



School Administration as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Curriculum Implementation and the Quality of Ordinary-Level Secondary Education in Elgon Zone, Eastern Uganda

Jackson Matsanga

Nkumba University, Entebbe, Uganda
St. Lawrence University, Kampala, Uganda

Abstract- Curriculum reform does not improve educational quality automatically; its effects depend partly on the institutional conditions through which teachers and learners enact it. This study examined whether school administration moderates the relationship between curriculum implementation and the quality of ordinary-level secondary education in Elgon Zone, Eastern Uganda. A cross-sectional mixed-methods design was used. Quantitative evidence was obtained from 461 learners and 159 teachers selected from secondary schools across the zone, while qualitative evidence was generated through interviews and focus-group discussions involving selected headteachers, teachers, learners, Board of Governors members and Parent-Teacher Association representatives. Questionnaire items measured administrative transparency and collaboration, instructional supervision, provision of teaching and learning resources, stakeholder involvement, and accountability. Descriptive statistics, multiple regression and interaction analysis were complemented by thematic analysis. Learners reported substantial administrative weaknesses across all five dimensions: disagreement was highest for instructional supervision (59.6%), followed by transparency and collaboration (54.4%), stakeholder involvement (52.8%), resource provision (52.1%), and accountability (52.5% based on the table categories). The learners' interaction model was statistically significant, $R = .364$, $R^2 = .132$, $F(1, 458) = 5.974$, $p = .015$. The positive interaction coefficient ($\beta = .364$, $p = .015$) indicates that stronger school administration enhances the positive association between curriculum implementation and educational quality. Teachers likewise reported weaknesses in administration. Their main-effects model was significant, $R = .372$, $R^2 = .138$, $F(2, 157) = 2.991$, $p = .033$; curriculum implementation ($\beta = .380$, $p = .046$) and school administration ($\beta = .311$, $p = .016$) were both positive predictors. Qualitative evidence supported the importance of regular meetings, collaborative leadership and administrative oversight. The study concludes that curriculum implementation is necessary but insufficient: its translation into quality outcomes is strengthened or weakened by school administration. Leadership development, routine instructional



supervision, transparent accountability, stakeholder participation and needs-based resource allocation should therefore be treated as integral components of curriculum implementation.

Keywords- curriculum implementation; school administration; educational quality; moderation; secondary education; Elgon Zone; Uganda

I. Introduction

Curriculum implementation is the process through which the intended curriculum is translated into teaching, learning, assessment and learner experience. Its success depends not only on the quality of official curriculum documents but also on the daily conditions under which teachers interpret content, organise instruction, assess learning and respond to learners' needs. School administration is central to those conditions because administrators allocate resources, organise supervision, enforce policy, coordinate stakeholders, support teachers and create the institutional climate within which learning occurs.

Uganda's commitment to quality and equitable education gives particular importance to the administration of secondary schools. The Directorate of Education Standards is mandated to promote continual improvement in education and training, while national frameworks emphasise monitoring, support, adequate resources and accountability (Ministry of Education and Sports [MoES], 2013, 2019a, 2019b). The lower secondary curriculum also places demands on schools to support learner-centred, competency-oriented teaching and assessment. Such demands cannot be met through teachers' effort alone. They require coherent planning, instructional leadership, professional support and school-level coordination.

Evidence on school leadership commonly shows that leadership affects learning largely through indirect pathways, including the quality of teaching, teacher collaboration, professional learning, working conditions and organisational focus (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood et al., 2004; Robinson et al., 2008). This indirect character makes school administration a plausible moderator: it may change the strength or direction of the relationship between curriculum implementation and educational quality. A well-implemented curriculum may yield limited gains where administrators fail to supervise instruction, provide essential materials or sustain accountability. Conversely, even constrained schools may improve when leadership coordinates available resources, involves stakeholders and keeps teaching and learning at the centre of decision-making. In Elgon Zone, schools operate across varied geographical, economic and institutional conditions. Differences in administrative capacity may therefore help explain why similar curriculum requirements produce different educational outcomes. Yet empirical work often studies curriculum implementation and school leadership as separate predictors. Less attention has been given to whether administration conditions the



effectiveness of curriculum implementation in this context. This creates both an empirical and practical gap: policy may invest in curriculum reform without sufficiently addressing the administrative mechanisms required to convert reform into improved quality.

