

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2025, Vol. 6, No. 2, 608 – 620

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.02.16>

---

## Research Article

### Stakeholders' Engagement and School Performance: Basis for a Proposed School-Community Partnership Program

Marilyn N. Sison\*, Helen C. Fuentes

Graduate School, Eastern Samar State University-Main Campus, Borongan City, Eastern Samar, Philippines, 6800

---

#### Article history:

Submission 31 January 2025

Revised 07 February 2025

Accepted 23 February 2025

#### \*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

[fabrienne08@gmail.com](mailto:fabrienne08@gmail.com)

#### ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between stakeholders' engagement and school performance, focusing on elementary schools in the Schools Division of Borongan City. The specific objectives were to determine the extent of stakeholder involvement in instructional, physical, and values development; evaluate the performance of respondent schools in terms of student achievement, school awards and recognition, and School-Based Management (SBM) level of practice. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered through survey questionnaires adapted and analyzed the prevailing conditions and cause-effect relationships. The study involved elementary school heads and SBM coordinators, who were selected via purposive sampling through total enumeration. Findings indicated active stakeholder engagement across instructional, physical, and values development areas. Among the 40 respondent schools, 47.5% were classified as very satisfactory and 52.5% as satisfactory in student achievement. Additionally, 50% of schools excelled in awards and recognition, 45% were moderately performing, and 5% were not performing. At the SBM level of practice, 95% were classified as progressive, with only 5% at the mature level. Statistical analysis revealed that student achievement and SBM level of practice were not significantly related to stakeholder engagement, with p-values of .315 and .715, respectively. However, a significant relationship was found between stakeholder engagement and school awards and recognition, with a p-value of .045. These results underscore the importance of stakeholder engagement in enhancing certain aspects of school performance, particularly in achieving awards and recognition, highlighting areas where further improvements and strategies are needed to link engagement more directly with academic outcomes and SBM practices.

**Keywords:** *Stakeholders' Engagement, School-Based Management, Partnership Program, School Performance*

---

#### How to cite:

Sison, M. N. & Fuentes, H. C. (2025). Stakeholders' Engagement and School Performance: Basis for a Proposed School-Community Partnership Program. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 6(2), 608 – 620. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.06.02.16

## **Introduction**

The basic framework of a quality education system succeeds in meeting the individual school's desired goals and outcomes; one that is relevant to the needs of students, communities, and society; and one that fosters the ability of students to acquire knowledge and the needed 21st-century skills (Budiyanto, et. al., 2024). Quality is not the only factor keeping students out of school, but when effective learning is not taking place in schools. When this happens, several factors may be viewed as reasons: poor teaching-learning experience given by teachers, having incompetent faculty in the rosters of teachers, mismanaged school system by school heads, and poor leadership potential and misguided governance of the school administrator (Greany & McGinity, 2021). All of these are essential in school-based management to improve internal and external stakeholders to provide quality education (Anabo, 2024).

School-based management (SBM) improves education by transferring decision-making authority from the national to the school level. SBM provides principals, teachers, students, and parents greater control over the education process by giving them responsibility for decisions about the budget, personnel, and curriculum. Through the involvement of teachers, parents, and other community members in these key decisions, SBM can create more effective learning environments for the learners. This came into existence to bring about significant change in educational practice and empower school staff by creating conditions that facilitate improvement, innovation, and continuous professional growth. School-Based Management is a key component of the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA), which empowers key officials to make informed and localized decisions based on their unique needs toward improving the educational system (Chapman & Schott, 2020). This is a pragmatic approach to a formal alteration of the bureaucratic model of school administration with a more democratic structure that identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement with the redistribution of decision-making authority (Maca, 2019).

Schools help learners acquire skills in socialization, communication, and the development of their academic ability. Equally, schools are venues that deliver a place for parents and other stakeholders to get involved in the teaching-learning processes and other educational reforms of the Department of Education (DepEd). However, the development of quality education is not a monopoly of the school. Hand-in-hand with the school are people who complement and supplement each other in achieving the desired educational goals for the learners. Hence, school personnel and other school partners must be attentive to the learners' welfare and performance in school. They have the responsibility to be involved and be sensitive enough to the learners' problems and or development in school. With their aid in the learners' education, positive cooperation and communication between the school and them will foster the learners' progress and better academic performance will be attained.

