

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2026, Vol. 7, No. 5, 2100 – 2118

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.07.05.20>

## Research Article

### Managing Stakeholders in Elementary Schools: Leadership Practices for Effective School Operations in Zambales

Marie Fe D. De Guzman<sup>1\*</sup>, Rene C. Dizon, Jr.<sup>1</sup>, Raymond D. Espiritu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales, 2201, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Castillejos, Zambales, 2208, Philippines

#### Article history:

Submission 25 April 2026

Revised 14 May 2026

Accepted 23 May 2026

#### \*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

[Deguzmanmariefe2018@gmail.com](mailto:Deguzmanmariefe2018@gmail.com)

#### ABSTRACT

This study explored the leadership practices of elementary school leaders in managing stakeholders within public schools in Zambales, Philippines, with the aim of improving school operations and fostering a collaborative and inclusive educational environment. The research focused on leadership dimensions such as communication, engagement, relationship-building, and conflict resolution, considering the perspectives of both school leaders and teachers. Given the challenges in rural areas, including mismanagement of resources and low levels of stakeholder involvement, the study emphasized the crucial role of school leadership in overcoming these barriers. Using a descriptive quantitative research design, data were collected from 30 principals and 535 teachers from 15 public elementary schools. The results indicated that both leaders and teachers placed a high value on relationship-building, particularly through recognizing stakeholder contributions and maintaining consistent communication. Teachers highlighted the importance of active participation in decision-making processes, while principals emphasized proactive problem-solving and relationship development. The study also revealed that demographic variables, including age, gender, and educational qualifications, influenced the perceptions of leadership practices. Based on these findings, an intervention plan was proposed to enhance leadership practices in communication, engagement, and conflict resolution through targeted training. The anticipated outcomes of the intervention included improved stakeholder communication, increased teacher involvement in decision-making, strengthened relationships within the school community, and enhanced conflict resolution practices. Ultimately, the study aimed to create a more cooperative school environment, leading to improved school performance and better academic outcomes for students. This research provides valuable insights into the leadership

#### How to cite:

De Guzman, M. F. D., Dizon, Jr., R. C., & Espiritu, R. D. (2026). Managing Stakeholders in Elementary Schools: Leadership Practices for Effective School Operations in Zambales. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 7(5), 2100 – 2118. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.07.05.20

dynamics in elementary schools and offers practical recommendations for enhancing stakeholder management to support effective school governance.

**Keywords:** *Communication practices, Conflict resolution, Educational leadership, Engagement, Relationship-building, School leadership, Stakeholder management, Teacher involvement*

---

## Background

The success of any school fundamentally relied on effective leadership, a concept that was particularly crucial in elementary schools, as these institutions laid the foundation for students' academic development (Javornik & Mirazchiyski, 2023). Principals in these schools were expected to do more than simply manage day-to-day operations; they had to act as "change agents," strategically overseeing resources and fostering positive relationships with stakeholders to ensure a productive learning environment (Global Education Monitoring Report, 2024/5, Leadership in Education: Lead for Learning, 2024; Valenzuela & Buenvenida, 2021). Research consistently showed a strong connection between effective instructional leadership and increased teacher self-efficacy, as well as improved student outcomes (Battad, 2024; Zhang et al., 2025). Studies by Javornik et al. and other global reports further emphasized that strong instructional leadership, coupled with engagement from stakeholders, was essential to school effectiveness (Global Education Monitoring Report, 2024/5, Leadership in Education: Lead for Learning, 2024; Javornik & Mirazchiyski, 2023).

Despite the recognition of these advantages, rural and developing schools continued to face numerous significant barriers that hindered their progress (Mincu, 2022; Reyes et al., 2021). The Philippine education system, described as a "dysfunctional bureaucracy," was characterized by high leadership turnover and a "culture of crisis," making long-term reforms challenging (Gatchalian et al., 2024; Reyes et al., 2021). Ongoing issues such as poor resource management, low administrative performance, and conflicting interests between school leaders and local officials adversely affected the functioning of schools (Saga, 2025; Vicente et al., 2023). These challenges were particularly

evident in provinces like Zambales, where school administrators regularly faced resource shortages and minimal involvement from parents and the broader community (Anastacio, 2025; Battad, 2024).

This study focused on elementary schools in Zambales, aiming to understand the leadership practices employed by principals, particularly in managing school resources and cultivating stakeholder relationships. The research aimed not only to gain insights into the perceptions of both principals and teachers regarding leadership practices but also to develop recommendations and strategies to address administrative challenges and enhance school governance in the region (Battad, 2024; Fontillas & Cabal, 2023).

## Objectives of the Study

This research aimed to explore how school leaders guide the individuals who assist in the operation and management of their schools. The purpose was to examine the demographic characteristics of school administrators (such as gender, age, education, and experience) as well as those of the teachers. The study also sought to understand the perceptions of both school leaders and teachers regarding the leaders' ability to manage stakeholders once communication is established, how effectively they manage engagement, and how they build relationships and resolve conflicts with stakeholders. Additionally, the research examined the challenges faced by both school leaders and teachers in working with stakeholders, with the goal of understanding whether their perceptions of leadership abilities differ based on demographic factors. The study concluded with the development of a plan aimed at enhancing the leadership skills of school administrators and improving school operations to foster

more successful stakeholder management. Ultimately, this research sought to contribute to the body of knowledge on leadership practices in school management and offer recommendations for improving leader-stakeholder engagement within schools.

## **Methods**

This research study was designed using a descriptive, quantitative approach to examine how school leaders created and maintained stakeholder engagement and evaluated the extent to which various leadership strategies contributed to school success. The focus of descriptive research was to accurately describe a particular problem or phenomenon without bias, providing a clear picture of the current state of the research subject. In addition, quantitative research allowed the investigation, using statistical techniques, of whether relationships existed between variables, ensuring objectivity in the data. Both research methods provided useful empirical evidence regarding the application of leadership and stakeholder management within the educational setting. The purpose of the study was to describe the characteristics and profiles of school leaders and teachers, examine the practices utilized by leaders in managing school resources, and identify the difficulties faced by both leaders and teachers in managing resources and stakeholders to achieve optimal school operations.

Participants in this study included two target groups: 30 school leaders, representative of leadership roles, and 535 teachers, who were the primary contributors to day-to-day educational activities and thus had a significant stake in educational outcomes. These participants were employed at public primary institutions across 15 districts in Zambales Division. Teachers were selected using random selection via Slovin's formula followed by stratified random sampling, ensuring the sample adequately represented the population of teachers across a large geographic area that extended from Subic to Sta. Cruz District. This method provided a diverse data set, capturing a broad range of experiences and challenges faced by school leaders and teachers.