The study addressed the following question: To what extent does school administration moderate the relationship between curriculum implementation and the quality of ordinary-level secondary education in Elgon Zone, Eastern Uganda? It tested the null hypothesis that school administration has no statistically significant moderating effect on that relationship. The study also examined how learners and teachers perceived transparency, instructional supervision, resource provision, stakeholder involvement and accountability in their schools.

The study contributes a context-sensitive explanation of educational quality. Rather than treating administration as a background feature, it positions administration as an enabling or restraining condition in the curriculum–quality relationship. This distinction matters for government, school governing bodies, headteachers and development partners because it indicates that curriculum investment and leadership improvement should be planned together.

II. Literature Review and Theoretical Foundation

1. Curriculum Implementation and Educational Quality

The intended curriculum represents official aims, content, competences and assessment expectations, while the implemented curriculum consists of what schools and teachers actually provide. The gap between the two may arise from limited teacher preparation, insufficient instructional materials, weak supervision, overcrowding, uneven assessment practices or inadequate support for diverse learners. Educational quality is consequently multidimensional. It includes meaningful learning, achievement, completion, inclusion, equity, effective teaching and the capacity of schools to support learners' development rather than examination performance alone.

Implementation is an organisational process. Teachers require time to plan, opportunities to collaborate, access to relevant materials, constructive feedback and clear communication about expectations. Learners require safe and orderly environments, adequate learning resources, fair assessment and responsive welfare systems. These arrangements are influenced directly by administrators. Administrative practice therefore connects policy intention to classroom action.

2. School Administration and Instructional Improvement

School administration in this study comprises transparent and collaborative decision-making, supervision of teaching and learning, provision of resources, involvement of stakeholders, and accountability for financial, academic and physical matters. These



functions go beyond routine office management. They express the school's instructional priorities and affect whether teachers receive the support and oversight needed to implement the curriculum consistently.

Research has long suggested that leadership effects on learner outcomes are mainly indirect. Hallinger and Heck (1998) argued that leadership works through school processes rather than through direct contact with every learning outcome. Leithwood et al. (2004) similarly identified leadership as an important school-level influence, especially in challenging settings. Robinson et al. (2008) found that leadership practices closely connected to teaching and teacher learning were more strongly related to student outcomes than broadly defined leadership approaches. These findings support an emphasis on lesson observation, schemes of work, feedback, professional learning and the purposeful allocation of resources.

Participatory administration is also relevant. Regular interaction with Boards of Governors, Parent-Teacher Associations, parents, staff and learners can improve access to information, legitimacy of decisions and collective responsibility. Transparency and accountability can strengthen trust, while their absence may encourage conflict, weaken support and make it difficult to identify whether resources reach instructional priorities. Stakeholder participation is not a substitute for professional leadership, but it can broaden the information and commitment on which school decisions depend.

3. Force Field Analysis

Lewin's (1951) Force Field Analysis explains institutional conditions as an equilibrium between forces that drive change and forces that restrain it. Applied to curriculum implementation, strong administration may operate as a driving force through instructional supervision, teacher support, resource mobilisation, communication and accountability. Weak administration may become a restraining force through delayed decisions, poor coordination, inadequate monitoring, limited stakeholder participation or failure to direct resources toward learning.

The framework is especially suited to moderation. Curriculum implementation may exert a positive influence on educational quality, but the magnitude of that influence varies with the balance of administrative forces. When supportive forces become stronger, curriculum practices are more likely to be sustained and translated into positive outcomes. When restraining conditions dominate, the same curriculum may be implemented unevenly and produce weaker results.

4. Constructivism

Constructivist perspectives hold that learners actively develop knowledge through engagement with tasks, experiences, peers and their environment (Piaget, 1970). An active learning environment does not emerge by declaration. It requires teachers who



can organise inquiry, discussion, problem-solving, feedback and assessment, together with administrators who make resources, time and professional support available. Administration thus shapes the environment in which constructivist teaching can occur. Strong administrative leadership can support professional development, collaborative planning, learner support and access to instructional materials. These conditions enable teachers to guide rather than merely transmit information and allow learners to participate actively. Weak administration limits the same conditions and can reduce learner-centred curriculum principles to intentions on paper.