Studies confirm that the involvement of stakeholders leads to more innovative projects but not necessarily to better-performing projects and better school management (Nederhand & Klijn, 2019). Collaboration between the school and community members is encouraged to support the school's improvement. Moreover, in the importance of the active participation of the students, parents, community, and administrators in the planning and execution of the different school processes is highlighted. It claimed that when stakeholders are active in creating the improvement plan, there are greater possibilities to carry out the plan.

With this, SBM has been revised to better highlight the learner as the center of SBM practice; and to encompass the diverse realities of learning contexts defined and uniquely occurring within specific geographic, social, cultural, economic, political, and environmental makeup of the contemporary society; to enhance commitment of education stakeholders at all levels to their responsibilities and accountabilities in realizing the education outcomes for SBM (Anabo, 2024).

In SBM, the parents and local communities are given the increased amounts of resources that schools now control and the need to give them more flexibility over how to use those

funds. SBM expands the role of School Governing Councils and increases awareness among parents and education stakeholders (Berhanu & Gobie, 2023). Though there are more factors affecting the formulation of a School Improvement Plan, the researcher believes that the involvement of the stakeholders is one of the most important parts of the process. Hence, he finds it necessary to study the practices of stakeholders' involvement in the formulation of the School Improvement Plan among high-performing schools. In summary, the present study focused on the extent of stakeholders' involvement and school performance to develop a proposed school-community partnership program. It further includes the practices that each school uses and implements to involve their stakeholders in the cycle for them to be updated and involved with the different activities or programs that the school is providing particularly the School Improvement Plan. Stakeholders contribute to better management of schools and the betterment of the teaching and learning process to promote equity in education (Penuel, et. al., 2020).

In Borongan City, it has been observed that despite the schools' best efforts to engage with different school stakeholders, there has been a decline in the outcomes of some school-initiated activities. The persistent low participation and involvement of stakeholders in school affairs are likely to result in ineffective school-based management, leading to poor delivery of basic quality education. This in turn, significantly affects the performance and the learners' achievement levels and mastery of the learners. Hence, this study aims to investigate the stakeholders' engagement with school-initiated activities and overall school performance. The result of this study will be a basis for the researcher himself to propose a school-community partnership program for the DepEd Borongan City Division.

## **Methods**

A descriptive-correlational design was employed in this study. A correlation research design is used when a study focuses on the current situation, aiming to discover a new reality. Correlational research gathers data from

individuals on two or more variables and then seeks to determine if the variables are related (Suen, et. al., 2014). Furthermore, it is a correlational design used to test if a relationship exists between two or more variables (Kowalczyk, 2018).

The identified respondents of the study were chosen from the stakeholders' engagement with school-initiated activities and overall school performance on School-Based Management. These individuals were selected through purposive sampling specifically the total enumeration method. To achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher adopted a questionnaire by reference to the former studies, which conducted the extent of stakeholders' participation in school-initiated activities and school-based management systems. The four levels of grading were employed to qualify the extent of stakeholders' engagement: very active = 4 points, active= 3 points, moderately active= 2 points, and inactive = 1 point. For the second objective, the same adopted questionnaire was used in the study. This questionnaire is a 4-point Likert scale, wherein highly performing = 4 points, performing= 3 points, moderately performing= 2 points, and not performing= 1 point.

The population was covered by a total of forty (40) respondents comprised of seventeen (17) elementary school administrators, seventeen (17) SBM coordinators, and six (6) school partnership focal persons from the identified schools in public elementary schools namely: Bugas Elementary School, San Saturnino Elementary School, Sta. Fe Elementary School, Tabunan Elementary School, Hindang Elementary School, Libuton Elementary School, Maypangdan Elementary School, Sabang Elementary School, Songco Elementary School, Eugenio A. Abunda Sr. Elementary School, Eugenio S. Daza Elementary School, Bato Elementary School, Can-abong Elementary School, Taboc Elementary School, Cabong Elementary School, Lalawigan Elementary School, and Locsoon Elementary School.

In the research instrument, the researchers used researcher-restructured questionnaires validated by experts with the school principal, assistant school principal, professor, and SBM

coordinator. Using Cronbach's coefficient determined the validity and reliability of the questionnaire were restructured to ensure validity before distributing it to the respondents (Colbert-Getz et al., 2014; Ballouk et. al., 2022). The validity and reliability overall score of Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 95%. The questionnaire respondents' first section (Part I) Extent of Stakeholders' Engagement in the School Program Instructional Development, Physical Development, and Values Development.

