IROAP
International Research Organization and Academic Publication
An International Peer-Reviewed Academic Journal
ISSN: 3155-6981

VOLUME / ISSUE	PUBLICATION	ARTICLE TYPE	ARTICLE ID
1 / 1	IROAP	RESEARCH ARTICLE	IROAP Published ID

Reported Compliance with Teaching Standards and Developmental Domains in Kindergarten Education: Implications for Management in Occidental Mindoro

Frances Andrea Camelle C. Bandales[1], **Randy M. Baja, FRIEdr, CESE**[2]
University of Batangas, Batangas City, Philippines

DOI	RECEIVED	ACCEPTED	PUBLISHED
10.5281/zenodo.22634893	July 31, 2026	August 25, 2026	September 1, 2026

ABSTRACT

Background. Quality kindergarten education depends on coherent learning programs, appropriate assessment, and classroom practices that support multiple developmental domains. Evidence from local school systems is needed to identify implementation strengths and management priorities. **Objective.** This study assessed reported teacher compliance with teaching standards and competencies, examined the reported evidence of four developmental domains, compared school-head and teacher assessments, tested relationships among the study variables, described implementation challenges, and developed a proposed management plan for selected public elementary schools in the Division of Occidental Mindoro, Philippines. **Methods.** The dissertation used a descriptive cross-sectional survey with correlational analyses and supplementary interviews during School Year 2023-2024. Chapter 3 reports 37 school heads and 182 teachers as respondents (n = 219). A researcher-developed questionnaire based on the National Early Learning Framework was reviewed by experts. Twelve school heads and/or teachers participated in interviews. Weighted means, standard deviations, independent-samples t tests, Pearson correlations, and analysis of variance with reported pairwise comparisons were used. **Results.** Reported compliance was high for learning program development (M = 3.44, SD = 0.56) and learning assessment (M = 3.46, SD = 0.48). Reported evidence was moderate for socio-emotional development (M = 3.46, SD = 0.44), physical health, wellbeing, and motor development (M = 3.45, SD = 0.50), and aesthetic/creative development (M = 3.43, SD = 0.49), and great for understanding of the physical and natural environment (M = 3.52, SD = 0.54). School-head and teacher ratings differed significantly for learning program development ($t = -2.87$, $p < .01$), learning assessment ($t = -2.09$, $p = .04$), and socio-emotional development ($t = -2.51$, $p = .013$). Learning program development correlated positively with the four developmental domains ($r = .49$-$.72$, all $p < .01$), as did learning assessment ($r = .52$-$.67$, all $p < .01$). Interview narratives emphasized crowded classrooms, resource limitations, limited access to intervention services, socioeconomic disparities, and limited family engagement. **Conclusion.** Teachers and school heads reported strong compliance with program-development and assessment expectations, but several developmental indicators remained at a moderate level. The positive associations indicate that stronger reported program and assessment practices co-occurred with stronger reported developmental-domain evidence; the cross-sectional self-report design does not establish causation. The proposed management plan targets curriculum responsiveness, assessment alignment, developmental supports, resource access, early intervention, and family engagement.

KEYWORDS early childhood education | kindergarten teachers | teacher competencies | learning assessment | developmental domains | cross-sectional survey

HOW TO CITE Bandales, F. A. C. C., & Baja, R. M. (2026). Reported Compliance with Teaching Standards and Developmental Domains in Kindergarten Education: Implications for Management in Occidental Mindoro. *International Research Organization and Academic Publication, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22634893

1 Introduction

Early childhood education establishes important foundations for cognitive, linguistic, social-emotional, physical, and creative development. Kindergarten is therefore not simply a preparatory year; it is a period in which children build early learning habits, relationships, self-regulation, and the capacities needed for later schooling. Multidimensional approaches to early learning are especially important because developmental domains interact rather than progress in isolation (Aquino et al., 2019; Zelazo et al., 2021).

In the Philippines, kindergarten has been incorporated into the basic education continuum and is guided by national expectations for developmentally appropriate, child-centered, and culturally responsive practice. The dissertation located these expectations within the National Early Learning Framework (NELF, 2015) and the broader K to 12 policy environment. Comparative work on the Philippine and Malaysian kindergarten curricula has likewise emphasized that curriculum quality depends on how learning domains and teaching-learning processes are translated into classroom practice (Aquino et al., 2017). Program implementation across the Philippine basic education system, however, is shaped by resources, institutional capacity, and local conditions (Dizon et al., 2019).

