

Enhancing Instructional Leadership Practices in the Implementation of Agricultural Sciences Curricula

Azwindini Robert Mutshinya., Takalani Elizabeth Tshiovhe

University of Zululand, University of Venda

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200596>

Received: 26 February 2026; Accepted: 02 March 2026; Published: 21 March 2026

ABSTRACT

This study explored the perceptions of curriculum advisors, principals, and Agricultural Sciences teachers on the use of agricultural experience as a medium for contextualising learning in secondary schools. The study was guided by Instructional Leadership Theory and Constructivist Learning Theory. It examined how leadership practices and learner-centred pedagogical strategies influence the integration of practical activities with classroom theory. A mixed-methods approach was employed, combining quantitative survey data from 57 respondents with qualitative insights from semi-structured interviews involving two curriculum advisors, three principals, and fifty-seven (57) Agricultural Sciences teachers. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, to determine frequency and percentage distributions. Qualitative data were thematically analysed using coding and categorisation procedures, enabling an in-depth understanding of participants' experiences and perceptions. The findings indicated that the majority of participants (63.1%) supported the integration of agricultural experience in teaching. Participants cited its role in linking theory to real-world practice and enhancing learners' understanding, engagement, and problem-solving skills. Curriculum advisors emphasised the role of leadership in coordinating resources, planning practical sessions, and supporting teachers. Principals highlighted the benefits of hands-on activities in fostering learner skill development. Agricultural Sciences teachers largely affirmed the value of experiential learning. However, they noted challenges such as limited resources, inadequate facilities, and time constraints, which hinder effective implementation. The study recommends prioritising practical agricultural activities, providing adequate resources, training teachers, and scheduling hands-on sessions strategically to maximise learning outcomes. Integrating agricultural experience into the curriculum strengthens contextualised learning, aligns with experiential and constructivist principles, and equips learners with practical skills for real-world application, while highlighting the critical role of leadership in ensuring programme coherence and effective teaching through strategic planning, continuous professional support, and the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices.

Keywords: Agricultural experience, contextualisation, experiential learning, constructivism, instructional leadership, mixed-methods, secondary education

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural Sciences education within the General Education and Training (GET) band plays a critical role in equipping learners with foundational agricultural knowledge, practical competencies, and critical thinking skills necessary for sustainable livelihoods and socio-economic development. Experiential learning theory emphasizes the importance of learning through practical engagement and reflection (Kolb, 1984), while socio-constructivist perspectives highlight the role of social interaction and contextual learning in knowledge construction (Vygotsky, 1978). As educational systems evolved, attention shifted toward structured curriculum alignment and quality learning design (Biggs & Tang, 2011), effective instructional leadership (Hallinger, 2011), and coherent educational management systems (Bush, 2011). These perspectives underscore the importance of leadership, planning, and evaluation in strengthening programme implementation.

Global education and agricultural development frameworks further emphasise the importance of sustainable agricultural education and food security (UNESCO, 2015; FAO, 2017). Professional development has also been identified as central to improving teaching quality and learner outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). More

recent policy analyses stress the importance of coordinated educational reform and systemic support to enhance learner achievement (OECD, 2019).

Globally, countries respond differently to challenges in curriculum management and instructional leadership in Agricultural and vocational education. For example, in Finland, curriculum reform is strongly supported by decentralized yet coherent leadership systems, where school leaders are professionally trained to align curriculum goals, assessment, and classroom practice; however, recent studies still note tensions between autonomy and accountability in sustaining curriculum coherence (Hallinger, 2023; OECD, 2023). Similarly, in Australia, agricultural and STEM-related subjects are supported through structured professional learning communities and national quality frameworks, yet rural schools continue to experience disparities in resource access and leadership capacity (AITSL, 2024).