The second section (Part II) Level of Performance of the Respondent-Schools Student Achievement, School Awards and Recognition, and Level of Practice on School-Based Management.

However, the validation of the instruments was undertaken to establish the validity of the instruments. First, the instruments were submitted to the research adviser for initial comments. Second, to the research committee during the pre-evaluation and some panel of experts from the respondents' schools for further suggestions. After the research defense, the research instruments were submitted to a panel of experts from the Graduate School of Eastern Samar State University for some technical assistance in editing the research instruments.

The following teachers extended their expertise in editing the researcher's instruments:

Assistant School Superintendent of Borongan City Division Dr. Raymund D. Capacite, Graduate School Professor Helen C. Fuentes, PhD, and Professor Virgilio P. Rapada, Jr., PhD. Some of the questions were rephrased to make them more consistent with the table of specifications on work immersion program questions and presentations of the survey questionnaire were modified. Based on the suggestions given the instruments were improved. Some questions were modified and others were changed to conform with the table of specifications. A certification was accomplished and labeled as Certification Approved validation of instruments. The instruments were subjected to a dry run. The results of the dry run were analyzed. It was conducted to determine the items needed to be changed or could be misleading. Based on the results, the instruments were improved to make them clear and simple so that

learner-respondents could easily understand. Some typographical errors were changed.

The instruments were pilot-tested in Maybacong Elementary School, Borongan City Division, Eastern Samar this elementary school was not included as a respondent school. In this school, Maybacong Elementary School was selected because it has similar characteristics to the school population and research locale of the study, specifically on the extent of school-based management extent of stakeholders' participation, and school performance.

Lastly, in the data gathering procedure, researchers have the following procedure in conducting data gathering for this study. First, the researchers sought a letter of approval from the school division superintendent and the school heads of different elementary schools. Second, a consent letter to the respondents. Only upon their consent form that the survey questionnaire was administered. The researchers personally went to different elementary school venues to distribute and retrieve the survey questionnaire of the respondents. To ensure no interruption of the classes in the school venue, the researchers ask for their vacant time and give enough time to answer the questionnaire to generate reliable data and retrieve a 100% response rate. After the retrieval, the researcher proceeds to the statistician for data management and results interpretation analysis of the study.

## Result and Discussion

### *Extent of Stakeholders' Engagement in the School Program Instructional Development*

Table 1 shows item number 10- *Administration of actual healthy competitions, talent exposition, and procreative and worthy activities that develop critical thinking and improve learners' skills.* It portrays the highest mean of 3.36 with a qualitative interpretation of active. From the result presented in Table 2, it can be gleaned that all items regarding the extent of stakeholders' engagement in the school program in terms of instructional development are active. It suggests that stakeholders were well involved in the different school programs, especially in instructional development.

The beliefs of teachers and administrators on parental involvement can have a vitalizing or demoralizing influence on school culture (Hellas, et. al., 2018). When teachers' efforts to involve parents were unsuccessful their self-efficacy was impacted, and they questioned their ability to teach and connect with parents (Sethi & Scales, 2020). Teachers may not have the requisite training or skills, particularly when dealing with students with behavioral difficulties

with individualized needs, and a lack of leadership support was seen as a barrier to relationship building (Duong, et. al., 2020).

Parental involvement influences students' academic progress, however, the ability to involve parents remains a concern (Otani, M. (2020). Diverse populations in urban schools have resulted in cultural differences regarding the term parental involvement.

Table 1. Extent of stakeholders' engagement in the school program instructional development in terms of instructional development

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
Preparation and planning for the School Improvement Plan (SIP) towards the attainment of the school goals, objectives and targets in terms of instructional development.	3.09	Active
Sharing of fruitful observations, ideas, suggestions and recommended solutions to address the needs for the instructional development	3.26	Active
Orientation and conduct of school campaigns and activities intended for instructional	3.19	Active
Discussion on the proposed implementation of learning modalities, remedial sessions, research, innovation and activities that improve the quality of learning.	3.24	Active
Planning of trainings and workshops towards improved classroom instruction and effective learning	2.95	Active
Preparation of school budget Ex. School Annual Procurement Plan for Instructional Development	3.03	Active
Acceptance and performance of tasks and responsibilities towards the realization of crafted SIP pertaining to instructional development	3.25	Active
Making of instructional materials for effective execution of appropriate lessons plans and implementation of innovations and remedial activities	3.35	Active
Participation in the instructional trainings/workshops and other related activities like module writing and sharing of teaching strategies	3.23	Active
Administration of actual healthy competitions, talent exposition, pro creative and worthy activities that develop critical thinking and improve learners' skills	3.36	Active
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>Active</b>