Two components of practice are particularly relevant to kindergarten quality. Learning program development requires teachers to adapt content, materials, grouping, technology, and learning experiences to diverse children. Learning assessment requires ethical, aligned, varied, and developmentally appropriate methods that provide usable feedback. A Philippine study of kindergarten program implementation reported generally strong knowledge and use of key program elements and identified relationships between selected implementation components and school-readiness outcomes (Cacao & Tan, 2019). Research using the Early Childhood Care and Development Checklist has also underscored the importance of assessment, teacher support, and parent partnership in strengthening kindergarten readiness (Ramos, 2020).

The Division of Occidental Mindoro provides a relevant setting for examining these issues because schools may differ in resources, class size, access to specialized services, and family participation. The dissertation described local concerns related to overcrowded classrooms, insufficient materials and facilities, monitoring limitations, and barriers affecting children in remote or socioeconomically constrained settings. Although these concerns are widely discussed in early childhood literature, the study addressed a more specific local gap: the simultaneous assessment of reported compliance with learning program development and learning assessment, the reported evidence of four developmental domains, differences between school-head and teacher perceptions, relationships among these variables, and implementation challenges that could inform a management response.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to develop a management plan for selected public elementary schools in the Division of Occidental Mindoro. Specifically, it sought to determine the reported level of teacher compliance with teaching standards and competencies in learning program development and learning assessment; assess the reported evidence of socio-emotional development, physical health, wellbeing and motor development, aesthetic/creative development, and understanding of the physical and natural environment; compare the assessments of school heads and teachers; examine relationships between the two teaching-standard areas and the four developmental domains; determine reported variations among the developmental domains; describe challenges in early child development and learning; and use the findings as the basis for a proposed management plan.

1.2 Conceptual Framework

The dissertation drew on Theory of Change (Weiss, 1995), Diffusion of Innovations (Rogers, 2003), constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978), and Multiple Intelligences theory (Gardner, 1983). In the condensed article, these perspectives are used as an interpretive orientation rather than as independently tested theories. Theory of Change links identified implementation gaps to planned management actions and measurable targets. Diffusion of Innovations highlights the role of school leaders and early adopters in normalizing improved practice. Constructivism supports active, exploratory, and socially mediated learning, while Multiple Intelligences supports varied activities and differentiated opportunities. Full bibliographic details for these sources require verification before submission.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Research design

The study used a descriptive, cross-sectional survey design with correlational analyses and a supplementary interview component. The dissertation described the design as descriptive because it assessed current practices and perceptions in a defined educational setting. The inferential analyses compared respondent groups, examined associations between reported teaching practices and developmental-domain evidence, and assessed reported variation among domains. The interview material was used to provide contextual descriptions of implementation challenges; the dissertation did not report a formal mixed-methods design or a named qualitative analytic approach.

2.2 Setting

The study was conducted in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Occidental Mindoro, MIMAROPA Region, during School Year 2023-2024.

2.3 Participants and respondents

The reported sampling frame comprised 342 pre-elementary school teachers and 40 school heads. The Methods chapter states that 182 teachers and 37 school heads were selected, for a provisional survey sample of 219 respondents. Chapter 5 states that 366 teachers and 37 school heads participated; because 366 exceeds the teacher population reported in Chapter 3, the Chapter 3 figure of 182 teachers is provisionally used in this manuscript. The author must confirm the final analytic sample and response rate before submission. No demographic profile of respondents was reported.

For the interview component, 12 teachers and school heads were invited.

2.4 Sampling

The dissertation reports that the Raosoft sample-size calculator was used with a 5% margin of error and that simple random sampling was employed. The confidence level, assumed response distribution, design effect, replacement procedure, and handling of nonresponse were not reported

2.5 Instrumentation

Data were gathered through a researcher-developed questionnaire and an interview guide. The questionnaire was based on the general principles of the National Early Learning Framework. The reported result tables show six 10-item areas: learning program development; learning assessment; socio-emotional development; physical health, wellbeing and motor development; aesthetic/creative development; and understanding of the physical and natural environment. Thus, the analyzed questionnaire appears to contain 60 rated indicators.