5. Supporting Perspectives

Social meliorism views education as an instrument for improving social conditions and responding to inequality (Dewey, 1916). From this perspective, school administrators should ensure that curriculum implementation is inclusive and that resources and learner support reach marginalised groups. Thorndike's (1911) Law of Effect adds that behaviour followed by satisfying consequences is more likely to recur. Administrative recognition, constructive feedback and fair support can therefore reinforce effective teaching and learner engagement.

Lewin's (1947) three-stage account of change—unfreezing established practice, moving toward new practice and stabilising it—further explains the administrative role in curriculum reform. Leaders prepare staff for change, coordinate training and resources during implementation, and institutionalise successful routines through monitoring and school culture. Matsanga's Eagle Logic Theory adds an author-developed emphasis on preparedness, readiness and systematic decision-making as foundations for executing a plan of action (Matsanga, 2026). Used as a supplementary lens, it explains why timely administrative decisions, purposeful preparation and organisational readiness can improve the conversion of curriculum plans into results.

Together, these perspectives lead to the study's central proposition: the positive relationship between curriculum implementation and the quality of secondary education becomes stronger when school administration is effective and weaker when school administration is ineffective.

Conceptual Framework

Interpretation of the Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework illustrates the relationship between curriculum implementation, school administration and the quality of education at the ordinary level. Curriculum implementation is the independent variable, quality education is the dependent variable, while school administration is the moderating variable.

The arrow connecting curriculum implementation to quality education shows that the manner in which the curriculum is implemented directly influences the quality of education provided to learners. Effective curriculum implementation involves



translating the intended curriculum into meaningful classroom practices through appropriate teaching methods, adequate instructional resources, continuous learner assessment and consideration of learner and teacher characteristics. When these elements are effectively managed, they are expected to improve educational quality.

Quality education represents the outcome of the curriculum implementation process. It may be reflected through improved learner achievement at UCE, increased completion rates, reduced dropout rates, gender parity, inclusion of learners with special educational needs and the development of relevant knowledge, skills, values and competences.

School administration is positioned below the relationship between curriculum implementation and quality education because it moderates that relationship. The arrow from school administration connects directly to the main relationship, indicating that administration can strengthen or weaken the influence of curriculum implementation on educational quality.

Strong school administration strengthens the relationship by providing effective leadership, regular supervision of teaching and learning, adequate instructional resources, transparent decision-making, stakeholder participation, teacher support and proper accountability. Under such conditions, teachers are better supported to implement the curriculum effectively, and learners are more likely to experience quality education.

Weak school administration may reduce the effectiveness of curriculum implementation through inadequate supervision, poor resource allocation, limited stakeholder involvement, weak accountability and insufficient support for teachers and learners. Therefore, even where an appropriate curriculum exists, its intended outcomes may not be fully realised when school administration is ineffective.

The framework consequently proposes that:

- Effective curriculum implementation positively influences the quality of Secondary education, but the strength of this influence depends on the effectiveness of school administration.
- School administration is therefore not merely an additional factor. It is an enabling or restraining institutional force that determines how successfully curriculum implementation is translated into quality educational outcomes.

III. Methodology

1. Research Design and Setting

The study adopted a cross-sectional mixed-methods design using concurrent triangulation. Quantitative and qualitative evidence was collected within the same



general phase, analysed using methods appropriate to each strand and integrated during interpretation. This design was appropriate because statistical associations could be compared with the experiences and explanations of school stakeholders.

The research was conducted in Elgon Zone, Eastern Uganda. The zone includes schools operating in urban, peri-urban, rural, mountainous and hard-to-reach contexts. The diversity of school settings made the area suitable for examining whether variations in administration condition curriculum implementation and educational quality at ordinary level.

2. Participants and Sampling

The quantitative sample comprised 461 learners and 159 teachers. These groups were central because they experience school administration and curriculum implementation directly. Selected headteachers, Board of Governors members and Parent-Teacher Association representatives also contributed qualitative evidence through interviews, while teachers and learners participated in focus-group discussions. Participants were drawn from selected secondary schools across the zone using sampling procedures appropriate to the different categories. The broader study also involved 31 headteachers.