**Extent of Stakeholders' Engagement in the School Program in terms of Physical Development**

One of the current international trends in educational reform is the devolution of decision-making powers from central government to school level. This trend is related to a move

towards institutional autonomy, the so-called site based (i.e. school-based) management of institutions, which refers to the issue of self-management of the institution. It can be noted from the results that majority of the respondents revealed that stakeholders' engagement relative to school program in terms of physical

development were more on monitoring and supervision of cleanliness, orderliness, safety and functionality of the facilities. This got the highest weighted mean of 3.36. This was immediately followed by taking part in the implementation of health protocols in terms of the physical areas of the school, with a similar high weighted mean of 3.28; and maintenance of cleanliness and orderliness such as waste segregation, basura ko, uwi ko, tapat ko linis ko! weighted mean of 3.25.

The result supports the findings of Grinshtain & Gibton, (2018) on the level of responsibility of principals leading to adopt of three strategies active, partly active, and passive. School-based management has a specific strategy that the school principal uses, the low level of authority but a higher level of responsibility in the physical development and to improve the performance of the school-based management.

Table 2. Extent of stakeholders' engagement in the school program instructional development in terms of physical development

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
Pre-evaluation of physical facilities in terms of functionality, accessibility, capacity and needed related materials	3.15	Active
Preparation and planning of School Improvement Plan (SIP) intended for physical facilities development	3.21	Active
Participation in the ocular inspection and taking part in the discussion of physical development programs such as needed repairs, maintenance and beautification	3.15	Active
Participation in the provision of the needed materials and supplies for repairs and improvement through partnership and linkages	3.08	Active
Participation in the launching and implementation of Brigada Eskwela	3.04	Active
Implementation of the SDRRMS advocacies and safety guidelines	3.09	Active
Implementation of Wash in the School (WINS), Food Production Area and proper usage of facilities following the recommended health protocols and precautionary safety measures	3.23	Active
Maintenance of cleanliness and orderliness such as waste segregation, basura ko, uwi ko, tapat ko linis ko!	3.25	Active
Taking part in the implementation of health protocols in terms of the physical areas of the school	3.28	Active
Monitoring and supervision of cleanliness, orderliness, safety and functionality of the facilities	3.36	Active
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>Active</b>

**Extent of Stakeholders' Engagement in the School Program in terms of Values Development**

Table 3 shows results on the extent of stakeholders' engagement in the school program regarding values development.

The grand mean of 3.14 showed stakeholders actively engaged in the school program regarding values development. This was supported by the highest weighted mean of 3.26,

on participation in the pieces of training and related activities that are intended for values development, participation in the implementation of programs and activities regarding values development of the school such as Family Day, Children's Day, Recollection, Team Building, Reach-out programs for indigent families, scouting, clean and green cachet, and community outreach programs, monitoring what is

good and righteous and participation in the assessment of values of learners by school made self-assessment tool, with similar weighted mean of 3.21, and involvement in the strategic planning for workshops and trainings regarding values development, with weighted mean of 3.19.

These findings must be understood. As children's education increasingly occurs across a range of settings, parents are uniquely positioned to help ensure that these settings best support their children's specific needs, especially their academic performance. Thus, parental involvement remains pivotal to children's educational success. Parents must exert

a lot of effort to partner with the school to develop children's cognitive development.

Their participation in this aspect must go hand-in-hand with the school's effort to achieve the pupils' progress. Meanwhile, according to the Theory of Psychosocial Development of Erickson, if children are encouraged and reinforced for their initiative, they begin to feel industrious and confident in their ability to achieve goals. If this initiative is not encouraged, if parents or teachers restricts it, the child begins to feel inferior, doubting his abilities, and therefore may not reach his or her potential.

