because of greater resources, nor that smaller schools faced a particular type of disadvantage.

The missing category definitions and respondent counts are consequential. They prevent assessment of whether the category means represent similar numbers of schools, whether a small number of raters influenced a category, or whether aggregation gave some schools more weight than others. The grouping remains useful as the stated descriptive structure, while the interpretation should stop short of a population comparison. Any subsequent planning support should be based on documented school needs rather than inferred from the category label alone.

Table 4. Reported agreement in management-practice indicator rankings

| Management practice | Kendall's W | Chi-square | Probability | Alternative hypothesis |
|---------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Planning            | 0.19        | 5.13       | p>0.05      | Rejected               |
| Organizing          | 0.61        | 18,26      | p>0.05      | Rejected               |
| Leading             | 0.42        | 11.47      | p>0.05      | Rejected               |
| Controlling         | 0.56        | 16.88      | p>0.05      | Rejected               |

Note. Significance level = 0.05. The string "18,26" is retained exactly as reported. Degrees of freedom, group-level ranks, and complete critical values were not specified.

Table 4 reports nonsignificant agreement for every management function under the stated analysis. These findings concern the relative ordering of indicators, whereas Table 1 concerns the level of the domain ratings. The coexistence of favorable means and nonsignificant concordance is therefore not inherently contradictory. Respondents can rate a set of practices favorably without producing a sufficiently consistent ordering to support the reported agreement test.

The W values differ across domains, but they should not be read as direct measures of management quality. In particular, the organizing value does not establish that organizing was more effective than planning. The associated chi-square result contains an unresolved comma-form numerical string. Without complete analysis specifications and underlying rankings, the study cannot independently confirm the reported probability classifications or infer an alternative numerical value.

The narrative attributed varied rankings to school resources, priorities, and experiences. The agreement tests alone do not identify these causes. Nor does nonsignificance establish statistically significant disagreement between school categories. The appropriate interpretation is that significant concordance was not demonstrated under the reported procedure. The study's stated rejection of the alternative hypothesis is retained as a reported decision, while broader claims about group differences or their causes remain unsupported by these statistics.

Table 5. Reported curriculum-implementation classifications

| Curriculum-related domain | Classification | Numerical reporting                                                 |
|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Curriculum Design         | Much Utilized  | Not reported                                                        |
| Instructional Delivery    | Much Utilized  | Not reported                                                        |
| Assessment and Evaluation | Much Utilized  | Not reported                                                        |
| Professional Development  | Much Utilized  | Highest overall average weighted mean; numerical value not reported |

Note. All four classifications were explicitly stated. No numerical domain mean was supplied in the attached chapter for these four domains; the highest position for professional development is retained as a qualitative finding.

Table 5 presents the favorable classifications reported across the curriculum-related domains. The curriculum-design discussion emphasized alignment of content and objectives with standards, review of instructional plans, and participation in curriculum development. Instructional delivery concerned support for teaching practices, learner-centered approaches, and classroom supervision. These descriptions indicate the kinds of processes respondents were asked to consider, but the absence of full numerical tables prevents comparison of complete item profiles or calculation of new domain scores.

Assessment and evaluation were discussed as ways to monitor learning and inform instructional adjustments. Professional development was described as the highest-rated domain in the summary, but its numerical mean was not stated. This qualitative ordering should not be converted into a fabricated score or treated as a measured advantage over the other domains. The table distinguishes an explicit classification from the absence of a numerical result.

The use of both utilization and effectiveness language creates an additional interpretive limit. Utilization concerns whether a practice is used, whereas effectiveness concerns whether it achieves a stated result. The study's generally favorable classifications can support a description of perceived curriculum-management support. They do not establish that the practices improved

implementation fidelity, teaching quality, or learner achievement. Those outcomes would require clearly defined measures and evidence beyond the classifications presented here.

Table 6. Selected instructional and professional-development practices

| Domain                   | Reported practice                                                                                                                   | Mean | Reported classification |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------------------------|
| Instructional Delivery   | Integrating technology tools to enhance active learning and higher-order thinking                                                   | 3.96 | Much utilized           |
| Instructional Delivery   | Utilizing targeted higher-order thinking questions                                                                                  | 3.96 | Much utilized           |
| Professional Development | Consistently measuring the direct and observable impact of professional development on teaching practices and student outcomes      | 3.96 | Much Effective          |
| Professional Development | Providing systematic coaching, follow-up, and peer support after initial professional development sessions to ensure skill transfer | 3.96 | Much Effective          |
| Professional Development | Documenting and tracking staff participation, goal completion, and measurable skill growth resulting from professional development  | 3.96 | Much Effective          |

Note. All means are weighted means. These practices were described as comparatively lower-rated. The instructional-delivery passage also uses Much Effective in its interpretation; the table retains its initial utilization labels and the explicit professional-development labels.