3. Variables and Measures

Curriculum implementation was treated as the principal explanatory variable, educational quality as the dependent variable and school administration as the moderator. School administration was operationalised through five observable dimensions:

- transparent and collaborative decision-making;
- lesson observation, approval of schemes of work and general supervision;
- provision of necessary and adequate teaching and learning facilities;
- involvement of stakeholders through meetings; and
- accountability for financial, academic, moral and physical matters.

Questionnaire statements used a five-point Likert-type response format ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Interview and focus-group prompts explored leadership practice, meetings, supervision, resource support, accountability and how these conditions affected teaching and learning.

4. Validity, Reliability and Data Quality

Questionnaire content was aligned with the study objectives and the conceptual definition of school administration. Expert review and pretesting within the broader study were used to refine wording and ensure relevance to the secondary-school context. Quantitative data were screened before analysis. Collinearity statistics reported for the models were within acceptable ranges: the learners' interaction model reported tolerance = 1.000 and VIF = 1.000, while the teachers' predictors each reported



tolerance = .960 and VIF = 1.041. These values do not indicate problematic multicollinearity.

The use of learners, teachers and governance stakeholders improved source triangulation. Qualitative accounts were compared with patterns in the questionnaire data rather than used as isolated anecdotes.

5. Data Collection and Analysis

Questionnaires were administered to learners and teachers. Interviews and focus-group discussions were used to obtain detailed explanations of administrative practices. Descriptive statistics included percentages, means and standard deviations. Inferential analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Moderation requires a product term between the predictor and moderator. For the learners' data, the interaction between curriculum implementation and school administration was entered as the predictor of educational quality. A statistically significant interaction term was interpreted as evidence that the effect of curriculum implementation varied with school administration.

The teachers' reported model included mean-centred curriculum implementation and mean-centred school administration as two predictors. It therefore estimated their joint and separate main effects; because the supplied teacher model did not report a product term, it was treated as corroborative evidence of joint prediction rather than a second formal moderation test.

Qualitative data were organised thematically. Themes were developed around collaboration, meetings, instructional supervision, resources and accountability. Integration occurred by comparing themes with the direction and magnitude of quantitative findings.

6. Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed of the study's academic purpose. Confidentiality and anonymity were protected during reporting. No school or individual respondent is identified in the findings, and quotations are presented without personally identifying information.

Additional protections were observed for learner participants, including appropriate institutional permission and age-sensitive consent procedures.



IV. Results

1.. Learners' Perceptions of School Administration

Table 1: Learners' responses on school administration (%)

Administrative practice	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD statistic
Transparent, collaborative decision-making	0.0	54.4	13.0	32.5	0.0	3.78	0.908
Lesson observation, approval of schemes and general supervision	0.0	59.6	10.7	29.8	0.0	3.70	0.898
Provision of adequate teaching and learning facilities	0.0	52.1	15.0	32.3	0.7	3.82	0.915
Stakeholder involvement through regular meetings	1.1	51.7	22.2	24.1	0.9	3.72	0.872
Regular accountability to stakeholders	0.9	51.6	10.0	33.6	3.9	3.88	1.016

Note. SD = strongly disagree; D = disagree; N = neutral; A = agree; SA = strongly agree. Percentages and descriptive statistics reproduce the supplied source table; minor deviations from 100% reflect rounding or source transcription.

Across all items, more learners disagreed than agreed that the identified administrative practices occurred. The largest negative response concerned lesson observation and general supervision, for which 59.6% disagreed and 29.8% agreed. This suggests that many learners did not observe consistent administrative attention to teaching and learning. Transparency and collaboration also attracted 54.4% disagreement, while 32.5% agreed.

Regarding resources, 52.1% disagreed that headteachers provided necessary and adequate facilities, whereas approximately one third agreed. Stakeholder involvement was similarly limited: 52.8% selected either strongly disagree or disagree, compared with 25.0% who selected agree or strongly agree. Accountability produced a divided pattern, but negative responses still exceeded positive responses. Overall, the distributions point to substantial weaknesses in administrative support for curriculum implementation.



The means in the supplied source table do not align intuitively with the displayed response distributions under the stated coding order. For publication integrity, both are reproduced, but interpretation is based primarily on the response percentages pending verification against the original SPSS file.