A survey questionnaire was used as the primary data collection method, consisting of five sections addressing leadership and stakeholder management. The first section gathered demographic information, the second focused on leadership practices related to resource management, the third addressed leadership practices in managing stakeholders, and the fourth collected data on challenges in managing both areas. Each survey question was based on a review of existing literature on leadership and resource management. A pilot test was conducted, and the instrument's reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's Alpha, confirming its validity and reliability in measuring the relevant variables.

Data collection occurred after receiving approval from the Schools Division Superintendent of Zambales. The researcher personally administered the survey to ensure participants understood the study's purpose and felt comfortable completing the survey. Data collection took place during the second semester of the 2025-2026 school year, with two weeks allocated for responses. During this period, the researcher-maintained confidentiality and provided clear instructions for completing the survey, ensuring that the data collected was accurate, relevant, and consistent with the study's objectives.

Given the quantitative nature of this research, the data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Descriptive statistical analysis included recording the number of responses, frequency distributions of responses by leadership practices, and the weighted average scores of each practice. Inferential statistical analysis involved using ANOVA and t-tests to test for statistically significant differences in the perceptions of school principals and teachers regarding their leadership practices and related challenges. This analysis provided the researcher with valid and useful information to draw conclusions about factors affecting school performance and stakeholder engagement, with conclusions based on established decision rules aligned with the data's significance level. The analysis yielded statistically sound and operationally meaningful conclusions.

## Result and Discussion

### Profile of the School Heads

Table 1 presented the demographic characteristics of school heads, which were evaluated based on their sex, age, highest level of education, number of years in their role as a school head, and their current position (e.g., principal, vice principal). This demographic

information provided valuable insights into the attributes that may have influenced the leadership capabilities of a school head, particularly in decision-making and their overall effectiveness as leaders. These factors were closely related to teachers' decisions to remain at a school and had a direct impact on the school's overall performance.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the School Heads' Profile

| <b>Sex</b>                              | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Female                                  | 18               | 60.00          |
| Male                                    | 12               | 40.00          |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>30</b>        | <b>100.00</b>  |
| <b>Age</b>                              | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| 60-65 years old                         | 8                | 26.67          |
| 50-59 years old                         | 16               | 53.33          |
| 40-49 years old                         | 6                | 20.00          |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>30</b>        | <b>100.00</b>  |
| <b>Mean = 54.63 years old</b>           |                  |                |
| <b>Highest Educational Attainment</b>   | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| Doctors Degree                          | 16               | 53.33          |
| Master's w/ EdD or PhD Units            | 11               | 36.67          |
| Master's Degree                         | 3                | 10.00          |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>30</b>        | <b>100.00</b>  |
| <b>Length of Service as School Head</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| 22 years and above                      | 12               | 40.00          |
| 19-21 years                             | 10               | 33.33          |
| 16-18 years                             | 8                | 26.67          |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>30</b>        | <b>100.00</b>  |
| <b>Mean = 20.40 years</b>               |                  |                |
| <b>Designation</b>                      | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| Principal IV                            | 9                | 30.00          |
| Principal III                           | 0                | 0.00           |
| Principal II                            | 3                | 10.00          |
| Principal I                             | 10               | 33.33          |
| Head Teacher III                        | 1                | 3.33           |
| Head Teacher II                         | 0                | 0.00           |
| Head Teacher I                          | 2                | 6.67           |
| OIC-Asst. Principal                     | 3                | 10.00          |
| Teacher in Charge/Caretaker             | 2                | 6.67           |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>30</b>        | <b>100.00</b>  |

Table 1 summarized the demographic characteristics of the school head respondents, providing detailed information on their sex, age, level of education, length of service, and position. The sex distribution revealed that 40% of the respondents were male, while 60% identified as female, reflecting a slight

predominance of female leadership, which aligns with research showing an increasing representation of women in leadership roles within education, influencing leadership styles and outcomes (Acosta & de Guzman, 2025). The majority of respondents (53.33%) were aged between 50 and 59 years, with an average

age of 54.63 years, indicating substantial experience in their roles, as experienced leaders are typically positioned in senior roles and equipped to manage complex challenges (Eustaquio & Espiritu, 2025). Additionally, 26.67% of the school heads were aged between 60 and 65, reflecting a significant cohort nearing retirement and suggesting the need for succession planning (Rogayan Jr. & De Guzman, 2025). Regarding educational qualifications, 53.33% held a Doctor's Degree, and 36.67% had completed coursework for a Master's Degree, with many pursuing EdD or PhD studies, highlighting the importance of advanced qualifications in enhancing leadership effectiveness (Eustaquio & Espiritu, 2025). The length of service data showed that 40% of respondents had served in their current roles for at least 22 years, with a mean length of service of 20.40 years, providing leaders with a deep understanding of school management (Acosta & de Guzman, 2025). Finally, the respondents held various leadership roles, with 33.33% classified as Principal I and 30% as Principal IV, illustrating the diversity of positions and

emphasizing that their extensive experience and advanced qualifications equipped them to handle the challenges of educational leadership effectively (Rogayan Jr. & De Guzman, 2025). This demographic data highlights the significant experience and qualifications that contribute to the efficacy of school leaders in managing school operations and addressing leadership challenges.

### **Profile of the Teachers**

Table 2 demonstrates how many teachers fall under the different sex categories. Based on the data, it can Table 2 presented the frequency and percentage distribution of the teachers' profile in terms of sex. The results revealed that the majority of the respondents were female teachers (n = 333; 62.24%), while male teachers accounted for 202 (37.76%) of the total 535 respondents. This distribution reflects the longstanding gender trend in the teaching profession, particularly in basic education, where women continue to dominate the workforce both locally and internationally.

*Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Teachers' Profile*

| <b>Age</b>                              | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| 60-65 years old                         | 0                | 0.00           |
| 50-59 years old                         | 60               | 11.21          |
| 40-49 years old                         | 158              | 29.53          |
| 30-39 years old                         | 201              | 37.57          |
| 20-29 years old                         | 116              | 21.68          |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>535</b>       | <b>100.00</b>  |
| <b>Mean = 37.53 years old</b>           |                  |                |
| <b>Highest Educational Attainment</b>   | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| Doctors Degree                          | 18               | 3.36           |
| Master's w/ EdD or PhD Units            | 64               | 11.96          |
| Master's Degree                         | 241              | 45.05          |
| Bachelor with Master's Unit             | 209              | 39.07          |
| Bachelor's Degree                       | 3                | 0.56           |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>535</b>       | <b>100.00</b>  |
| <b>Length of Service as School Head</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| 36 years and above                      | 2                | 0.37           |
| 31-35 years                             | 59               | 11.03          |
| 26-30 years                             | 171              | 31.96          |
| 21-25 years                             | 152              | 28.41          |
| 16-20 years                             | 47               | 8.79           |
| 11-15 years                             | 49               | 9.16           |
| 6-10 years                              | 35               | 6.54           |

|                           |                  |                |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 0-5 years                 | 20               | 3.74           |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>535</b>       | <b>100.00</b>  |
| <b>Mean = 22.65 years</b> |                  |                |
| <b>Sex</b>                | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
| Female                    | 333              | 62.24          |
| Male                      | 202              | 37.76          |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>535</b>       | <b>100.00</b>  |

Table 2 provided a comprehensive profile of the teacher respondents, reflecting a wide range of ages, educational qualifications, years of service, and gender distribution. The majority of teachers were in the 30-39 age group, comprising 37.57% of the sample, with a mean age of 37.53 years. This suggests that the teaching workforce was predominantly youthful, bringing energy and fresh perspectives to their roles. In terms of educational attainment, a significant proportion of teachers (45.05%) held a Master's Degree, and 39.07% possessed a Bachelor's Degree with Master's units, indicating a well-educated workforce committed to professional development. However, only a smaller percentage held advanced degrees such as a Doctor's Degree (3.36%) or Master's with EdD or PhD units (11.96%), highlighting a gap in the pursuit of higher education within the profession. This trend aligns with studies

indicating that higher qualifications are linked to improved teaching effectiveness and student performance (de Guzman & Blanco, 2024). The data on length of service revealed that most teachers had extensive experience, with 31.96% having served between 26-30 years, and a mean service length of 22.65 years. This significant experience suggested that the respondents possessed a wealth of knowledge and expertise, contributing to their teaching effectiveness and decision-making (Guerrero & Espiritu, 2025). Finally, the gender distribution showed that 62.24% of teachers were female, reinforcing the trend observed in the education sector, where women overwhelmingly dominated the profession (Guerrero & Espiritu, 2025). Collectively, these findings highlighted a workforce that was youthful, highly educated, and experienced, with a strong gender imbalance favoring female teachers.

*Table 3. School Head and Teacher Respondents' Perception on the Communication Practices of the School Head in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation*

| Communication  | School Heads |     |      | Teachers |     |      |
|--|--------------|-----|------|----------|-----|------|
|  | WM           | QR  | Rank | WM       | QR  | Rank |
| 1. Establish a consistent communication schedule, such as weekly emails or monthly newsletters, keeps stakeholders informed and engaged          | 3.73         | MIP | 1    | 3.78     | MIP | 1    |
| 2. Create opportunities for two-way communication, such as feedback sessions and Q&A, allows stakeholders to express their views and feel heard. | 3.63         | MIP | 2    | 3.56     | MIP | 5.5  |
| 3. Utilize various platforms like newsletters, social media, and in-person meetings ensures information reaches all stakeholders effectively.    | 3.53         | MIP | 5.5  | 3.61     | MIP | 2    |
| 4. Demonstrate that their input is valued and helps to identify and resolve issues before they escalate.   | 3.57         | MIP | 3.5  | 3.56     | MIP | 5.5  |

| Communication   | School Heads |            |      | Teachers    |            |      |
|---|--------------|------------|------|-------------|------------|------|
|   | WM           | QR         | Rank | WM          | QR         | Rank |
| 5. Leverage technology, such as school websites, social media, and mobile apps, can enhance communication | 3.47         | FP         | 7    | 3.55        | MIP        | 7    |
| 6. Establish open and honest communication, being accessible, and fostering a sense of community          | 3.53         | MIP        | 5.5  | 3.60        | MIP        | 3    |
| 7. Respond to questions, understand their perspectives, and feedback with empathy.                        | 3.40         | FP         | 8    | 3.47        | FP         | 8    |
| 8. Share timely, accurate, and relevant information with stakeholders, keeping them informed and engaged  | 3.57         | MIP        | 3.5  | 3.59        | MIP        | 4    |
| <b>Overall Weighed Mean</b>   | <b>3.55</b>  | <b>MIP</b> |      | <b>3.59</b> | <b>MIP</b> |      |

*Legend:*

*WM = Weighted Mean QR = Qualitative Rating MIP= Most intensively Practiced FP= Frequently Practiced*

Table 3 examines the differences in the way school heads and teachers perceive how they Table 3 presented an analysis of School Heads' and Teachers' perceptions regarding communication practices in managing stakeholders for effective school operations. Both groups identified establishing a consistent communication schedule, such as weekly emails or monthly newsletters, as the most important practice, with a "Most Intensively Practiced" (MIP) rating, highlighting the critical role of regular communication in engaging and informing stakeholders. Additionally, creating opportunities for two-way communication, such as feedback sessions, and sharing timely, accurate information were highly valued by both groups, underscoring their significance in fostering engagement and transparency. However, notable differences emerged between the groups, with Teachers ranking the use of diverse communication platforms, such as social media and newsletters, second, reflecting a preference for multiple channels, while School Heads ranked this practice lower at 5.5. School Heads also placed greater emphasis on demonstrating that stakeholder input is valued, ranking it higher than Teachers, which indicated a stronger focus on proactive issue resolution. Both groups

acknowledged the importance of school websites and mobile apps, yet School Heads rated these as "Frequently Practiced" (FP), suggesting a less intensive use of digital tools. Lastly, while both groups recognized the importance of responding empathetically to stakeholders, this practice was ranked lowest by both, indicating it was applied consistently, though less intensively. These findings align with Saraih et al. (2022), who emphasize the importance of effective communication in engaging stakeholders, and Salamondra (2021), who highlights the value of transparency and feedback. However, the divergence in perceptions regarding digital platforms, with Teachers favoring social media over School Heads, reflects broader trends where some administrators continue to favor traditional non-digital channels or face barriers in fully utilizing digital tools (Saraih et al., 2022; Silva et al., 2020). Additionally, while School Heads prioritized valuing stakeholder input, aligning with leadership models focused on trust and active listening, the lower ranking of empathetic responses by both groups highlights a gap between leadership ideals and their consistent implementation (Waller et al., 2020).