Table 6 identifies a common numerical value across several practices that require sustained application and review. The instructional-delivery items concern purposeful technology integration and higher-order questioning. Their comparatively lower position does not show that technology or analytical questioning was absent. Both retained a favorable utilization label. The findings indicate relative priorities for closer examination, without identifying a measured deficit or establishing the reasons for the ratings. The professional-development items concern evidence of transfer after training: observing instructional impact, providing follow-up support, and tracking growth. These differ from attendance or access to a seminar. The study's narrative suggested that they require continued observation, interaction, and documentation. Those are reasonable interpretations of the task demands, but the study did not measure monitoring time, coaching intensity, or data-system capacity. Such explanations should therefore guide further inquiry rather than be reported as tested causes.

Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) provide relevant context by treating coaching, feedback, reflection, and sustained learning as features of effective professional development. The comparison supports examining follow-through rather than relying solely on participation records. It does not validate the specific ratings or demonstrate that the reported activities improved student outcomes. The repeated mean also does not make the practices equivalent: the items address different instructional processes and retain different verbal labels, whose intended meaning requires clarification.

Table 7. Reported agreement in curriculum-related indicator rankings

| Domain                    | Reported squared-deviation quantity | Kendall's W | Chi-square | Probability |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Curriculum Design         | 46.00                               | 0.06        | 1.62       | $p > 0.05$  |
| Instructional Delivery    | 1.90                                | 0.19        | 5.70       | $p > 0.05$  |
| Assessment and Evaluation | 43.00                               | 0.06        | 1.62       | $p > 0.05$  |
| Professional Development  | 152.00                              | 0.15        | 4.50       | $p > 0.05$  |

Note. The quantity is described as a summation of squares from the mean, but its exact definition is unclear. "1.90" is retained without changing it to 190. Critical chi-square values of 16.919 for Curriculum Design and 18.307 for Instructional Delivery were stated at 0.05. No critical values were supplied for the other two domains. The alternative hypothesis was reported as rejected in all four domains.

Table 7 reports nonsignificant rank-order agreement across all four curriculum-related domains. As with the management-function results, these tests address consistency in ordering rather than the level of perceived utilization. The favorable classifications in Table 5 therefore should not be interpreted as contradicted by the agreement results. Conversely, the nonsignificant results do not demonstrate that curriculum implementation was unsuccessful or that the school categories had significantly different performance levels. The statistical quantities require caution. The narrative associates a set of values with a summation of squares from the mean, but the terminology is not sufficiently clear to establish the exact computational role of that quantity. The instructional-delivery entry of 1.90 is retained as printed, even though it warrants verification alongside the reported W and chi-square. The study does not have the rank data needed to resolve the discrepancy. Supplying a likely-looking replacement would compromise fidelity rather than improve statistical accuracy. The stated critical values provide only partial information about the decision rule. Degrees of freedom, tie corrections, and the number of ranked indicators were not fully specified. The table therefore preserves the reported decisions without claiming independent verification. Its substantive implication is limited: statistically supported concordance was not reported for the

curriculum-related rankings. Explanations involving resources, teacher experience, or local priorities remain possible interpretations that were not tested by the displayed statistics.

#### 4. Discussion

##### 4.1 Management utilization and curriculum support

The study's first research question was answered by favorable ratings of planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. The organizing mean was numerically highest, while the remaining functions occupied a narrow range and shared the same classification. This pattern supports an account of broadly utilized management practices, rather than a conclusion that only one function mattered. The small descriptive separation also limits the practical significance that can be assigned to their rank order without information on variability or a test of mean differences.

The management functions describe complementary parts of implementation. Plans establish direction, organization coordinates work, leadership supports participants, and monitoring supplies information for revision. This conceptual relationship helps interpret the profile, but it was not tested as a causal sequence in the study. No analysis showed that stronger planning led to better organizing, that supervision mediated an implementation outcome, or that a particular combination of functions produced higher achievement. The study's treatment of management can be read alongside research on leadership for learning. Hallinger (2011) emphasizes the role of context and school-level conditions in understanding leadership contributions. That perspective supports careful local interpretation, but it does not supply missing evidence about the Nabua schools. The present results do not establish how resources, school size, or professional experience shaped the ratings. Those relationships remain questions for subsequent investigation.

##### 4.2 Planning across school contexts

The planning findings identify annual review, resource forecasting, and alignment as reported strengths. These practices suggest an orientation toward keeping institutional goals connected with requirements and departmental work. Their relevance lies in the potential to make plans usable rather than merely documentary. The study did not examine plan quality directly, however, so a favorable planning mean cannot establish that priorities were coherent, feasible, or implemented as intended.

The school-size means provide a descriptive view of the planning profile. They do not establish why one category's rating was slightly higher, nor do they justify a claim that smaller schools require a particular intervention. Without category definitions, sample sizes, and school-level information, a size-based explanation would go beyond the evidence. Local support could instead begin with review of actual planning processes and identified needs, using school size as contextual information rather than a substitute for assessment. The lower-rated planning indicators cannot be assigned confidently to particular statements because their wording-to-value mapping is incomplete. The study's surrounding narrative discusses contingency planning and allocation concerns, but that discussion does not resolve the indicator numbering. Preserving this distinction prevents an unsupported diagnosis. A subsequent review should reconnect indicator numbers with the full instrument before using the reported ranks to target a specific management skill.