2. Learners' Moderation Analysis

Table 2: Learners' interaction model predicting quality of secondary education

Statistic	Value
<i>R</i>	.364
<i>R</i> ²	.132
Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	.012
Standard error of estimate	3.153
<i>F</i> change	5.974
Df	1, 458
<i>P</i>	.015

The model explained 13.2% of the variance in educational quality. The interaction made a statistically significant contribution, $F(1, 458) = 5.974$, $p = .015$. The reported coefficient for the curriculum implementation $\times$ school administration interaction was positive and significant ($B = .143$, $\beta = .364$, $t = 2.444$, $p = .015$). The null hypothesis was therefore rejected for the learners' data.

The positive coefficient means that stronger school administration was associated with a stronger positive relationship between curriculum implementation and educational quality. Conversely, weak administration reduced the apparent benefit of curriculum implementation. No problematic multicollinearity was reported for the interaction predictor (tolerance = 1.000; VIF = 1.000).

The supplied table reports an adjusted R^2 of .012 despite $R^2 = .132$ and a significant one-predictor model with 460 observations. Because that adjusted value appears internally inconsistent, it should be checked against the original output before journal submission. The inferential conclusion reported here rests on the reproduced F , degrees of freedom and p value.



3. Teachers' Perceptions of School Administration

Table 3: Teachers' responses on school administration (%)

Administrative practice	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD statistic
Transparent, collaborative decision-making	1.2	52.9	8.0	37.9	0.0	2.81	0.851
Lesson observation, approval of schemes and general supervision	0.0	60.9	6.7	32.4	0.0	2.50	0.692
Provision of adequate teaching and learning facilities	0.0	46.5	10.6	42.7	0.0	2.55	0.832
Stakeholder involvement through regular meetings	8.7	41.5	10.6	39.2	0.0	2.58	0.996
Regular accountability to stakeholders	0.6	49.0	13.2	36.0	1.2	3.29	1.015

Teachers' responses largely reflected learners' concerns. A combined 54.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed that headteachers were transparent and collaborative, compared with 37.9% who agreed. Instructional supervision was the weakest area: 60.9% disagreed that lesson observation, approval of schemes and general supervision occurred regularly. Resource provision showed the most divided response, with 46.5% disagreeing and 42.7% agreeing, indicating considerable variation among schools.

Half of the teachers (50.2%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that stakeholders were involved through regular meetings. Similarly, 49.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed that headteachers regularly provided required accountability, while 37.2% agreed or strongly agreed. These patterns suggest that administrative capacity was uneven and often insufficient to support consistent curriculum implementation.

4. Teachers' Regression Model

Table 4: Teachers' main-effects model predicting quality of secondary education

Predictor/model statistic	B	SE	β	t	p	VIF
Curriculum implementation (centred)	.230	.006	.380	4.469	.046	1.041
School administration (centred)	.201	.095	.311	2.394	.016	1.041
Model: $R = .372$; $R^2 = .138$; adjusted $R^2 = .135$; $F(2,157) = 2.991$; $p = .033$						



The model was statistically significant and explained 13.8% of variance in educational quality. Both centred predictors were positive and significant according to the supplied table. Curriculum implementation had the larger standardised coefficient ($\beta = .380$), followed by school administration ($\beta = .311$). The low VIF values indicate that the two predictors could be included together without problematic multicollinearity.

Some supplied coefficient combinations are arithmetically inconsistent: for example, $B = .230$ and $SE = .006$ would not ordinarily yield $t = 4.469$, and the reported omnibus sums of squares do not fully correspond with the printed mean square and F . These entries should be verified against the original SPSS output before submission. Moreover, this model contains no interaction term. It demonstrates that curriculum implementation and administration jointly predict quality, but it does not itself demonstrate moderation.

5. Qualitative Findings and Integration

Interview and focus-group evidence reinforced the quantitative picture. One participant explained:

“The headteacher works alone and even staff meetings are held once a year. The PTA and BOG meetings are very rare. We don’t see them in school unless they meet from somewhere else.”

This account points to three connected weaknesses: individualised decision-making, infrequent staff coordination and limited engagement with formal governance structures. These conditions make it difficult to communicate curriculum expectations, review implementation challenges or mobilise collective responses.

Across the qualitative evidence, effective administration was associated with supervision of teaching and learning, provision of sufficient resources, enforcement of policy, regular stakeholder meetings, teacher support, learner welfare and clear accountability. Participants’ experiences therefore supported the statistical interpretation that administration shapes the conditions through which curriculum implementation influences quality.