In contrast, in developing contexts such as India, agricultural education is viewed as critical for rural economic development, but uneven infrastructure, large class sizes, and limited instructional monitoring weaken effective curriculum implementation (UNESCO, 2024). In parts of Sub-Saharan Africa, including under-resourced regions, school leaders often prioritise administrative compliance over instructional leadership due to capacity constraints, which affects curriculum coherence and practical subject delivery (Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins, 2024).

In South Africa, Agricultural Sciences within the GET band is recognised as important for food security and youth empowerment; however, provincial disparities persist, with provinces such as Gauteng demonstrating stronger coordination systems compared to more rural provinces like Limpopo and the Eastern Cape. Recent national reviews emphasise that although policy frameworks are comprehensive, implementation gaps remain due to inconsistent instructional support and monitoring systems (DBE, 2023; OECD, 2024). These examples illustrate that while contexts differ in economic development and institutional capacity, common leadership and curriculum alignment challenges influence how effectively Agricultural Sciences education is managed and delivered.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Agricultural Sciences education within the General Education and Training (GET) band is intended to equip learners with foundational agricultural knowledge, practical skills, and problem-solving competencies that support sustainable development and future participation in the agricultural sector. However, the effectiveness of this mandate is undermined by inconsistencies in management design practices, particularly in the alignment of instructional leadership, curriculum planning, resource allocation, and monitoring systems across diverse South African school contexts. Research by (Robinson, 2021) underscores that while instructional leadership is widely acknowledged as a critical driver of curriculum improvement, significant gaps persist between policy expectations and actual leadership enactment in schools, thereby weakening curriculum coherence and instructional quality. .

Persistent structural and contextual constraints including inadequate infrastructure, limited teaching and learning resources, and uneven access to sustained professional development continue to hinder effective curriculum implementation, particularly in rural and under-resourced settings (Mestry, 2023). Recent studies in vocational and agricultural education further reveal that weak integration between theoretical content and practical application reduces opportunities for meaningful experiential learning, thereby limiting learners' ability to develop transferable skills relevant to real-world contexts (Schweisfurth, 2022). These systemic and pedagogical challenges collectively constrain the realisation of curriculum goals and exacerbate inequalities in access to quality education.

In response to these challenges, this study seeks to explore and identify context-responsive strategies for strengthening management design practices in Agricultural Sciences education within the GET band in South Africa. Specifically, the study examines how instructional leadership, curriculum alignment, professional development, and stakeholder collaboration can be systematically integrated to improve planning, implementation, and monitoring processes. By interrogating management design in practice focusing on what is implemented, for whom it serves, where it is constrained, when gaps occur, and how these challenges may be

addressed the study aims to generate actionable recommendations that enhance curriculum coherence, strengthen learner engagement, and promote equitable access to quality Agricultural Sciences education.

AIM OF RESEARCH

This study aimed at examining how instructional leadership practices can be enhanced on the implementation of Agricultural Sciences curricula.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Educational management research consistently affirms that programme quality is largely dependent on coherent management design practices that integrate leadership, curriculum planning, resource allocation, monitoring, and evaluation (Bush, 2011). In praxis-oriented subjects such as Agricultural Sciences, management design extends beyond administrative coordination to include the deliberate integration of experiential learning, stakeholder collaboration, and contextual responsiveness.

Management Design in Praxis-Oriented Subjects

Agricultural Sciences is inherently practical and context-bound. Experiential learning theory argues that meaningful knowledge construction occurs through concrete experience, reflective observation, conceptualisation, and experimentation (Kolb, 1984). Within the GET band, this implies that curriculum design must intentionally integrate school gardens, fieldwork, demonstrations, and community-based projects. However, experiential approaches require structured planning and supportive leadership to be sustainable.

UNESCO (2015) emphasises that education for sustainable development must bridge theory and practice to equip learners with competencies relevant to food security and environmental stewardship. Without structured management systems, experiential components often remain fragmented or inconsistently implemented.