Table 4. School Head and Teacher Respondents' Perception on the Engagement Practices of the School Head in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation

| Engagement  | School Heads |           |      | Teachers    |            |      |
|---|--------------|-----------|------|-------------|------------|------|
|   | WM           | QR        | Rank | WM          | QR         | Rank |
| 1. Actively involving stakeholders in decision-making processes, ensures diverse perspectives are considered.                           | 3.60         | MIP       | 1    | 3.77        | MIP        | 1    |
| 2. Encourage stakeholders to identify areas for improvement and innovation within the school.   | 3.43         | FP        | 2.5  | 3.50        | FP         | 6    |
| 3. Exemplify the desired behaviors and attitudes, setting a positive example for all stakeholders.                                      | 3.40         | FP        | 4.5  | 3.62        | MIP        | 2    |
| 4. Prioritize building strong relationships with all stakeholders by demonstrating a genuine commitment                                 | 3.43         | FP        | 2.5  | 3.53        | MIP        | 4    |
| 5. Facilitate collaborative problem-solving sessions that involve all relevant stakeholders.  | 3.27         | FP        | 7    | 3.43        | FP         | 8    |
| 6. Investing in professional development opportunities for teachers and staff ensuring they can effectively implement school initiative | 3.23         | FP        | 8    | 3.48        | FP         | 7    |
| 7. Acknowledge and celebrate the contributions of all stakeholders, both big and small.   | 3.40         | FP        | 4.5  | 3.51        | MIP        | 5    |
| 8. Regularly assess the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement practices and make adjustments as needed                                | 3.37         | FP        | 6    | 3.56        | MIP        | 3    |
| <b>Overall Weighed Mean</b>   | <b>3.39</b>  | <b>FP</b> |      | <b>3.55</b> | <b>MIP</b> |      |

Legend: WM = Weighted Mean QR = Qualitative Rating MIP= Most intensively Practiced  
FP= Frequently Practiced

Table 4 presented an analysis of the perceptions of School Heads and Teachers regarding the engagement practices employed by school leaders to manage stakeholders for effective school operations. Both groups ranked actively involving stakeholders in decision-making processes as the most important practice, with a "Most Intensively Practiced" (MIP) rating, underscoring their shared recognition of the value of inclusivity in decision-making. Additionally, both groups rated encouraging stakeholders to identify areas for improvement and exemplifying desired behaviors as important, though there were differences in their rankings. Teachers placed greater emphasis on exemplifying desired behaviors, ranking it second, while School Heads ranked it lower. Building strong relationships with stakeholders was also highly valued by both groups, with Teachers ranking it slightly higher than School

Heads, indicating a greater emphasis on relationship-building among Teachers. Collaborative problem-solving sessions were ranked lowest by both groups, suggesting that while collaboration is recognized as important, it is not as intensively prioritized. Similarly, while professional development opportunities for teachers and staff were acknowledged, Teachers rated it slightly higher than School Heads, reflecting a stronger perception of its importance for enhancing teaching efficacy. Acknowledging stakeholder contributions was viewed as important by both groups, though Teachers ranked it higher, suggesting a more positive view of celebrating contributions. Finally, regular assessment of engagement effectiveness was rated as a "Most Intensively Practiced" (MIP) practice by both groups, with Teachers placing greater importance on evaluating and adjusting engagement strategies.

Overall, the findings indicated that while both School Heads and Teachers shared common views on key engagement practices, Teachers generally placed higher value on practices re-

lated to relationship-building, professional development, and ongoing assessment, reflecting a more intense focus on fostering a collaborative and supportive school environment.

*Table 5. School Head and Teacher Respondents' Perception on the Relationship Building Practices of the School Head in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation*

| Relationship Building  | School Heads |            |      | Teachers    |            |      |
|--|--------------|------------|------|-------------|------------|------|
|  | WM           | QR         | Rank | WM          | QR         | Rank |
| 1. Recognize and acknowledge the contributions of stakeholders, fostering a sense of value and belonging.  | 3.70         | MIP        | 1    | 3.83        | MIP        | 1    |
| 2. Be visible and available to stakeholders, creating opportunities for open dialogue and interaction.   | 3.63         | MIP        | 3.5  | 3.71        | MIP        | 2    |
| 3. Organize regular meetings and forums for stakeholders to connect, share ideas, and build relationships.                                       | 3.63         | MIP        | 3.5  | 3.67        | MIP        | 5    |
| 4. Host events that bring the school community together, fostering a sense of belonging and shared purpose.                                      | 3.47         | FP         | 8    | 3.59        | MIP        | 8    |
| 5. Recognize and understand the diverse needs and perspectives of all stakeholders (students, parents, teachers, staff, and the wider community) | 3.67         | MIP        | 2    | 3.66        | MIP        | 6    |
| 6. Recognize and celebrate the accomplishments of students, staff, and the school community to build morale and motivation.                      | 3.53         | MIP        | 6.5  | 3.61        | MIP        | 7    |
| 7. Involve stakeholders in decision-making processes, ensuring diverse perspectives are considered.  | 3.53         | MIP        | 6.5  | 3.69        | MIP        | 3.5  |
| 8. Pay close attention to stakeholder concerns and perspectives, valuing their input.  | 3.60         | MIP        | 5    | 3.70        | MIP        | 3.5  |
| <b>Overall Weighed Mean</b>  | <b>3.60</b>  | <b>MIP</b> |      | <b>3.68</b> | <b>MIP</b> |      |

*Legend: WM = Weighted Mean QR = Qualitative Rating MIP= Most intensively Practiced FP= Frequently Practiced*

Table 5 examined the perceptions of School Heads and Teachers regarding the relationship-building practices employed by school leaders to manage stakeholders for effective school operations. Both groups ranked recognizing and acknowledging stakeholder contributions as the most important practice, with a "Most Intensively Practiced" (MIP) rating, reflecting the high value placed on fostering a sense of belonging within the school community. Being visible and accessible to stakeholders was ranked second by both groups, emphasizing the importance of open dialogue and

interaction in building trust. Organizing regular meetings and forums to connect stakeholders was also highly valued by both groups, although Teachers ranked it slightly higher, suggesting a greater emphasis on collaborative communication. Hosting community events, while acknowledged, was ranked lowest by both groups, indicating it was seen as less critical to relationship-building efforts. Recognizing and understanding the diverse needs of stakeholders was ranked second by School Heads, while Teachers placed it lower, though both groups considered it an essential practice.

Celebrating accomplishments and involving stakeholders in decision-making processes were similarly rated, but ranked lower compared to other practices, indicating that, while important, they were not as intensively emphasized. Overall, the findings indicated that both

School Heads and Teachers shared a strong commitment to relationship-building practices, prioritizing recognition, visibility, and engagement, with minor differences in how specific practices were valued.