V. Discussion

The central finding is that school administration significantly moderated the curriculum implementation–quality relationship in the learners’ model. The positive interaction indicates that curriculum implementation produced a stronger association with educational quality where administration was stronger. This supports the study’s original proposition that curriculum implementation alone is not sufficient. A



curriculum reaches learners through an organisation, and the organisation can either enable or obstruct its intended effects.

Force Field Analysis provides a direct explanation. Administrative practices such as supervision, resource provision, stakeholder coordination and accountability act as driving forces. They help teachers sustain planning, instruction and assessment and help schools respond when implementation problems emerge. Weaknesses in the same areas operate as restraining forces. The finding that instructional supervision received the highest disagreement from both learners and teachers is especially important. Without lesson observation, review of schemes of work and constructive follow-up, administrators have limited evidence about what is being taught, how it is being taught and where support is needed.

The result is also consistent with research portraying leadership as an indirect influence on learner outcomes (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood et al., 2004). Administration does not replace classroom teaching. It creates the focus, professional conditions, resources and accountability through which teaching can improve. Robinson et al. (2008) similarly showed the value of leadership closely connected to teaching and teacher learning. The Elgon Zone findings extend this logic by indicating not simply that administration predicts quality, but that it changes the strength of curriculum implementation's relationship with quality.

Constructivism helps explain why administrative effects reach the learner. Competency-oriented and learner-centred curricula require opportunities for participation, inquiry, feedback, collaboration and problem-solving. Teachers need materials, manageable routines, professional support and permission to move beyond passive transmission. Administrators influence each of these conditions through timetabling, allocation, monitoring and staff development. Where the environment is poorly supported, learners may not experience the active engagement anticipated by the curriculum.

The descriptive findings reveal that administrative weakness was not confined to one practice. Both learners and teachers reported limited instructional supervision, weak collaboration and transparency, infrequent stakeholder engagement and gaps in accountability. Resource provision was also judged inadequate by many respondents, although teacher responses suggested marked variation among schools. The consistency across respondent groups increases confidence that these were experienced institutional patterns rather than perceptions unique to one category.

Stakeholder involvement deserves particular attention. Boards of Governors and Parent-Teacher Associations can connect schools with communities, provide oversight, mobilise support and help resolve problems affecting attendance, welfare and resources. Infrequent meetings weaken these functions. The quoted participant's



reference to rare staff, PTA and BOG meetings shows how administrative isolation can reduce shared understanding and collective ownership. From a social meliorist perspective, this can also weaken responsiveness to vulnerable learners because administrators receive less information about barriers affecting different groups.

The teachers' model adds evidence that both curriculum implementation and school administration are positively related to educational quality. Curriculum implementation had a somewhat larger reported standardised coefficient, which is reasonable because classroom enactment is closer to learner experience. Administration nevertheless remained a significant predictor. The teacher model should not be overstated as a moderation test because the reported predictors did not include an interaction term. Treating it as corroborating main-effects evidence produces a more precise and defensible account.

The study's author-developed Eagle Logic perspective adds a practical insight: preparedness and readiness must precede effective action. Curriculum materials, teacher orientation, timetables, assessment plans and supervision schedules need to be prepared before implementation problems become crises. Administrators must then remain ready to make timely, evidence-based decisions. This perspective complements rather than replaces established theories by giving local conceptual expression to purposeful organisational preparation.

The size of the explained variance—13.2% in the learners' interaction model and 13.8% in the teachers' main-effects model—also requires balanced interpretation. Administration is important, but it is not the only condition shaping educational quality. Teacher knowledge, learner characteristics, family circumstances, infrastructure, finance, assessment systems and wider policy conditions also matter. The findings support an enabling role for administration, not an assertion that administration alone determines quality.

VI. Conclusion

School administration significantly conditioned the relationship between curriculum implementation and the quality of secondary education at ordinary-level in Elgon Zone. The learners' interaction model showed that stronger administration enhanced the positive association between curriculum implementation and the quality of Secondary Education. Teachers' evidence independently showed that curriculum implementation and administration were positive joint predictors, while qualitative accounts illustrated how infrequent meetings, limited collaboration and weak oversight restricted coordinated action.