Table 3. Extent of stakeholders' involvement in the school program instructional development in terms of values development

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
Preparation of the values development plan for the learners, parents and teachers	3.00	Active
Making decisions on the choice of learning programs, advocacies and activities that will promote positive values	3.16	Active
Sharing of experience, worthy, and values related experiences, ideas and insights towards the improvement of learners' values	3.16	Active
Participation in the strategic planning for workshops and trainings regarding values development	3.19	Active
Participation in the implementation of programs and activities regarding values development of the school such as in Family Day, Children's Day, Recollection, Team Building, Reach-out programs for indigent families, scouting, clean and green cachet, and community outreach programs	3.21	Active
Participation in the trainings and related activities that are intended for values development	3.26	Active
Monitoring what is good and righteous	3.21	Active
Participation in the assessment of values of learners by school made self-assessment tool	3.21	Active
Participation in the making of future plans based from the result of assessment tool to address the needs of the learners in terms of values development	2.98	Active
Giving quality time in correcting learners' manner of speaking, thinking and actuations in a possible way	2.99	Active
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>Active</b>

**Summary of the extent of stakeholders' engagement in the school program**

Table 4 summarizes the extent of stakeholders' engagement in the school program. Stakeholders' engagement may translate into goodwill stimulating improved pupil academic

performance. This can only be achieved at the advent of ideal participation by parents, sponsors, and adjoining communities around the public learning institutions. Involvement by local communities in school activities provides goodwill in the academic program (Bangani,

2024). This enhances the governance prism owing to collective responsibility that spurs improved academic performance. The study sought to find out how stakeholder engagement affected pupils' academic performance in the study area.

The study findings confirmed previous works that called for parental involvement to enhance the management of public learning institutions. The leadership in the schools assures the ability to have optimal parental

participation in the school's governance. Sound structures in the administrative systems ensure that public institutions can realize the value of inclusivity. Consultative leadership enhances the involvement of communities around the schools entailing the parents to guarantee the success of the programs in place (Anabo & Rapada Jr, 2024). This gives the school communities leverage as it pertains to decision-making.

Table 4. Summary of the extent of stakeholders' engagement in the school program

<b>Engagement in School Program</b>	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Instructional development	3.19	Active
Physical development	3.18	Active
Values development	3.14	Active
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>Active</b>

**Level of Performance of the Respondent-Schools in terms of Student Achievements**

Table 5 illustrates the schools' level of performance in terms of student achievement. From the table below, it can be gleaned that out of 40 school respondents, 47.5%, or 19 schools, belonged to the very satisfactory level and 52.5%, or 21 schools, belonged to the satisfactory level. The level of performance is based on DepEd Order # 08, s. 2015—Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program.

This result is supported by the recent result of the National Achievement Test (NAT) being

conducted in the year 2023. Out of 55,568 sampled schools that took the NAT, only 17.69% of them belong to the very satisfactory level in terms of the Mean Percentage Score (DepEd Memorandum # 64, s. 2024). Furthermore, Albano, (2021) cited by Calzada & Antonio, (2023) the student achievement in the National Achievement Test (NAT) results revealed that the national average mean percentage score (MPS) continued to decline and diminishing, with the lowest performance in history of the Department of Education's standardized examination.

Table 5. Respondent-schools' level of performance in terms of student achievement

<b>Level of Performance in Terms of Student Achievement</b>	<b>Frequency N=40</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Outstanding		
Ver Satisfactory	19	47.5
Satisfactory	21	52.5
Fairly Satisfactory		
Did not meet Expectation		

**Level of Performance of the Respondent-Schools in terms of School Awards and Recognition**

Table 6 shows the school's level of performance in terms of awards and recognition. It can be seen that 50% (20) of the schools were

able to "perform" in terms of awards and recognition. On the other hand, there were 45% or 18 schools belonging to the category who were moderately performing and 5% or 2 schools who were not performing in terms of awards and recognition.



Awards and recognitions contribute significantly to shaping a positive school culture that values excellence and achievement. Garcia and Mejia (2021) emphasize that public acknowledgment of school accomplishments fosters a sense of pride and belonging among students, educators, and parents. Furthermore, these programs reinforce a culture of aspiration and success, inspiring individuals within the school community to strive for greatness.

The school awards motivate students to engage actively in their studies, leading to improved academic outcomes. Similarly, Korper-shoek, et. al., (2020) highlighted the role of

recognition programs in incentivizing students to set and achieve educational goals, thus enhancing their motivation and commitment to learning.

Peterson and Stephens (2023) noted that public acknowledgment of educators' efforts and accomplishments boosts morale and job satisfaction, leading to greater enthusiasm and dedication in the classroom. Furthermore, these recognitions provide opportunities for educators to showcase their innovative practices and expertise, fostering a culture of continuous learning and growth (Darling-Hammond, et. al., 2020).