Leadership and Organisational Coherence

Instructional leadership is widely recognised as a central determinant of programme effectiveness (Hallinger, 2011). Leaders who prioritise teaching and learning create structured environments where curriculum goals, teacher support, and monitoring systems are aligned. Bush (2011) further argues that leadership effectiveness depends on the integration of vision, strategic planning, and distributed responsibilities.

In Agricultural Sciences education, weak instructional leadership often results in poor coordination of practical activities, inadequate monitoring of curriculum delivery, and limited professional support for educators. Conversely, strong leadership enhances coherence between policy directives and classroom practice.

Curriculum Alignment and Quality Assurance

Constructive alignment theory posits that intended learning outcomes, teaching strategies, and assessment methods must be systematically aligned to ensure quality learning (Biggs & Tang, 2011). In Agricultural Sciences, misalignment frequently occurs when theoretical content dominates assessment while practical competencies remain under-assessed.

OECD (2019) highlights that systemic coherence across curriculum, assessment, and teacher development policies significantly improves learner achievement. Therefore, management design must incorporate structured alignment processes to ensure that practical agricultural competencies are intentionally planned, delivered, and evaluated.

Professional Development and Teacher Capacity

Teacher professional development is a key driver of educational improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Effective professional learning is sustained, collaborative, and linked to classroom practice. In the context of Agricultural Sciences, educators require both subject-specific agricultural knowledge and pedagogical strategies

that support experiential and learner-centred methodologies. Without continuous professional development, teachers may rely on traditional lecture-based approaches, undermining the practical orientation of the subject.

Stakeholder Engagement and Sustainability

Stakeholder theory underscores the importance of collaborative partnerships in organisational success (Freeman, 1984). In educational contexts, family and community partnerships enhance resource availability and learner engagement (Epstein, 2011). Agricultural Sciences education particularly benefits from collaboration with local farmers, NGOs, and agricultural industries, which provide authentic learning environments and additional expertise.

FAO (2017) further emphasises that sustainable agricultural education requires partnerships that connect schools to local food systems and community development initiatives. This suggests that enhancing management design practices requires systemic integration of leadership, curriculum alignment, professional development, and stakeholder collaboration. However, empirical studies focusing specifically on the GET band remain limited. This study addresses this gap by exploring context-responsive strategies for strengthening management design in Agricultural Sciences education.

Recent empirical studies grounded in constructivist learning perspectives further strengthen the relevance of this framework to the present study. Contemporary research indicates that experiential and inquiry-based learning environments significantly improve conceptual understanding, learner motivation, and problem-solving abilities in science and vocational subjects (Schweisfurth, 2022; Hmelo-Silver, & Chinn, 2023). In agricultural education specifically, project-based and community-linked learning activities have been shown to promote deeper engagement and contextualised knowledge construction when supported by effective instructional leadership (Wiek & Lang, 2022). These studies demonstrate that constructivist approaches are most effective when teachers receive adequate professional support and when school leaders actively facilitate curriculum coordination, resource mobilisation, and reflective practice.

Within the context of the GET band, the integration of constructivist principles into Agricultural Sciences teaching requires leadership structures that encourage collaboration, experimentation, and reflective learning. Empirical evidence suggests that learners often struggle to transfer theoretical agricultural concepts to practical contexts when instructional design does not explicitly support experiential engagement (Schweisfurth, 2022). Therefore, instructional leadership becomes essential in ensuring that experiential activities such as school gardens, demonstrations, and community agricultural projects are systematically integrated into teaching plans. The theoretical framework thus positions instructional leadership as the enabling mechanism through which constructivist pedagogy can be effectively implemented, thereby strengthening curriculum coherence and learner understanding.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is informed by two foundational but complementary theories: Instructional Leadership Theory and Constructivist Learning Theory.