*Table 6. School Head and Teacher Respondents' Perception on the Conflict Resolution Practices of the School Head in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation*

| Conflict Resolution  | School Heads |            |      | Teachers    |            |      |
|--|--------------|------------|------|-------------|------------|------|
|  | WM           | QR         | Rank | WM          | QR         | Rank |
| 1. Provide training in conflict resolution skills to empower individuals to address disputes constructively.                         | 3.53         | MIP        | 5    | 3.74        | MIP        | 1    |
| 2. Create a safe space for open dialogue and encourage constructive communication among stakeholders.                                | 3.43         | FP         | 6    | 3.53        | MIP        | 7    |
| 3. Encourage respect, inclusivity, and dialogue to reduce the likelihood of conflicts arising.                                       | 3.33         | FP         | 8    | 3.45        | FP         | 8    |
| 4. Setting clear guidelines for behavior and conflict management minimizes ambiguity and provides a framework for addressing issues. | 3.40         | FP         | 7    | 3.58        | MIP        | 6    |
| 5. Actively listen to all parties involved in a conflict, demonstrating empathy and understanding                                    | 3.67         | MIP        | 1    | 3.68        | MIP        | 2    |
| 6. Create a safe space for open dialogue and encourage constructive communication among stakeholders.                                | 3.60         | MIP        | 3    | 3.67        | MIP        | 3.5  |
| 7. Transparent in communication about the conflict, its potential impact, and the steps being taken to resolve it.                   | 3.60         | MIP        | 3    | 3.65        | MIP        | 5    |
| 8. Protect the privacy of those involved in conflicts, especially when sensitive issues are at stake.                                | 3.60         | MIP        | 3    | 3.67        | MIP        | 3.5  |
| <b>Overall Weighed Mean</b>  | <b>3.52</b>  | <b>MIP</b> |      | <b>3.62</b> | <b>MIP</b> |      |

*Legend:*

*WM = Weighted Mean QR = Qualitative Rating MIP= Most intensively Practiced FP= Frequently Practiced*

Table 6 outlined the perceptions of School Heads and Teachers regarding conflict resolution practices in managing stakeholders for effective school operations. Both groups placed high value on training in conflict resolution, with Teachers rating it higher (WM = 3.74) than School Heads (WM = 3.53), although both assigned it a "Most Intensively Practiced" (MIP) rating. Active listening was also highly rated by both groups, with School Heads (WM = 3.67) ranking it first and Teachers (WM = 3.68) ranking it second. Other practices, such as

creating a safe space for dialogue, transparent communication, and protecting privacy, received MIP ratings from both groups, though their rankings varied slightly. Encouraging respect and dialogue to prevent conflicts was ranked lowest by both, receiving a "Frequently Practiced" (FP) rating. Overall, both groups agreed on the importance of conflict resolution practices, with minor differences in their rankings reflecting different perceptions of emphasis.

Table 7. Summary of the School Head and Teacher Respondents' Perception on the Leadership Practices of the School Head in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation

| Leadership Practices in Engaging Stakeholders | School Heads |            |      | Teachers    |            |      |
|---|--------------|------------|------|-------------|------------|------|
|   | OWM          | QR         | Rank | OWM         | QR         | Rank |
| Communication                                 | 3.55         | MIP        | 2    | 3.59        | MIP        | 3    |
| Engagement                                    | 3.39         | FP         | 4    | 3.55        | MIP        | 4    |
| Relationship Building                         | 3.60         | MIP        | 1    | 3.68        | MIP        | 1    |
| Conflict Resolution                           | 3.52         | MIP        | 3    | 3.62        | MIP        | 2    |
| <b>Grand Mean</b>                             | <b>3.52</b>  | <b>MIP</b> |      | <b>3.61</b> | <b>MIP</b> |      |

Legend: OWM = Overall Weighted Mean QR = Qualitative Rating MIP= Most intensively Practiced FP= Frequently Practiced

Table 7 illustrates a high level of agreement between school leaders and teachers regarding the key leadership practices necessary for effective school operations, particularly in relationship building and communication. Both groups ranked relationship building as the most important leadership practice, emphasizing its fundamental role in influencing organizational performance. The literature supports this, as strong interpersonal relationships are often described as the "cultural glue" that connects stakeholders to the goals of the institution (Devanadera & Ching, 2023; Aidla & Vadi, 2008). Communication was also highly valued by both groups, highlighting its crucial role in engaging the school community and creating a professional framework for involving stakeholders in decision-making (Hussein, 2025; Saraih et al., 2022). Teachers placed slightly higher value on collaboration compared to school leaders (Grand Mean Teacher [OD] =

3.55, Grand Mean [Leader] = 3.39), underscoring their emphasis on stakeholder inclusion and fostering a sense of ownership in the school improvement process (Murugui & Mugwe, 2021; Roque, 2023). Both groups equally identified conflict resolution as important, illustrating its role in maintaining a professional environment and strengthening unity within schools (Annet, 2025; Aula et al., 2020). The slight difference in the Grand Mean of leadership practices teachers (3.61) versus school leaders (3.52) suggests that while both groups are committed to collaborative leadership, teachers perceive these practices as being applied more rigorously (Arombo, 2023; Waller et al., 2020). In summary, while there is strong agreement between school leaders and teachers on the importance of relationship building and conflict resolution, subtle differences exist in how each group prioritizes communication and engagement.

Table 8. Difference on the School Head-Respondents' Perception on the Communication Practices of the School Head in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation When Grouped According to Their Profile Variables

| Profile Variables                   | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Sig. | Interpretation                      |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Sex</b>                          | Between Groups      | 0.00           | 1  | 0.00        | 0.90 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 6.06           | 28 | 0.22        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 6.06           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Age</b>                          | Between Groups      | 0.81           | 2  | 0.41        | 0.14 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 5.25           | 27 | 0.19        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 6.06           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Highest Education Attainment</b> | Between Groups      | 0.96           | 2  | 0.48        | 0.10 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 5.11           | 27 | 0.19        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 6.06           | 29 |             |      |                                     |

| Profile Variables                        | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Sig. | Interpretation                      |
|--|---------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Length of Services as School Head</b> | Between Groups      | 0.06           | 2  | 0.03        | 0.87 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 6.00           | 27 | 0.22        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 6.06           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Designation</b>                       | Between Groups      | 0.53           | 6  | 0.09        | 0.89 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 5.53           | 23 | 0.24        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 6.06           | 29 |             |      |                                     |

Table 8 presents the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the differences in school heads' perceptions of communication practices based on profile variables such as sex, age, highest education attainment, length of service as a school head, and designation. The findings show that none of these variables had a statistically significant impact on perceptions of communication practices, as all p-values exceeded the 0.05 threshold. Specifically, sex (p = 0.90), age (p = 0.14), education level (p = 0.10), length of service (p = 0.87), and designation (p

= 0.89) were not found to significantly influence how school heads viewed communication practices in managing stakeholders. These results suggest that school heads' perceptions of communication are not significantly affected by their demographic or professional characteristics, indicating that communication practices may be uniformly valued and applied across these variables. This highlights the importance of communication in school leadership, irrespective of personal and professional differences.