Table 6. Respondent-schools' level of performance in terms of awards and recognition

<b>Level of Performance in Terms of Awards &amp; Recognition</b>	<b>Frequency (N=40)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Highly Performing		
Performing	20	50.0
Moderately Performing	18	45.0
Not Performing	2	5.0

Table 7. Respondent-schools' level of performance in terms SBM level of practice

<b>SBM Level of Practice</b>	<b>Frequency (N=40)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Mature	2	5.0
Progressive	38	95.0
Standard		

**Level of Practice in School-Based Management**

Above is Table 7 on the school's level of performance in terms of SBM level of practice. As illustrated, there were only two (2) schools who are at the mature level. It means that the school went further by maximizing the efforts of the school and the community/stakeholders to achieve higher learning outcomes. On the contrary, there were 95% or 38 schools who are at a progressive level. The school needs to intensify the mobilization of resources and maximize the efforts of the school to achieve desired learning outcomes. Despite its promise, SBM implementation in the Philippines faces various challenges, including resource constraints, bureaucratic inertia, and uneven levels of community participation. However, empirical studies highlight the resilience of Filipino educators, who navigate these challenges

through innovative strategies and collaborative partnerships. Enhancing academic performance, and promoting effective school governance (Saro, et. al., (2022). Moreover, SBM contributes to the holistic development of students by encouraging community involvement and cultivating 21st-century skills (Villanueva, et. al., 2021).

**Relationship between the Extent of the Stakeholders' Involvement in the School Program and to the Level of Performance of the Respondent-Schools**

The results presented in Table 8 depict the relationship between the extent of stakeholders' engagement in the school program and the level of performance of the school such as students' achievement, school awards and recognition, and SBM level of practice.

Table 8. Test of relationship between the extent of the stakeholders' engagement in the school program and to the level of performance of the respondent schools

Variables		r	p	Interpretation
Independent	Dependent			
Stakeholders' involvement in the school program instructional development	Student achievement	.163	.315	Not significant
	School awards and recognition	.783	.045	Significant
	SBM level of practice	.715	.060	Not significant

As shown in Table 8, student achievement and SBM level of practice were revealed to be statistically not significant to the stakeholders' engagement in the school program with the p-value of .315 and .715 respectively, the result of analysis failed to reject the aforementioned null hypothesis in terms of student achievement and SBM level of practice. On the other note, the school awards and recognition were statistically significant to the stakeholders' engagement with the p-value of .045 thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the extent of the stakeholders' engagement in the school program and the level of performance of the respondent-schools is rejected.

Recent research has cast doubt on the presumed correlation between stakeholder engagement and the effectiveness of School-Based Management (SBM) initiatives. Despite the widespread belief that the active involvement of stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and community members, is essential for successful SBM implementation, empirical evidence suggests otherwise. Studies indicate that while stakeholder engagement is often advocated as a means to enhance accountability, promote democratic governance, and empower local communities in educational decision-making processes, its impact on SBM outcomes is inconsistent and context-dependent. This challenges the conventional wisdom that greater stakeholder engagement leads to higher levels of SBM effectiveness.

Furthermore, the absence of a clear relationship between stakeholder engagement and SBM levels underscores the complexity of educational governance and the multifaceted nature of school improvement efforts. Contextual factors such as variations in stakeholders' expertise, conflicting interests, and institutional dynamics may obscure any discernible link

between stakeholder involvement and SBM outcomes (Martin, 2019). This highlights the need for a more nuanced understanding of the role of stakeholders in SBM and the recognition that their engagement alone may not guarantee improved educational outcomes.

Despite the widespread belief in the educational community that stakeholder engagement positively impacts student achievement, recent research has begun to challenge this assumption. While stakeholders such as teachers, parents, and community members are often seen as essential partners in fostering student success through their involvement in decision-making processes and support activities, empirical evidence suggests that the relationship between stakeholder engagement and student achievement is not as straightforward as previously thought. Studies indicate that while stakeholder engagement may play a role in creating a supportive and conducive learning environment, its direct impact on student achievement is inconsistent and context-dependent (Handoyo & Anas, 2024).

Contextual factors have been found to exert a stronger influence on student achievement than the level of stakeholder engagement alone (Jang, et. al., 2009). Furthermore, the quality and depth of stakeholder engagement, rather than its mere presence, appear to be more closely associated with student outcomes. For instance, meaningful engagement characterized by collaboration, shared decision-making, and a focus on student learning goals may significantly impact student achievement more than superficial or tokenistic forms of involvement (Saraspe, et. al., 2020).