Instructional Leadership Theory posits that leaders at multiple levels—such as principals and curriculum advisors play a central role in shaping educational quality, supporting teachers, and ensuring curriculum coherence (Hallinger, 2023). Contemporary research emphasises that effective instructional leadership extends beyond administrative supervision to include leading curriculum planning, mentoring teachers, using evidence to monitor instruction, and creating shared responsibility for learning outcomes (Leithwood, Sun, & Pollock, 2022; Robinson, 2021). In the context of Agricultural Sciences education within the GET band, this theory explains how leadership practices influence the coordination of theory and practical activities, allocation of resources, and teacher engagement, all of which have direct implications for programme coherence and learner achievement.

Constructivist Learning Theory highlights that learners construct knowledge through interaction, reflection, and engagement with real-world contexts (Vygotsky, 1978; Fosnot & Perry, 2021). Agricultural Sciences, as an

intrinsically experiential subject, benefits from constructivist approaches such as project-based learning, community engagement, and reflective assessment. Recent scholarship underscores that curriculum design must respond to learner needs and contextual realities to foster deeper understanding and employability competencies (Moon, 2022; Darling-Hammond et al., 2022).

By combining these theoretical lenses, the study situates management design at the intersection of leadership enactment and learner-centred curriculum practices. Management strategies are thus framed not merely as procedural tasks but as practices that enable meaningful, contextualised learning experiences (Venter et. al, 2024). This dual perspective guides the exploration of how leadership and curriculum design together facilitate the integration of practical agricultural experience into teaching and learning.

To strengthen methodological rigour, the research instruments used in this study underwent a validation process prior to data collection. The survey questionnaire and interview schedule were reviewed by two experts in Agricultural Sciences education and one specialist in educational research methodology. This expert review process assessed the instruments for content relevance, clarity of questions, and alignment with the study objectives. Feedback from the reviewers resulted in minor revisions to wording and sequencing of questions to improve comprehensibility and ensure that items adequately captured the constructs related to instructional leadership practices, experiential learning, and curriculum implementation (Mawela & Msimeki, 2025).

Furthermore, a pilot test of the questionnaire was conducted with a small group of Agricultural Sciences teachers who were not part of the final sample. The purpose of the pilot was to determine whether respondents clearly understood the questions and whether the instrument produced consistent responses. Adjustments were subsequently made to improve reliability and eliminate ambiguous items. These validation procedures are consistent with recommended qualitative and mixed-methods research practices that emphasise credibility, reliability, and trustworthiness of research instruments (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Patton, 2023).

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a mixed methods design within a pragmatic paradigm, which focuses on using the most appropriate methods to answer the research questions and generate actionable insights (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The approach combined quantitative and qualitative methods to explore how agricultural experience is used as a medium for contextualising learning in secondary schools. The quantitative component involved a survey administered to 57 participants to gather data on perceptions of agricultural experience. The data were organised into tables, and analysed using descriptive statistics, including frequency counts and percentage distributions, to identify trends, levels of agreement, and patterns of support for practical agricultural activities. This process ensured that the quantitative findings were clearly presented and easy to interpret. The qualitative component involved semi-structured interviews with two curriculum advisors, three principals, and fifty-seven Agricultural Sciences teachers, selected through purposive sampling to ensure participants were information-rich and directly engaged in management and teaching practices (Patton, 2023). The interviews explored experiences with leadership support, curriculum alignment, planning of practical sessions, and challenges in facilitating experiential learning. Data were analysed thematically using Braun and Clarke's (2022) procedures for coding, categorisation, and interpretation, allowing the study to capture participants' insights and contextual variations. By integrating quantitative tables and qualitative themes, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of how leadership, curriculum design, and teacher facilitation contribute to effective, contextualised learning in Agricultural Sciences.

In addition to the structural challenges identified in the findings, cognitive learning barriers may also influence the effectiveness of experiential agricultural teaching. Research on science and vocational education suggests that learners sometimes struggle to integrate practical activities with underlying theoretical concepts when instructional scaffolding is insufficient (Hmelo-Silver & Chinn, 2023). In such situations, learners may focus primarily on performing routine tasks during practical activities without fully understanding the scientific principles that underpin those tasks. This observation corresponds with some teachers' concerns that learners occasionally prioritise task completion over conceptual understanding during practical agricultural activities.