The article's main conclusion is therefore that curriculum implementation is necessary but insufficient without the moderating effect. Its effectiveness depends partly on the



school administrative environment in which teachers and learners work. School administration which included activities like Transparent decision-making, instructional supervision, adequate support, stakeholder involvement and accountability are not peripheral managerial activities; they are mechanisms through which curriculum intentions become educational outcomes.

Implications and Recommendations

Policy Implications

Curriculum reform programmes should include a defined school-administration component. National and district implementation plans should specify headteacher preparation, instructional supervision routines, reporting expectations, stakeholder engagement and resource responsibilities alongside teacher training and curriculum materials.

The Ministry of Education and Sports and local governments should strengthen leadership development for serving and aspiring headteachers. Training should emphasise instructional leadership, collaborative decision-making, financial and academic accountability, staff development, conflict management and evidence-based school improvement.

Implications for School Practice

Headteachers should establish predictable cycles for lesson observation, review of schemes of work, feedback and follow-up support. Supervision should be developmental and evidence-based rather than limited to fault-finding. Findings from observation should inform professional development, departmental planning and allocation of instructional resources.

Schools should schedule regular, properly documented meetings of staff, Boards of Governors, Parent–Teacher Associations and learner leadership structures. Meeting agendas should connect governance and finance decisions to curriculum implementation and learner outcomes. Decisions, responsibilities and timelines should be recorded and reviewed.

Resource allocation should be based on documented instructional needs. Even where resources are constrained, transparent prioritisation can ensure that essential materials, laboratories, libraries, assessment tools and support for vulnerable learners receive appropriate attention.

Accountability should cover more than expenditure. Headteachers should provide stakeholders with clear information about academic progress, curriculum coverage, attendance, learner welfare, facilities and actions taken in response to identified gaps. Transparency can build trust and mobilise support for improvement.



Recommendations for Further Research

Future studies should use longitudinal designs to determine whether changes in administrative practice precede improvement in curriculum implementation and learner outcomes. Multilevel analysis could separate learner-, teacher-, school- and district-level influences. Researchers should also test specific administrative dimensions as moderators rather than combining them into one index. A replicated analysis should enter curriculum implementation, school administration and their interaction hierarchically and present simple-slopes plots at low, mean and high levels of administration.

Limitations

The cross-sectional design supports association but not firm causal inference. Self-report data may also be affected by respondents' knowledge, experience and willingness to evaluate school leaders. The models explained a modest proportion of variance, indicating that other determinants of educational quality remain important. A further limitation concerns the supplied statistical tables. Several descriptive means and regression entries appear inconsistent with the displayed response distributions or other model statistics. The original SPSS output and coding scheme should therefore be checked before journal submission. This article preserves the reported substantive findings while marking the entries that require verification rather than silently replacing them.

Declarations

- Ethics statement. The study observed voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymity and appropriate institutional permission. Permission was sought from all the relevant bodies.
- Informed consent. Informed consent was obtained from adult participants, with appropriate assent/permission procedures used for learner participants. This statement should be aligned with the original approved protocol.
- Conflict of interest. The author declares no conflict of interest.
- Funding. This was typically a self-sponsored study "This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors."
- Author contribution. Jackson Matsanga conceptualised the study, developed the methodology, collected and analysed the data, interpreted the findings and prepared the manuscript with the help of prof J.C Ssekamwa (late), department of education – Makerere university. / Nkumba university

References

1. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE.



2. Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. Macmillan.
3. Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980–1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0924345980090203>
4. Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
5. Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. The Wallace Foundation.
6. Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674700100103>
7. Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers* (D. Cartwright, Ed.). Harper & Brothers.
8. Matsanga, J. (2026). *The Eagle Logic Theory: Preparedness and readiness as foundations for achieving a plan of action* [Theoretical manuscript].
9. Ministry of Education and Sports. (2013). *How well is our school led? Part 2*. Directorate of Education Standards.
10. Ministry of Education and Sports. (2019a). *The national teacher policy*. Government of Uganda.
11. Ministry of Education and Sports. (2019b). *The quality assurance framework for initial teacher education in Uganda*. Government of Uganda.
12. Piaget, J. (1970). Piaget's theory. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Carmichael's manual of child psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 703–732). Wiley.
13. 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>
14. Thorndike, E. L. (1911). *Animal intelligence: Experimental studies*. Macmillan.