*Table 9 Difference on the School Head-Respondents' Perception on the Engagement Practices of the School Head in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation When Grouped According to Their Profile Variables*

| Profile Variables                        | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Sig. | Interpretation                      |
|--|---------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Sex</b>                               | Between Groups      | 0.01           | 1  | 0.01        | 0.71 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 2.46           | 28 | 0.09        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 2.47           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Age</b>                               | Between Groups      | 0.21           | 2  | 0.10        | 0.31 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 2.27           | 27 | 0.08        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 2.47           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Highest Education Attainment</b>      | Between Groups      | 0.78           | 2  | 0.39        | 0.01 | Ho is rejected<br>Significant       |
|  | Within Groups       | 1.69           | 27 | 0.06        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 2.47           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Length of Services as School Head</b> | Between Groups      | 0.14           | 2  | 0.07        | 0.47 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 2.34           | 27 | 0.09        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 2.47           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Designation</b>                       | Between Groups      | 0.37           | 6  | 0.06        | 0.68 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 2.11           | 23 | 0.09        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 2.47           | 29 |             |      |                                     |

Table 9 presents the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the differences in school heads' perceptions of engagement practices in managing stakeholders for effective school operations, based on profile variables such as sex, age, highest education attainment, length of service as a school head, and

designation. The results show that most of the profile variables—sex (p = 0.71), age (p = 0.31), length of service (p = 0.47), and designation (p = 0.68)—did not have a statistically significant effect on perceptions of engagement practices, as all p-values were greater than 0.05. However, the variable of highest education

attainment showed a significant effect ( $p = 0.01$ ), indicating that school heads with different educational qualifications perceive engagement practices differently. These findings suggest that while demographic and professional

characteristics like sex, age, and designation do not significantly influence school heads' views on engagement practices, educational attainment plays a significant role in shaping their perceptions.

*Table 10. Difference on the School Head-Respondents' Perception on the Relationship Building Practices of the School Head in Managing Resources for Effective School Operation When Grouped According to Their Profile Variables*

| Profile Variables                        | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Sig. | Interpretation                      |
|--|---------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Sex</b>                               | Between Groups      | 0.01           | 1  | 0.01        | 0.81 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 3.29           | 28 | 0.12        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 3.29           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Age</b>                               | Between Groups      | 0.25           | 2  | 0.12        | 0.35 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 3.05           | 27 | 0.11        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 3.29           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Highest Education Attainment</b>      | Between Groups      | 1.44           | 2  | 0.72        | 0.00 | Ho is rejected<br>Significant       |
|  | Within Groups       | 1.85           | 27 | 0.07        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 3.29           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Length of Services as School Head</b> | Between Groups      | 0.18           | 2  | 0.09        | 0.47 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 3.12           | 27 | 0.12        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 3.29           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Designation</b>                       | Between Groups      | 0.79           | 6  | 0.13        | 0.34 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 2.50           | 23 | 0.11        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 3.29           | 29 |             |      |                                     |

Table 10 presents the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the differences in school heads' perceptions of relationship-building practices in managing resources for effective school operations, based on profile variables such as sex, age, highest education attainment, length of service as a school head, and designation. The results show that sex ( $p = 0.81$ ), age ( $p = 0.35$ ), length of service ( $p = 0.47$ ), and designation ( $p = 0.34$ ) did not have a statistically significant effect on perceptions of relationship-building practices, as all p-values

were greater than 0.05. However, the variable of highest education attainment showed a significant effect ( $p = 0.00$ ), indicating that school heads with different educational backgrounds perceive relationship-building practices differently. These findings suggest that while sex, age, length of service, and designation do not significantly influence school heads' views on relationship-building practices, educational attainment plays a key role in shaping these perceptions.

*Table 11. Difference on the School Head-Respondents' Perception on the Conflict Resolution Practices of the School Head in Managing Resources for Effective School Operation When Grouped According to Their Profile Variables*

| Profile Variables | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Sig. | Interpretation                      |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| Sex               | Between Groups      | 0.00           | 1  | 0.00        | 1.00 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|                   | Within Groups       | 1.82           | 28 | 0.07        |      |                                     |
|                   | Total               | 1.82           | 29 |             |      |                                     |

| Profile Variables                                    | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | Sig. | Interpretation                      |
|--|---------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Age</b>   | Between Groups      | 0.27           | 2  | 0.14        | 0.11 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 1.55           | 27 | 0.06        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 1.82           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Highest Education Attainment</b>                  | Between Groups      | 0.49           | 2  | 0.25        | 0.02 | Ho is rejected<br>Significant       |
|  | Within Groups       | 1.33           | 27 | 0.05        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 1.82           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Length of Services as School Head Designation</b> | Between Groups      | 0.03           | 2  | 0.02        | 0.80 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 1.79           | 27 | 0.07        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 1.82           | 29 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Designation</b>                                   | Between Groups      | 0.16           | 6  | 0.03        | 0.90 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|  | Within Groups       | 1.67           | 23 | 0.07        |      |                                     |
|  | Total               | 1.82           | 29 |             |      |                                     |

Table 11 presents the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the differences in school heads' perceptions of conflict resolution practices in managing resources for effective school operations, based on profile variables such as sex, age, highest education attainment, length of service as a school head, and designation. The results show that sex ( $p = 1.00$ ), age ( $p = 0.11$ ), length of service ( $p = 0.80$ ), and designation ( $p = 0.90$ ) did not have a statistically significant effect on perceptions of conflict resolution practices, as all p-values

were greater than 0.05. However, the variable of highest education attainment showed a significant effect ( $p = 0.02$ ), indicating that school heads with different educational backgrounds perceive conflict resolution practices differently. These findings suggest that while sex, age, length of service, and designation do not significantly influence school heads' views on conflict resolution practices, educational attainment plays a significant role in shaping their perceptions.