The researcher developed the indicators through literature reading and observation, obtained comments from the dissertation adviser, revised the draft, and submitted it to field experts for validation. The dissertation does not report the number or qualifications of validators, a content-validity index, pilot-testing procedures, item analysis, internal-consistency reliability, test-retest reliability, or the final questionnaire as an appendix

The interview guide contained open-ended questions intended to clarify survey findings and capture experiences related to early child development and learning. The guide was reviewed by the adviser and other experts. No coding framework or analytic protocol was reported; therefore, the interview findings are presented as descriptive narratives rather than as formally derived qualitative themes.

2.6 Scoring and interpretation

Items were rated on a four-point scale. The dissertation defined 3.50-4.00 as Very High or Great Extent and 1.00-1.49 as Very Low or Least Extent. It printed the High or Moderate Extent interval as 2.50-3.29, although the results tables classify values from 3.30 through 3.49 as High or Moderate Extent. The intended interval was therefore likely 2.50-3.49, but this manuscript does not silently correct the source. Reported verbal interpretations are reproduced as presented, and the scale boundaries require author verification.

2.7 Data-gathering procedure

After the instrument was approved, the researcher sought permission from the Schools Division Superintendent and school heads, arranged questionnaire distribution and interviews, and personally administered the questionnaire. Completed responses were retrieved, manually tallied, grouped, and tabulated before statistical treatment. The dissertation did not

report response monitoring, duplicate prevention, data-entry verification, missing-response rules, or the exact data-collection dates.

2.8 Ethical considerations

Participation was described as voluntary. Respondents were informed about the purpose and procedures of the study, could decline or withdraw, and were assured anonymity and confidentiality. Informed consent and compliance with data-privacy requirements were reported. The dissertation did not identify an institutional ethics review board, approval or exemption number, approval date, consent form, data-retention plan, or specific protections for interview recordings.

2.9 Data analysis and statistical treatment

Weighted means and standard deviations summarized the rated indicators and composite areas. Independent-samples t tests compared school-head and teacher assessments. Pearson correlation coefficients examined relationships between learning program development or learning assessment and each developmental domain. Analysis of variance was listed as the procedure for examining variation among developmental domains, and the results report six pairwise comparisons. The dissertation did not provide the statistical software, a priori alpha level, degrees of freedom, confidence intervals, assumption checks, omnibus F statistic, or the post-hoc procedure. The numerical results and significance labels below are reproduced exactly as reported.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Results

3.1.1 Respondent information

The provisional analytic sample was 37 school heads and 182 teachers, as reported in Chapter 3. No age, sex, educational attainment, teaching experience, school size, school location, or response-rate data were reported. Twelve school heads and/or teachers contributed interview narratives; their group distribution was not stated.

3.1.2 Reported compliance and developmental-domain evidence

Both teaching-standard areas were rated High overall. Learning program development had an overall composite mean of 3.44 (SD = 0.56), while learning assessment had an overall composite mean of 3.46 (SD = 0.48). Among the developmental domains, understanding of the physical and natural environment was rated at Great Extent (M = 3.52, SD = 0.54). Socio-emotional development (M = 3.46, SD = 0.44), physical health, wellbeing and motor development (M = 3.45, SD = 0.50), and aesthetic/creative development (M = 3.43, SD = 0.49) were rated at Moderate Extent (Table 1).

Table 1. Composite scores by respondent group

Area	School heads M (SD), VI	Teachers M (SD), VI	Overall M (SD), VI
Learning program development	3.39 (0.56), H	3.49 (0.58), H	3.44 (0.56), H
Learning assessment	3.43 (0.47), H	3.48 (0.49), H	3.46 (0.48), H
Socio-emotional development	3.45 (0.43), ME	3.53 (0.49), GE	3.46 (0.44), ME
Physical health, wellbeing and motor development	3.53 (0.50), GE	3.43 (0.50), ME	3.45 (0.50), ME
Aesthetic/creative development	3.42 (0.58), ME	3.44 (0.47), ME	3.43 (0.49), ME
Understanding of the physical and natural environment	3.37 (0.51), ME	3.52 (0.55), GE	3.52 (0.54), GE

Note. H = High; ME = Moderate Extent; GE = Great Extent. Values are reproduced as reported.

The highest and lowest indicators within each area are summarized in Table 2. In learning program development, tailoring instruction to diverse learning styles, abilities, and interests received the highest overall rating (M = 3.52, SD = 0.50), whereas incorporating diverse perspectives into the curriculum received the lowest (M = 3.29, SD = 0.62). In learning assessment, reflecting on assessment practice and adjusting it in response to feedback and learner needs was highest (M = 3.67, SD = 0.57), while ensuring alignment with curriculum and department standards was lowest (M = 3.33, SD = 0.60).