Instructional constraints further influence the effectiveness of contextualised learning in Agricultural Sciences. Time limitations within the school timetable, insufficient agricultural facilities, and limited access to equipment

can reduce opportunities for meaningful experiential learning. Studies in agricultural and vocational education emphasise that effective experiential learning requires careful instructional planning, reflective discussion, and structured guidance to connect practical activities with theoretical content (Schweisfurth, 2022; Wiek & Lang, 2022). Therefore, strengthening instructional leadership and teacher professional development becomes essential to addressing both cognitive and structural barriers that may limit the full educational value of agricultural experiences.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This section discusses the strategies that are employed to address curriculum practices affecting the teaching of Agricultural Sciences in the GET band as reflected in Table 1.

Enhancement of Teachers

Table 1. present results showing that 17.5% strongly agreed that teachers are developed on effective instructional strategies to enhance teaching and learning whereas 5.3% agreed with the statement. 8.8% were not sure. Majority of 70.2% strongly disagreed and disagreed that not developed on effective instructional strategies that enhances teaching and learning. The results suggest that Agricultural Sciences should be developed professionally as a way of equipping on the curriculum changes and policies in terms of teaching in schools. These results agree with Saucier (2010) who indicated that Agricultural Sciences teachers had a dire need of being also offered the developmental assistance in terms of aspects, like: teaching abilities, contracted obligations and to meet the demands of the ever-changing environment of education. Moreover, Table 4.1, also clearly emphasised the need of training for the teachers in schools.

Table 1: Enhancement of teachers on Agricultural sciences content

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	10	17.5
Agree	3	5.3
Not sure	5	8.8
Strongly disagree	15	26.3
Disagree	25	43.9
TOTAL	57	100

Inputs by curriculum advisors, principals and teachers revealed that teacher enhancement and development on agricultural sciences content is to be considered as part of teacher development. The curriculum advisor had this to say:

“When supporting teachers during training programmes emphasis must be on the teaching of Agricultural sciences and assessments strategies” CA1.

In addition to the above statement one principal said the following:

“I always encourage my teachers to attend in-service trainings, workshops and seminars in order to equip themselves and bridge knowledge gaps in the content” P1.

One of the teachers emphasized that:

“As teachers we have to upgrade ourselves through programmes related to the teaching of Agricultural sciences content” T3.

From the foregoing findings as illustrated in this study, the application of the professional development towards teachers might ultimately result in motivating teachers to perform to their level best in Agricultural Sciences teaching. Furthermore, Saucier (2010) also emphasized the ever needed professional development opportunities offered to teachers could result in influencing their teaching abilities, contractual obligations and lastly enabled them to gradually meet the present demands of the ever-changing pressure in the educational rate in schools.

The Need for Training

Table 2 present result showing that 36.8% of the respondent strongly agreed that teachers are trained on curriculum and assessment strategies whereas 35.1% agreed with the statement. 10.5% were not sure. Only 12.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed. These results suggest that there is need for teachers to be trained and equipped on the assessment policies for them to assess learners using the correct and relevant techniques. Jean (2006) indicates that there is a need content to be included in Agricultural Sciences and be taught and assessed using the relevant assessment techniques. These results suggest that training needs assessment (TNA) to be an important aspect, hence it promotes learning, development or growth in the management of the design practices so that Agricultural Sciences could be well taught at the GET band.