Table 12. Difference on the Teacher-Respondents' Perception on the Communication Practices of the School Head in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation When Grouped According to Their Profile Variables

| Profile Variables                   | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | Sig. | Interpretation                      |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Sex</b>                          | Between Groups      | 0.00           | 1   | 0.00        | 0.95 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 74.84          | 533 | 0.14        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 74.84          | 534 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Age</b>                          | Between Groups      | 0.21           | 3   | 0.07        | 0.69 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 74.64          | 531 | 0.14        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 74.84          | 534 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Highest Education Attainment</b> | Between Groups      | 0.31           | 4   | 0.08        | 0.70 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 74.53          | 530 | 0.14        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 74.84          | 534 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Length of Services</b>           | Between Groups      | 1.72           | 7   | 0.25        | 0.09 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 73.12          | 527 | 0.14        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 74.84          | 534 |             |      |                                     |

Table 12 presents the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the differences

in teacher respondents' perceptions of communication practices by school heads in managing

stakeholders for effective school operations, based on profile variables such as sex, age, highest education attainment, and length of service. The results show that none of the profile variables had a statistically significant effect on teachers' perceptions of communication practices. Specifically, sex ( $p = 0.95$ ), age ( $p = 0.69$ ), highest education attainment ( $p = 0.70$ ),

and length of service ( $p = 0.09$ ) all had  $p$ -values greater than 0.05, indicating no significant differences. These findings suggest that teachers' perceptions of communication practices are not influenced by their demographic characteristics or length of service, highlighting that communication practices may be similarly valued by teachers regardless of these factors.

*Table 13 Difference on the Teachers-Respondents' Perception on the Engagement Practices of the School Head in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation When Grouped According to Their Profile Variables*

| Profile Variables                   | Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | Sig. | Interpretation                      |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Sex</b>                          | Between Groups      | 0.37           | 1   | 0.37        | 0.03 | Ho is rejected<br>Significant       |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 42.57          | 533 | 0.08        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 42.94          | 534 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Age</b>                          | Between Groups      | 1.44           | 3   | 0.48        | 0.00 | Ho is rejected<br>Significant       |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 41.49          | 531 | 0.08        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 42.94          | 534 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Highest Education Attainment</b> | Between Groups      | 0.17           | 4   | 0.04        | 0.72 | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 42.77          | 530 | 0.08        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 42.94          | 534 |             |      |                                     |
| <b>Length of Services</b>           | Between Groups      | 2.43           | 7   | 0.35        | 0.00 | Ho is rejected<br>Significant       |
|                                     | Within Groups       | 40.51          | 527 | 0.08        |      |                                     |
|                                     | Total               | 42.94          | 534 |             |      |                                     |

Table 13 presents the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the differences in teacher respondents' perceptions of engagement practices by school heads in managing stakeholders for effective school operations, based on profile variables such as sex, age, highest education attainment, and length of service. The results show that significant differences were found based on sex ( $p = 0.03$ ), age ( $p = 0.00$ ), and length of service ( $p = 0.00$ ), with all  $p$ -values less than 0.05, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) for these variables. This suggests that teachers' perceptions of

engagement practices vary based on their sex, age, and length of service. In contrast, the variable of highest education attainment did not show a significant effect ( $p = 0.72$ ), meaning that teachers' perceptions of engagement practices were not influenced by their educational background. These findings indicate that demographic factors such as sex, age, and experience play a role in shaping how teachers perceive engagement practices, while educational attainment does not appear to be a significant factor.

*Table 14. Differences on the Perception of School Head and Teacher Respondents on the Challenges in Managing Stakeholders for Effective School Operation*

| t-computed | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Interpretation                      |
|------------|----|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| -1.07      | 22 | 0.30            | Do not reject Ho<br>Not Significant |

Table 14 presents the results of a t-test examining the differences in perceptions of school heads and teacher respondents

regarding the challenges in managing stakeholders for effective school operations. The t-computed value is -1.07 with a  $p$ -value of 0.30.

Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis (Ho) is not rejected, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of school heads and teachers regarding the challenges they face in managing stakeholders. This suggests that both groups experience similar challenges in this area, despite any potential differences in their roles.

### ***Program Intervention: Enhancing Leadership Practices for Effective Stakeholder Management in Zambales Elementary Schools***

The primary objective of the proposed intervention plan is to enhance leadership practices related to stakeholder management to improve the operational effectiveness of schools in Zambales. The intervention aims to increase communication, involvement, relationship-building, and conflict resolution between school heads and teachers. To achieve this, the plan will implement a series of training workshops designed to improve communication skills among school leaders and teachers. These workshops will focus on developing multiple forms of communication, establishing two-way channels that promote more inclusive and transparent interactions with stakeholders.

Another key focus of the intervention is to encourage greater teacher involvement in decision-making processes within schools. This will be achieved by increasing opportunities for teachers to participate in collaborative problem-solving and decision-making. A third emphasis will be placed on recognizing stakeholders and fostering stronger relationships through community-building initiatives, including organizing community events to enhance visibility and engagement between school leaders, teachers, and community members.

Additionally, the intervention will improve conflict resolution practices by conducting training sessions on active listening, empathy, and creating safe spaces for open dialogue. The anticipated outcomes of these strategies include enhanced communication between school heads and stakeholders, greater teacher participation in school decision-making, stronger ties between school leaders and their

communities, and improved conflict resolution practices within schools.

The implementation of the intervention will be monitored through ongoing review meetings and the collection of stakeholder survey results. These evaluations will ensure continuous improvements in creating a more collaborative and productive school environment, leading to better school operations and, ultimately, improved student performance outcomes. The budget for this program will include costs for training workshops, community events, and materials, with a focus on maximizing engagement across all school stakeholders.

### **Conclusion**

The results of the research indicate that both school administrators and educators share similar views on the critical role of clear and effective communication, engaging all parties, building collaborative partnerships, and resolving conflicts to ensure successful school operations. Both groups placed significant importance on relationship-building efforts, emphasizing the need to recognize and acknowledge the contributions of students and staff, which enhances their sense of belonging within the school community. Effective communication was also a shared priority, with both groups recognizing the ongoing need for regular updates and the development of two-way communication methods to engage stakeholders effectively. The research highlighted the mutual agreement between administrators and teachers on the necessity of resolving conflicts constructively through active listening, openness, honesty, and compassion. However, some differences emerged in how engagement was viewed. While both groups agreed on the importance of involving teachers in collaborative decision-making, teachers placed more emphasis on creating ongoing methods for involving them in the decision-making process, whereas administrators focused more on proactively building relationships and addressing conflicts before they escalate. Teachers were particularly focused on being actively involved in shaping policies and rules governing student behavior, while administrators viewed proactive relationship-building and conflict resolu-

tion as essential elements. Additionally, the research revealed that demographic characteristics such as age, gender, and length of service affected teachers' perspectives on engagement and conflict resolution, while for administrators, educational attainment was identified as a key factor influencing their views on these issues.