For socio-emotional development, forming friendships and emotional connections with peers was highest (M = 3.59, SD = 0.55), while asserting independence through choices and self-initiated activity was lowest (M = 3.35, SD = 0.58). For physical health, wellbeing and motor development, ensuring a balanced diet was highest (M = 3.51, SD = 0.58), and providing independent exploration opportunities was lowest (M = 3.34, SD = 0.71). Artistic expression and music/movement were jointly highest in aesthetic/creative development (both M = 3.49), while parent-teacher

collaboration for creative growth was lowest (M = 3.35, SD = 0.68). Multisensory activities were highest in understanding the physical and natural environment (M = 3.60, SD = 0.52), while exploration of objects, textures, and spaces was lowest (M = 3.42, SD = 0.61).

Table 2. Highest- and lowest-rated indicators within each area

Area	Highest reported indicator	Lowest reported indicator
Learning program development	Tailor instruction to diverse learning styles, abilities, and interests: 3.52 (0.50), VH	Incorporate diverse perspectives into the curriculum: 3.29 (0.62), H
Learning assessment	Reflect on assessment practice and adjust to feedback and learner needs: 3.67 (0.57), VH	Align assessments with curriculum and department standards: 3.33 (0.60), H
Socio-emotional development	Develop social skills and emotional connections through friendships: 3.59 (0.55), GE	Assert independence through choices and self-initiated activities: 3.35 (0.58), ME
Physical health, wellbeing and motor development	Ensure a balanced diet with adequate nutrients, vitamins, and minerals: 3.51 (0.58), GE	Provide opportunities to explore and learn independently: 3.34 (0.71), ME
Aesthetic/creative development	Artistic expression: 3.49 (0.59), ME; music and movement: 3.49 (0.62), ME	Parent-teacher collaboration for creative growth: 3.35 (0.68), ME
Physical and natural environment	Engage multiple senses through textures, foods, and sounds: 3.60 (0.52), GE	Explore objects, textures, and spaces to understand physical properties: 3.42 (0.61), ME

Note. VH = Very High; H = High; ME = Moderate Extent; GE = Great Extent. The learning-assessment item mean of 3.67 is reproduced as reported and should be checked against the source dataset.

3.1.3 Comparisons between school heads and teachers

Teachers rated learning program development, learning assessment, and socio-emotional development significantly higher than school heads. Learning program development differed by 0.10 points (school heads M = 3.39; teachers M = 3.49; t = -2.87, p < .01). Learning assessment differed by 0.05 points (3.43 vs. 3.48; t = -2.09, p = .04), and socio-emotional development differed by 0.08 points (3.45 vs. 3.53; t = -2.51, p = .013). The reported differences for physical health, wellbeing and motor development, aesthetic/creative development, and understanding of the physical and natural environment were not statistically significant (Table 3).

Table 3. Reported comparisons between school heads and teachers

Area	School heads M	Teachers M	t	p	Reported interpretation
Learning program development	3.39	3.49	-2.87	< .01	Highly significant
Learning assessment	3.43	3.48	-2.09	.04	Significant
Socio-emotional development	3.45	3.53	-2.51	.013	Significant
Physical health, wellbeing and motor development	3.53	3.43	0.30	.76	Not significant
Aesthetic/creative development	3.42	3.44	-1.64	.10	Not significant
Understanding of the physical and natural environment	3.37	3.52	1.44	.15	Not significant

3.1.4 Relationships between teaching-standard areas and developmental domains

Learning program development had positive, highly significant reported relationships with all four developmental domains. The strongest relationship was with socio-emotional development (r = .72, reported r-square = .52), followed by understanding of the physical and natural environment (r = .63, reported r-square = .49), aesthetic/creative development (r = .56, r-square = .31), and physical health, wellbeing and motor development (r = .49, r-square = .24). All reported p values were below .01.

Learning assessment was also positively related to all four domains. The strongest relationship was with aesthetic/creative development (r = .67, r-square = .45), followed by socio-emotional development (r = .60, r-square = .36), understanding of the physical and natural environment (r = .58, r-square = .34), and physical health, wellbeing and motor development (r = .52, r-square = .27). All reported p values were below .01 (Table 4).