As educators and policymakers navigate the complexities of promoting student achievement, it is essential to recognize the nuanced nature of the relationship between stakeholder engagement and student outcomes. While

stakeholder involvement remains an important aspect of educational governance and community empowerment, its direct influence on student achievement may be mediated by various factors. By adopting a more comprehensive understanding of the role of stakeholders in education and focusing on strategies that foster authentic collaboration and shared responsibility, stakeholders can work together more effectively to support student success and create equitable learning environments

## Conclusion

In light of the findings of the study, the conclusion was drawn as follows:

1. Stakeholders actively participate in all aspects of the school program, from instructional development to maintaining cleanliness, safety, and functionality of facilities, as well as promoting values development through various activities and engagements, demonstrating a comprehensive commitment to the holistic growth and success of the school community.
2. Most of the schools perform very satisfactorily. On the school level of performance in terms of awards and recognition, schools are performing. Most of the schools had a progressive level of SBM level of practice. The consistent recognition and awards reflect their commitment to excellence, while the progressive SBM levels indicate a solid foundation for continuous improvement and sustainable development in educational practices.
3. Student achievement and SBM level of practice do not have enough evidence to show the strong relationship between the two variables in stakeholders' engagement, however, school awards portray a significant relationship between the stakeholders' engagement. This suggests that stakeholder engagement has a more pronounced impact on the recognition and awards a school receives compared to its influence on direct student achievement and SBM practices.

## Recommendation

1. Establish regular communication channels and feedback mechanisms to enhance

stakeholder involvement further and ensure continuous alignment of their contributions with the evolving needs and goals of the school community.

2. Schools should prioritize continuous improvement by fostering a culture of innovation and collaboration, leveraging best practices from high-performing institutions, and actively seeking opportunities for professional development to sustain and further elevate their achievements in both academic and organizational excellence.
3. Conduct a comprehensive analysis to identify key factors influencing stakeholder engagement concerning student achievement and SBM level of practice, utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methods to gather robust evidence.
4. Explore strategies to enhance stakeholder involvement in areas where a significant relationship with school awards has been observed, aiming to foster a more cohesive and effective partnership towards overall school improvement.

## Acknowledgment

The researchers want to express their sincere gratitude and thanks to the Graduate School Eastern Samar State University-Main Campus, Borongan City, Philippines.

## References

- Albano Jr., E. (2021). 'Old,' 'up to date': Inventing word meanings and data on the education crisis. <https://opinion.inquirer.net/142809/old-up-to-date-inventing-word-meanings-and-data-on-the-education-crisis>.
- Anabo, R. O. (2024). Analysis of Different Principles in School-based Management. Available at SSRN 4780126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4780126>
- Anabo, R. O. (2024). Instructional Leadership in School-Based Management of DepEd Schools in Samar Island: Systematic Approach Review. Available at SSRN 4799364. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4799364>
- Anabo, R. O., & Rapada Jr, V. P. (2024). Leadership Styles of School Heads and