Based on these findings, the research served as the foundation for developing the intervention plan titled *Enhancing Leadership Practices for Effective Stakeholder Management in Zambales Elementary Schools*. The primary goal of this plan is to address the identified differences and strengthen leadership practices in managing school stakeholders. The intervention will focus on improving communication by providing training for school leaders and educators on utilizing various communication platforms and ensuring regular, transparent updates to stakeholders. Engagement practices will be enhanced by increasing opportunities for teachers to participate in collaborative decision-making processes, particularly regarding policies and procedures that impact student achievement, and by facilitating collaborative problem-solving. Relationship-building strategies will include creating opportunities for school leaders to engage more visibly with the community and gain a deeper understanding of stakeholders' needs, while also providing training on conflict resolution techniques such as active listening and compassion. The expected outcomes of these strategies include enhanced communication between school leaders and stakeholders, greater teacher participation in decision-making, stronger relationships within the school community, and improved conflict resolution practices. The implementation of these strategies will be continuously monitored and evaluated through regular feedback surveys, ensuring ongoing improvements and fostering a collaborative, supportive, and productive school environment. The ultimate goal of this intervention plan is to improve school operations, strengthen relationships with stakeholders, and enhance student achievement, leading to significant gains in school performance.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to everyone who made this research possible, particularly to all the principals and teachers in the elementary schools of Zambales. Without their active participation and invaluable insights, conducting this study would not have been possible. I am also deeply thankful to my academic mentors, peers, and friends for their unwavering support, encouragement, and guidance throughout this research journey. Their constructive feedback and thoughtful suggestions have significantly contributed to the enhancement of this study. I would like to extend my appreciation to the organizations and institutions that provided the necessary resources and assistance to complete this research. A special thanks goes to the Schools Division Superintendent of Zambales and all those who helped me obtain the necessary permissions for this study. I am profoundly grateful to my family for their constant love and support, which has been a source of strength throughout my academic journey. Lastly, I dedicate this study to all those who believe in the transformative power of education to create positive change in communities and improve the lives of individuals within them.

## References

- Acosta, J. E., & de Guzman, M. D. (2025). Challenges in cooperative learning approach in secondary social studies instruction, Zone 1, Department of Education, Division of Zambales, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(3), 1001-1009. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.03.02>
- Aidla, A., & Vadi, M. (2008). Relations between attitudes of school administrations towards school performance criteria and the national examination results in Estonian schools. *Trames Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 12(1), 73-94. <https://doi.org/10.3176/tr.2008.1.05>
- Anastacio, K. V. (2025). Preparedness, challenges, and coping mechanisms of teachers and school heads in the implementation of face-to-face classes in Zone 2, Schools Division of Zambales, Philippines.

- International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research, 6(3), 1022. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijma-ber.06.03.04>
- Annet, K. A. (2025). Conflict resolution strategies for school leaders. *RESEARCH INVENTION JOURNAL OF CURRENT ISSUES IN ARTS AND MANAGEMENT*, 4(2), 5. <https://doi.org/10.59298/rijciam/2025/42511>
- Arombo, C. M. L. (2023). Master teachers-school heads designate's instructional competencies, instructional leadership practices, and challenges.
- Aula, N., Ikhwan, A., & Nuraini, N. (2020). The leadership role of the principal as supervisor in conflict management at Muhammadiyah 2 Madiun High School, East Java, Indonesia. *AL-HAYAT Journal of Islamic Education*, 4(1), 90. <https://doi.org/10.35723/ajie.v4i1.112>
- Antigo, C. L., & de Guzman, M. F. D. (2024). Resumption of in-person classes in public secondary schools Division of Zambales: Priorities and challenges for shared responsibility. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(12), 5175-5198. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijma-ber.05.12.20>
- Battad, J. L. (2024). Instructional leadership skills of school heads and its relation to the self-efficacy of elementary teachers in Castillejos District. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(8), 3071. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijma-ber.05.08.12>
- De Guzman, M. F. D., & Blanco, M. J. D. (2024). Achieving productivity in the new normal: Teachers' work productivity in public secondary schools Division of Zambales. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(12), 5199-5217. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijma-ber.05.12.21>
- Devanadera, C., & Ching, D. A. (2023). School head's managerial roles as correlates of organizational performance. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 4(3), 110. <https://doi.org/10.53378/353015>
- Eustaquio, R. P., & Espiritu, R. D. (2025). Elementary teachers' academic preparation and performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(11), 5448-5459. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijma-ber.06.11.06>
- Guerrero, J., & Espiritu, R. D. (2025). Benefits and drawbacks of smartphone use on English academic performance of Grade 3 learners. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(11), 5658-5670. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijma-ber.06.11.25>
- Hussein, A. (2025). Voices from the frontline: School leaders on effective communication. *EDULEARN Proceedings*, 1, 3239. <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2025.0857>
- Mincu, M. (2022). Why is school leadership key to transforming education? Structural and cultural assumptions for quality education in diverse contexts. *Prospects*, 52, 231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-022-09625-6>
- Murugi, R. M., & Mugwe, M. (2023). Stakeholders' involvement and school leadership for effective implementation of strategic planning. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 277. <https://doi.org/10.59765/fa59zan3>
- Quintino, B. B., & Espiritu, R. D. (2025). Assessing the role of screen time and digital literacy in student learning at Learning Circle Inc., Olongapo City. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(11), 5574-5584. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijma-ber.06.11.18>
- Reyes, J. T., & De Guzman, M. D. (2021). The role of communication in transforming education systems: Lessons from the Philippines. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(3), 215-230.

- Roque, J. (2023). Revisiting the level of school-based management in public elementary schools of Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines. *Journal for Educators Teachers and Trainers*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2023.14.01.012>
- Saga, J. G. (2025). A structural model on school management effectiveness. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 3303. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.90300259>
- Salamondra, T. (2021). Effective communication in schools. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education*, 13(1), 22. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1303981.pdf>
- Saraih, E. F., Wong, S. L., Asimiran, S., & Khambari, M. N. Md. (2022). Contemporary communication conduit among exemplar school principals in Malaysian schools. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-022-00179-x>
- Silva, P., Dodel, M., & Pepe, A. I. (2020). Entre el cuaderno de comunicados y el smartphone: Los desafíos para la gestión en centros educativos uruguayos en el contexto de comunicación digital. *Dixit*, 32, 61. <https://doi.org/10.22235/d.vi32.2118>
- Waller, S. K., Waller, L., Mpofu, V., & Kurebwa, M. (2020). Education at the intersection of globalization and technology. In *IntechOpen eBooks*. IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.87331>
- Zhang, S., Li, Y., & Li, M. (2025). Instructional leadership and teacher self-efficacy: How leadership influences teacher motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 115(3), 534-550. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000203>