Table 4. Reported correlations with developmental domains

Developmental domain	LPD r	Reported r2	p	LA r	Reported r2	p
Socio-emotional development	.72	.52	< .01	.60	.36	< .01

Developmental domain	LPD r	Reported r2	p	LA r	Reported r2	p
Physical health, wellbeing and motor development	.49	.24	< .01	.52	.27	< .01
Aesthetic/creative development	.56	.31	< .01	.67	.45	< .01
Understanding of the physical and natural environment	.63	.49	< .01	.58	.34	< .01

Note. LPD = learning program development; LA = learning assessment. r2 values are reproduced as reported.

3.1.5 Reported variation among developmental domains

The dissertation reported six pairwise comparisons. Socio-emotional development differed significantly from aesthetic/creative development (mean difference = 0.03, p = .05) and from understanding of the physical and natural environment (mean difference = 0.06, p = .05). Physical health, wellbeing and motor development differed significantly from aesthetic/creative development (mean difference = 0.02, p = .05). The remaining three comparisons were reported as not significant (Table 5). An omnibus ANOVA statistic and the post-hoc method were not provided.

Table 5. Reported pairwise differences among developmental domains

Comparison	Mean difference	p	Reported interpretation
Socio-emotional vs. physical health/wellbeing/motor	0.01	.15	Not significant
Socio-emotional vs. aesthetic/creative	0.03	.05	Significant
Socio-emotional vs. physical/natural environment	0.06	.05	Significant
Physical health/wellbeing/motor vs. aesthetic/creative	0.02	.05	Significant
Physical health/wellbeing/motor vs. physical/natural environment	0.07	.10	Not significant
Aesthetic/creative vs. physical/natural environment	0.09	.10	Not significant

Note. The omnibus F statistic, degrees of freedom, and post-hoc test were not reported. Values at p = .05 were classified as significant in the dissertation.

3.1.6 Interview-reported challenges

Interview narratives described five recurring implementation problems. First, crowded classrooms limited individualized attention and shifted teacher effort toward group management. Second, insufficient materials, equipment, facilities, and support staff constrained the range and quality of learning experiences. Third, limited access to early intervention services reduced the availability of speech, occupational, behavioral, and specialized educational support. Fourth, socioeconomic disparities affected nutrition, learning materials, attendance, home study conditions, and emotional wellbeing. Fifth, limited family engagement was associated with work schedules, financial pressures, language or cultural barriers, and uneven school-home communication. The dissertation conclusion highlighted crowded classrooms and resource availability as the principal challenges, while the detailed results and management plan also addressed intervention access and family engagement.

3.2 Discussion

The study presents a pattern of relatively strong reported compliance with teaching standards but more moderate reported evidence across several developmental domains. Learning program development and learning assessment both received High composite ratings, suggesting that teachers and school heads generally perceived the expected planning and assessment practices as present. This broad pattern is consistent with Philippine kindergarten research reporting substantial implementation of curriculum guidance, instructional materials, teaching methods, and administrative support, although implementation strength can vary across program elements and school contexts (Cacao & Tan, 2019).

The distinction between high reported practice and moderate developmental-domain evidence is important. It suggests that compliance with expected processes does not automatically mean that every developmental opportunity is experienced to the same extent. The lowest program-development indicators involved responsiveness to student feedback and the incorporation of diverse perspectives. The lowest assessment indicators involved alignment with curriculum standards and the use of varied assessment approaches. These areas require more than policy awareness: they depend on teacher time, professional learning, materials, leadership support, and usable feedback systems. Program-level studies of Philippine education similarly show that policy implementation is mediated by local capacity and operating conditions (Dizon et al., 2019).

Teacher ratings were significantly higher than school-head ratings for learning program development, learning assessment, and socio-emotional development. One plausible interpretation is that teachers, because they implement daily classroom

activities and assessments, may observe more frequent use of these practices than school heads. Another possibility is role-based response bias: teachers may evaluate their own practice more favorably, while school heads use broader or more stringent criteria. The study did not collect observational evidence that could adjudicate between these explanations. The absence of significant group differences for physical, creative, and environmental domains indicates greater convergence in those areas, but the unreported degrees of freedom and confidence intervals limit evaluation of the precision and practical magnitude of the differences.