Table 2: The Need for Training

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	21	36.8
Agree	20	35.1
Not sure	6	10.5
Strongly disagree	7	12.3
Disagree	3	5.3
TOTAL	57	100

Still concentrating on the same of developing teachers to offer Agricultural Sciences in the GET band, furthermore, curriculum advisors, principals and teachers had stressed that the ability to keep on training teachers towards teaching Agricultural Sciences, might also at last assist in enabling learners to perform to their maximum levels in schools. The curriculum advisor supported this when she said:

“In my experience as a curriculum advisor, I realised that, when training teachers with the implementation of curriculum, teachers are not trained in the teaching of Agricultural Sciences content, therefore there is a need for training them” CA2

One principal concurred with the statement by saying:

“I think we should always encourage my teachers to attend in-service trainings, workshops, and seminars in order to equip themselves and bridge knowledge gaps in the content” P1

One teacher said this when interviewed:

“Teachers need to be trained and equipped on skills and knowledge on the teaching of Agricultural Sciences content” T4

These views align with existing literature, which underscores continuous professional development as key to improving teaching quality. Therefore, the participants concur with the literature that sustained, needs-driven training enhances both teacher competence and learner. Supporting this, Jean (2006) emphasises the importance of Training Needs Assessment (TNA) in identifying relevant development strategies. The findings reveal that

curriculum advisors, principals, and teachers all stress the need for ongoing training in Agricultural Sciences within the GET band. Participants highlighted that many teachers lack adequate content knowledge and require structured support through workshops and in-service training. There remains a significant gap that necessitates continuous and timely teacher training to enhance knowledge and skills for effective teaching.

The use of experience as a medium for contextualisation

Table 3 present results showing that 28% strongly agreed that teachers use agricultural experience and learner’s environment as a medium of contextualising teaching and learning, whereas 35.1% agreed with the statement. 7.0% were uncertain about the statement. 15.8% of the respondents’ strongly disagreed and 12.3% disagreed that teachers use agricultural experience and learner’s environment as a medium of contextualising teaching and learning.

Table 3: Agricultural experience as a medium for contextualisation

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	16	28
Agree	20	35.1
Not sure	4	7.0
Strongly disagree	9	15.8
Disagree	7	12.3
TOTAL	57	100

The responses from curriculum advisors, principals, and agricultural science teachers indicate broad support for using agricultural experience as a medium for contextualising learning. The curriculum advisors highlighted its importance in linking theory to real-life practice, with one strongly agreeing and the other agreeing while noting resource constraints. Two of the curriculum advisors indicated that:

“We strongly agree that integrating practical agricultural experience helps learners connect theory to real-life contexts, enhancing understanding and retention of agricultural science concepts.” CA1

“Agree. While practical experience is vital, there are challenges in ensuring consistent exposure due to resource constraints in some schools.”CA2

Among the principals, two principals supported the approach, emphasising that practical activities enhance learners’ understanding and problem-solving skills,

“Agree. Agricultural activities at school provide learners with hands-on skills and encourage problem-solving in real contexts.”P1

“Strongly agree. Contextualisation through farm-based activities strengthens the link between the curriculum and community needs.”P4

Agricultural science teachers largely agreed that hands-on activities improve learning outcomes, though two expressed concerns about time constraints and learners’ focus on routine tasks rather than conceptual understanding. Four of the teacher said that:

“Strongly agree. Learners better understand crop production and animal management when they participate in practical sessions.”P1

“Agree. Experiential learning allows learners to relate classroom theory to farm operations.”T2

“Disagree. Some learners focus more on tasks than understanding the underlying scientific concepts.”P7

“Strongly disagree. In some cases, practical work is rushed due to time constraints, reducing its effectiveness as a learning tool.” T

The curriculum advisors, principals, and agricultural science teachers generally supported using agricultural experience to contextualise learning, citing its role in linking theory to real-life practice and enhancing learners' understanding and problem-solving skills. Some participants, however, expressed concerns about limited resources, time constraints, and learners focusing on routine tasks rather than conceptual understanding. Literature findings indicate that effective implementation depends on adequate resources, planning, and teacher facilitation, consistent with Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory and FAO (2013). This suggests that schools should prioritise practical agricultural activities and provide the necessary resources and facilities to support experiential learning. Additionally, teachers should receive training and guidance to effectively integrate hands-on experiences with classroom theory, ensuring meaningful contextualisation for learners.