##### 4.3 Instructional leadership and professional learning

The curriculum-related findings extend the management profile to design, delivery, assessment, and professional development. All received favorable classifications, with professional development described as highest in the qualitative summary. The numerical absence of domain means prevents a fuller comparison. Nevertheless, the selected follow-up items identify a substantive issue: opportunities for professional learning should be distinguished from evidence that learning was applied and sustained.

Robinson et al. (2008) identify leadership involvement in teacher learning and development as an important dimension in their analysis of leadership and student outcomes. The study's emphasis on coaching and follow-up is relevant to that dimension. The comparison does not permit an effect estimate to be transferred to the Nabua schools. It instead supplies a reason to ask whether management practices create conditions for teachers to review, apply, and improve instruction.

The Learning Action Cell policy provides a Philippine institutional context for collaborative school-based professional learning (Department of Education, 2016). Within the study's recommendations, such sessions could serve as a setting for reviewing lesson alignment, discussing assessment information, and planning responses to instructional concerns. Their value should be evaluated through the quality of that work and its application. The study did not report the frequency, content, participation, or outcomes of actual sessions, so their effectiveness in the setting remains unmeasured.

Technology integration and higher-order questioning also require interpretation at the level of instructional purpose. The shared mean does not establish that the two practices faced the same barriers or required the same support. The narrative proposes explanations involving resources and pedagogical demands, but no access inventory or teacher-competency measure accompanies them. The findings support reviewing these practices, while leaving their causes and consequences open to investigation.

##### 4.4 Meaning of the agreement findings

The second and fourth research questions were addressed through concordance tests, all reported as nonsignificant. The principal implication is about ranking consistency. These results do not estimate an effect of management on curriculum implementation, and they do not test whether the school-size category means were equal. Treating them as evidence of improved implementation or of statistically significant group differences would answer questions that the reported tests did not address.

The distinction between high ratings and shared rankings is also practically important. A group may judge many practices favorably while differing in which should receive priority. That possibility is compatible with the study's descriptive profile, but the aggregate statistics do not reveal the actual group-level pattern. The missing ranks prevent identification of which indicators generated the greatest variation or whether ties affected the results.

Several reporting inconsistencies limit confidence in more detailed inferential claims. The organizing chi-square has comma-form notation; the squared-deviation quantity is ambiguously named; and the instructional-delivery quantity requires verification. The study also refers to an interactive problem-solving approach within a management-agreement interpretation, although that construct

is not part of the stated research questions. These issues do not justify changing the reported values. They require clarification before the tests can support stronger conclusions.

#### 4.5 Policy implications and future investigation

The policy recommendations emphasize aligned annual implementation plans, classroom monitoring, constructive feedback, professional development, collaborative planning, equitable resource allocation, and use of assessment information. They also propose participation by department heads, master teachers, teacher leaders, and external stakeholders. These proposals follow the study's management and curriculum focus. They are recommendations derived from the findings, rather than interventions whose feasibility or effectiveness was evaluated.

A practical application is to connect each proposed action with a documented need and a clear criterion for review. An annual plan can be examined for alignment and follow-through; coaching can be reviewed for the specificity of guidance and subsequent application; and assessment discussions can be examined for the instructional decisions they inform. These are possible evaluation directions, not additional procedures undertaken in the study. Their purpose is to distinguish the completion of an activity from evidence that it supported implementation.

Further research should first clarify the respondent population, instrument, and grouping structure so that the descriptive and concordance analyses can be reproduced. Direct evidence of curriculum implementation could then complement ratings through documented lesson alignment, classroom observations, or clearly defined administrative indicators. A longitudinal or comparative design would be needed to examine change and alternative explanations before causal language is warranted. Policy adoption should be accompanied by evaluation rather than assumed to produce improvement.

### 5. Conclusion

The study characterized planning, organizing, leading, and controlling as Much Utilized in implementing the Revised K to 12 Curriculum in Nabua Districts. Organizing had the highest reported management mean. Planning was favorably classified across big, medium, and small schools, and all four curriculum-related domains were also classified as Much Utilized. All reported agreement tests were nonsignificant. Selected instructional and professional-development follow-up practices identify priorities for review, but their labels and several statistical entries require clarification. The findings inform recommendations for aligned planning, coordinated instructional support, professional learning, and monitoring. They do not establish causal improvements in curriculum implementation or learner outcomes. Complete methods, full data presentation, and resolution of the identified inconsistencies are necessary before stronger empirical claims are supported.

### References

- [1] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report>
- [2] Department of Education. (2016). The Learning Action Cell (LAC) as a K to 12 Basic Education Program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning (DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016). [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/DO\\_s2016\\_035.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/DO_s2016_035.pdf)
- [3] Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- [4] Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>