The developmental-domain pattern was mixed. Understanding of the physical and natural environment received a Great Extent rating, driven by high scores for multisensory activity, questioning, imaginative play, observation, and outdoor or nature-related learning. These practices are compatible with constructivist approaches that emphasize exploration and meaning-making. However, the low indicator for exploration of objects, textures, and spaces and the moderate rating for access to greenery suggest that environmental learning may be stronger in teacher-led or readily available activities than in sustained, resource-intensive exploration. The reported composite for this domain should be verified because it equals the teacher mean despite the lower school-head mean.

Socio-emotional development was rated Moderate Extent overall, even though forming friendships and positive peer connections received a Great Extent rating. The lower rating for independence, choice, and self-initiated activity indicates a potential imbalance between social participation and autonomy. In kindergarten, both dimensions matter: children need supportive relationships and opportunities to make decisions, initiate activity, and regulate behavior. Aquino et al. (2019) emphasized the multidomain nature of kindergarten competence, while comparative curriculum analysis has highlighted the need to translate developmental principles into consistent classroom opportunities (Aquino et al., 2017).

Physical health, wellbeing and motor development was also rated Moderate Extent overall. Nutrition-related indicators were among the strongest, whereas nurturing caregiver-child bonds and independent exploration were lower. This pattern may reflect the visibility of routine health messages relative to the more relational and environment-dependent work of sustained emotional support and exploratory learning. The finding should not be interpreted as direct evidence of child health or motor outcomes because the study measured adult perceptions rather than clinical, observational, or performance-based indicators.

Aesthetic/creative development had the lowest composite mean, although the differences across domains were small. Artistic expression and music/movement approached the Great Extent threshold, but parent-teacher collaboration for creative growth, a balanced allocation of curriculum time, and recognition of individual talents were lower. Creative learning can be particularly vulnerable when class size, materials, schedule demands, and emphasis on core competencies constrain open-ended activity. The moderate rating supports the proposed emphasis on arts integration, professional development, and family participation rather than the creation of a separate, isolated arts initiative.

The correlations were positive and statistically significant across all combinations of the two teaching-standard areas and four developmental domains. The strongest reported association was between learning program development and socio-emotional development ($r = .72$), followed by learning assessment and aesthetic/creative development ($r = .67$). These findings are consistent with the conceptual proposition that coherent planning and assessment co-occur with broader developmental support. They should not be interpreted causally. All measures came from the same questionnaire and respondent context, creating the possibility of common-method variance; the design was cross-sectional; potential confounders were not controlled; and direct child outcomes were not measured. The reported r-square value for $r = .63$ is also internally inconsistent and requires verification before any variance-explained statement is published.

The interview narratives explain why high reported compliance may coexist with implementation gaps. Crowding reduces opportunities for differentiated instruction and sustained observation. Resource shortages limit manipulatives, technology, creative materials, and accessible learning spaces. Limited intervention services delay specialized support. Socioeconomic pressures affect attendance, nutrition, and home learning, while limited family engagement weakens continuity between school and home. These concerns are compatible with research describing the distinctive pressures on early childhood teaching and the importance of flexible, family-responsive support systems (Timmons et al., 2021). Ramos (2020) similarly emphasized strong parent partnership and targeted activities when addressing kindergarten readiness needs.

The proposed management plan appropriately focuses on the lowest-rated indicators and the interview-reported barriers. Its value lies in connecting each priority to an action and a measurable target. Nevertheless, the plan was not piloted, validated, costed, or evaluated within the study. The target percentages should therefore be treated as proposed implementation benchmarks rather than evidence of effectiveness. Before adoption, district supervisors, school heads,

teachers, parents, and relevant specialists should review feasibility, resource requirements, responsibility assignments, timelines, and data sources for monitoring.

3.3 Practical Implications and Proposed Management Plan

The findings support a coordinated management response rather than isolated classroom adjustments. The first priority is a feedback-responsive learning program: regular observation, daily reflection, student check-ins, parent feedback, and a curriculum audit can help teachers adapt instruction and incorporate diverse cultural and socioeconomic perspectives. The second priority is assessment quality: learning objectives, curriculum standards, formative observations, checklists, anecdotal records, performance tasks, projects, and age-appropriate written assessments should be mapped within a common assessment framework.