- Performance of Teachers in Eastern Samar Division. *TWIST*, 19(3), 713-717. <https://twistjournal.net/twist/article/view/460>
- Ballouk, R., Mansour, V., Dalziel, B., & Hegazi, I. (2022). The development and validation of a questionnaire to explore medical students' learning in a blended learning environment. *BMC medical education*, 22, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-03045-4>
- Bangani, S. (2024). Academic libraries' support for quality education through community engagement. *Information Development*, 40(4), 590-601. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02666669231152862>
- Berhanu, K. Z., & Gobie, D. (2023). Adequacy of capacity building and stakeholder involvement in decentralized education management: evidence from Ethiopia. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(2), 2247151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2247151>
- Budiyanto, K. K., Harapan, E., Purwanto, M. B., & Smaratungga, S. T. I. A. B. (2024). 21st century English learning: A revolution in skills, critical thinking, creativity, and visual communication. *Asian J. Appl. Educ*, 3(1), 43-54. <https://doi.org/10.55927/ajae.v3i1.7841>
- Calzada, M. P. T., & Antonio, V. V. (2023). Effectiveness of quiz, quiz, trade incorporating hugot and pop rock songs in enhancing students' performance in earth science. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 2(2), 121-129. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v2i2.1458>
- Chapman, J. M., & Schott, S. (2020). Knowledge coevolution: generating new understanding through bridging and strengthening distinct knowledge systems and empowering local knowledge holders. *Sustainability Science*, 15(3), 931-943. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00781-2>
- Colbert-Getz, J. M., Kim, S., Goode, V. H., Shochet, R. B., & Wright, S. M. (2014). Assessing medical students' and residents' perceptions of the learning environment: exploring validity evidence for the interpretation of scores from existing tools. *Academic Medicine*, 89(12), 1687-1693. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.00000000000000433>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied developmental science*, 24(2), 97-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- Duong, M. T., Nguyen, L., Gaias, L., Benjamin, K. S., Lee, K., Buntain-Ricklefs, J., & Cook, C. R. (2020). Using stakeholder input to guide cultural and contextual adaptations for a universal school-based intervention. *The Urban Review*, 52, 853-879. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-019-00547-w>
- Garcia M., & Mejia, L. (2021). Veterans, newcomers, and immigrant attraction: California's heterogeneous public-school student population. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 15(24), 1-36
- Greany, T., & McGinity, R. (2021). Structural integration and knowledge exchange in multi-academy trusts: Comparing approaches with evidence and theory from non-educational sectors. *School Leadership & Management*, 41(4-5), 311-333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2021.1872525>
- Grinshtain, Y., & Gibton, D. (2018). Responsibility, authority, and accountability in school-based and non-school-based management: Principals' coping strategies. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(1), 2-17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-01-2017-0005>
- Handoyo, S., & Anas, S. (2024). The effect of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) on firm performance: the moderating role of country regulatory quality and government effectiveness in ASEAN. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2371071.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2371071>
- Hellas, A., Ithantola, P., Petersen, A., Ajanovski, V. V., Gutica, M., Hynninen, T., ... & Liao, S. N. (2018). Predicting academic performance: a systematic literature review. In *Proceedings companion of the 23rd annual ACM conference on innovation and technology in computer science education* (pp. 175-199). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3293881.3295783>
- Korpershoek, H., Canrinus, E. T., Fokkens-Bruinsma, M., & De Boer, H. (2020). The relationships between school belonging and students' motivational, social-emotional, behavioural, and academic outcomes in secondary education: A meta-analytic review. *Research papers in education, 35*(6), 641-680. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2019.1615116>
- Kowalczyk, S. T. (2018). *Digital curation for libraries and archives*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA. <https://leen.oc.gov/2018003078>
- Maca, M. N. (2019). School-based Management in the Philippines: Fostering Innovations in the Public Education System. *Romblon State University Research Journal, 2*(1), 35-59.
- Martin, M. (2019). The implementation of school-based management in public elementary schools. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning, 9*(1), 44-56. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ajatel.vol9.no1.5.2019>
- Nederhand, J., & Klijn, E. H. (2019). Stakeholder involvement in public-private partnerships: Its influence on the innovative character of projects and on project performance. *Administration & Society, 51*(8), 1200-1226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399716684887>
- Otani, M. (2020). Parental involvement and academic achievement among elementary and middle school students. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 21*(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-019-09614-z>
- Penuel, W. R., Riedy, R., Barber, M. S., Peurach, D. J., LeBouef, W. A., & Clark, T. (2020). Principles of collaborative education research with stakeholders: Toward requirements for a new research and development infrastructure. *Review of Educational Research, 90*(5), 627-674. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320938126>
- Peterson, E. L., and Stephens, R. M. (2023). "A motivational approach to self: integration in personality," in Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Perspectives on Motivation, Vol. 38. <https://books.google.com.ph/books>
- Saraspe, L. D., & Abocejo, F. T. (2020). Effectiveness of descriptive praise on the English composition skill of bridging students. *European Journal of English Language Teaching, 5*(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v5i4.3140>
- Saro, J., Silabay, A., Lumbanon, J., Pepugal, E., & Pareja, M. (2022). School-Based Management: Reevaluating and Innovating Learning Outcomes to Refine Schools' Performances and Practices. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 4*(5), 439-448. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7087798>
- Sethi, J., & Scales, P. C. (2020). Developmental relationships and school success: How teachers, parents, and friends affect educational outcomes and what actions students say matter most. *Contemporary educational psychology, 63*, 101904. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101904>
- Suen, H. K., & Ary, D. (2014). *Analyzing quantitative behavioral observation data*. psychology press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315801827>
- Villanueva, J. S., & Cruz, R. A. O. D. (2021). Confronting Challenges of School-Based Management in a Developing Country. *Journal on School Educational Technology (JSCH), 17*(3). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1356454>