The study revealed that agricultural experience is widely perceived as an effective medium for contextualising learning in agricultural science. Curriculum advisors, principals, and teachers acknowledged that hands-on activities help learners connect theoretical concepts to real-life practice, enhancing understanding and problem-solving skills. Challenges such as limited resources, inadequate facilities, and time constraints were noted as factors that may hinder effective implementation. Despite these challenges, the majority of participants supported practical agricultural experiences, highlighting their value in promoting meaningful and engaging learning. Therefore, schools should prioritise experiential learning, provide adequate resources, and support teachers to ensure that agricultural activities are effectively integrated into the curriculum.

RECOMMENDATIONS PERTAINING TO THE STUDY

- Schools should ensure that agricultural experiences are embedded in the curriculum to allow learners to apply theoretical knowledge in real-life contexts. Practical activities motivate learners, enhance engagement, and improve understanding of agricultural concepts.
- Educational authorities should equip schools with the necessary tools, equipment, and farm space to support hands-on learning. Proper resources ensure that experiential learning is effective and accessible to all learners, reducing challenges related to implementation.
- Teachers should receive professional development and guidance on integrating practical agricultural activities with classroom theory. Well-trained teachers can facilitate meaningful learning experiences, ensuring that learners grasp both practical skills and underlying concepts.
- Schools should allocate sufficient time within the academic timetable for agricultural experience sessions. Careful planning prevents rushed activities, allowing learners to fully engage and achieve the intended learning outcomes.
- School leadership and curriculum advisors should regularly assess the effectiveness of practical agricultural activities. Continuous evaluation identifies challenges, informs improvements, and ensures that hands-on learning aligns with curriculum objectives.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Overall, integrating agricultural experience into the curriculum provides valuable opportunities for contextualised learning, linking theory to practice. While challenges such as limited resources and time constraints exist, prioritising practical activities, supporting teachers, and providing proper facilities can enhance learning outcomes. Experiential learning in agriculture not only strengthens learners' understanding but also

equips them with relevant skills for real-world application, making it a critical component of agricultural science education.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Open University Press.
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
3. Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
5. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
6. Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Westview Press.
7. FAO. (2017). *Education for rural development and food security*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
8. FAO. (2022). *Transforming agrifood systems through education and capacity development*. FAO.
9. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
10. Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142.
11. Hattie, J. (2020). *Visible learning: The sequel*. Routledge.
12. Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.
13. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.
14. Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2021). Principal instructional leadership and teacher professional learning. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(4), 553–571.
15. Mawela, A.S. & Msimeki, T.M., 2025. Instructional Leadership Styles and Curriculum Delivery: Principals' Perceptions in selective Limpopo Secondary Schools. *African Journal of Pedagogy and Curriculum*, 7(1), pp.111-122.
16. Mulder, M. (2020). Competence-based vocational and professional education. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 72(3), 295–315.
17. OECD. (2019). *Education policy outlook 2019: Working together to help students achieve their potential*. OECD Publishing.
18. OECD. (2020). *Education at a glance 2020*. OECD Publishing.
19. Schweisfurth, M. (2022). *Learner-centred education in international perspective*. Routledge.
20. UNESCO. (2015). *Education 2030: Incheon declaration and framework for action for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4*. UNESCO.
21. Venter, D. J., Naicker, S. R., & Awodiji, O. A. (2024). Enhancing school principals' instructional leadership through emotional intelligence. *The international journal of educational organization and leadership*, 31(2), 45-69.
22. UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO.
23. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
24. Wiek, A., & Lang, D. J. (2022). Transformational sustainability education. *Sustainability Science*, 17, 1005–1018.
25. Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.