Developmental priorities include empathy, emotional awareness, independence, choice, nurturing relationships, safe and stimulating learning centers, arts integration, parent participation, and outdoor or sensory exploration. System-level priorities include classroom-space optimization, flexible seating, resource distribution and access, a centralized referral and intervention hub, partnerships with community and health providers, and multiple communication channels for families. Supplementary Table S1 presents a compact version of the dissertation plan and preserves the proposed success indicators exactly. These indicators require validation and should not be reported as achieved outcomes.

3.4 Limitations

The study has several limitations. First, the design was cross-sectional and descriptive; the reported correlations cannot establish temporal sequence or causality. Second, all primary variables were measured through adult ratings, which may be affected by self-report, social-desirability, and common-method bias. No direct classroom observation, child-performance assessment, administrative record, or parent report was used to triangulate the findings. Third, the study was conducted in one school division and did not report the number or characteristics of participating schools, limiting transferability to other settings.

Fourth, the dissertation does not report instrument reliability, formal content-validity indices, pilot testing, response rate, missing-data handling, statistical software, degrees of freedom, confidence intervals, assumption checks, or the post-hoc procedure. Several numerical and labeling inconsistencies require verification, including the teacher sample count, scale intervals, one t-statistic sign, selected overall means, and an r-square value. Fifth, the interview component lacks sufficient methodological detail to assess credibility, including sampling, composition, recording, transcription, coding, reflexivity, saturation, and participant identifiers. Finally, the study excluded Values Education, Mathematics, and Language Literacy and Communication, and the dissertation notes that hard-to-reach populations may have been underrepresented.

4 Conclusion

School heads and teachers reported High compliance with learning program development and learning assessment. Reported developmental-domain evidence ranged from Moderate to Great Extent, with the physical and natural environment rated highest and aesthetic/creative development lowest. Teachers rated program development, assessment, and socio-emotional development significantly higher than school heads. Both teaching-standard areas were positively associated with all four developmental domains, although the cross-sectional self-report design precludes causal inference. Crowded classrooms, resource limitations, intervention access, socioeconomic pressures, and limited family engagement constrained implementation. A proposed management plan was developed to address the lowest-rated indicators and system barriers, but it requires validation, feasibility testing, and outcome evaluation before scale-up.

4.1 Recommendations

The proposed management plan should be reviewed and validated by district supervisors, school heads, kindergarten teachers, parents, and relevant child-development or intervention specialists. A small-scale pilot should specify responsibilities, resource requirements, timelines, baseline measures, and data-collection procedures for each target. Subsequent research should confirm the instrument's psychometric properties, use direct observations and child-level measures, report complete inferential statistics, and include Values Education, Mathematics, and Language Literacy and Communication. Multi-site or longitudinal designs would provide stronger evidence about whether improvements in program development and assessment precede changes in developmental outcomes.

5 References

Aquino, L. N., Mamat, N., & Che Mustafa, M. (2017). Comparing the kindergarten curriculum: Framework of the Philippines and Malaysia. International Journal of Early Childhood Education Care, 6, 27-40.

Aquino, L. N., Mamat, N., & Che Mustafa, M. (2019). Levels of competence in the learning domains of kindergarten entrants. Southeast Asia Early Childhood Journal, 8(1), 37-46. http://ejournal.upsi.edu.my/index.php/SAECJ

Cacao, M. M., & Tan, C. S. (2019). Extent of implementation of kindergarten program and its impact on School Readiness Year-End Assessment (SReYA) in the elementary schools in one division in the Philippines. International Journal of Advanced Research, 7, 786-805. www.journalijar.com

Dizon, R. L., Calbi, J. S., Cuyos, J. S., & Miranda, M. (2019). Perspectives on the implementation of the K to 12 program in the Philippines: A research review. International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences, 6(6).

Gardner, H. (1983).

National Early Learning Framework. (2015).

Ramos, K. C. C. (2020). Readiness of kindergarten learners using Early Childhood Care and Development Checklist: Basis for proposed interactive activities. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies, 1(October).

Rogers, E. M. (2003).

Timmons, K., Cooper, A., Bozek, E., & Braund, H. (2021). The impacts of COVID-19 on early childhood education: Capturing the unique challenges associated with remote teaching and learning in K-2. Early Childhood Education Journal, 49, 887-901.

Zelazo, P. D., Lourenco, S. F., Frank, M. C., Elison, J. T., Heaton, R. K., Wellman, H. M., Slotkin, J., Kharitonova, M., & Reznick, J. S. (2021). Measurement of cognition for the National Children's Study. Frontiers in Pediatrics. https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2021.60312