

STAKEHOLDERS' INVOLVEMENT WITH SCHOOL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

Flordeliz F. Fuentes
STI West Negros University
Olympia Island Integrated School
flordeliz.fuentes@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study examined the level of stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects among selected education stakeholders in a small-sized public school division in the Central Philippines during the School Year 2024–2025. A descriptive research design was employed, involving 82 education stakeholders who were selected as respondents. Data were collected using a validated 32-item survey questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequency count, percentage, mean, and inferential statistics to determine differences across demographic groups. Results showed that most respondents were senior female stakeholders with higher financial backgrounds. Overall, stakeholders demonstrated a high level of involvement in all areas, including planning and decision-making, information dissemination, monitoring and evaluation, and partnership and collaboration. When grouped by age, sex, and Family Income, involvement across all areas remained consistently high. However, significant differences were observed in certain areas: age influenced involvement in planning and decision-making as well as monitoring and evaluation; sex showed a significant difference in involvement across all areas; and Family Income was associated with differences in monitoring and evaluation. Based on the findings, it is recommended that partnership plans be retooled and stakeholders' specific roles and functions revisited to strengthen their participation in decision-making processes and improve communication lines. This contextualized approach aims to enhance overall stakeholder engagement in school programs and projects.

Keywords: *Stakeholder involvement, school programs, school projects, partnership, education engagement*

Bio-profile

Flordeliz F. Fuentes earned her Bachelor of Science in Computer Education from Negros Oriental State University-Dumaguete City Main Campus and her Master of Arts in Education, major in Administration and Supervision, from STI-West Negros University, Bacolod City. A dedicated educational leader currently serving as the School Principal at Olympia Island Integrated School. Throughout her tenure, Ms. Fuentes has remained committed to fostering a structured environment for growth and professional development, leveraging her background in educational leadership to guide her faculty and students toward success.



Introduction

Rationale

The development of quality education in any school cannot be achieved in isolation; rather, it is a collaborative process that requires the active involvement of various stakeholders who work together toward common educational goals for the benefit of learners and society (Livala et al., 2023). This perspective aligns closely with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), which promotes inclusive, equitable, and participatory learning environments. Achieving quality education requires not only effective teaching and learning processes but also the collective efforts of stakeholders who contribute to learners' holistic development. In this context, the role of stakeholders in the educational system becomes indispensable. A stakeholder is defined as any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization's objectives (Kivits & Sawang, 2021), emphasizing their shared responsibility in ensuring educational success.

In the Philippine educational setting, the Department of Education (DepEd) emphasizes empowering stakeholders within school communities. Through active participation in school-based management, stakeholders are encouraged to contribute to planning, decision-making, and implementation of school programs, thereby strengthening the school system's capacity to align with the objectives of global initiatives such as Education for All (Amaba, 2024). Moreover, stakeholders serve as vital sources of resources, information, and opportunities, as well as providers of support, care, and guidance necessary for achieving educational goals. Their involvement in school programs, projects, and activities plays a crucial role in ensuring that intended learning outcomes are effectively realized (Valencia, 2024).

Despite these initiatives, local observations reveal that while schools strive to engage stakeholders, participation in some school-initiated activities remains limited. In particular, low levels of involvement are evident in volunteering for school activities, engaging in community-based initiatives, and supporting programs such as school maintenance week. Contributions in terms of materials, financial assistance, and labor are sometimes insufficient, and responsiveness to urgent school needs—such as assisting during school events, visits, and evaluations—varies. These challenges reflect gaps in stakeholder engagement that may hinder the effective implementation of school programs and the attainment of quality education as envisioned in United Nations SDG 4.

Given this situation, the researcher, who has direct experience in the educational system as a school head, seeks to determine the level of stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects. This study also aims to deepen the understanding of stakeholder participation within the current educational context. The researcher strongly believes that a solid partnership between schools and stakeholders is a key factor in the success and sustainability of school initiatives. Strengthening this partnership can enhance communication, clarify stakeholder roles, and promote active participation in decision-making processes.

Ultimately, this study aims to contribute to improving school-community relationships by fostering a more inclusive and participatory approach to education. By reinforcing stakeholder engagement, schools can create more responsive and supportive learning environments that benefit both learners and the wider community. In doing so, the study supports national education priorities and contributes to the realization of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4, which envisions quality, inclusive, and equitable education for all.



Literature Review

Stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects is widely recognized as a critical factor in improving educational quality and institutional effectiveness. This aligns with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), which emphasizes inclusive, participatory, and collaborative educational systems. As emphasized by Shanko (2020), stakeholders contribute significantly to school improvement through their involvement in planning, evaluation, and implementation, underscoring their essential role in strengthening educational programs.

A stakeholder is defined as any group or individual who can affect or be affected by an organization's achievement of its objectives (Kivits & Sawang, 2021). This definition underscores the interconnected roles of individuals and groups within the educational system. Stakeholder engagement involves collaboration, resource sharing, and collective goal attainment, encompassing both internal and external actors such as school personnel, parents, learners, community members, and partner institutions (Bolling, 2024). As schools cultivate productive relationships with stakeholders, they gain valuable insights, feedback, and support that contribute to the development of a responsive and effective learning environment.

One key dimension of stakeholder involvement is planning and decision-making in school programs and projects. Engaging stakeholders in decision-making processes is essential for managing change and ensuring that educational initiatives are relevant, inclusive, and sustainable. Kumar (2024) emphasized that stakeholder participation in educational decision-making is necessary for creating responsive and equitable learning environments. Similarly, Murugi and Mugwe (2023) highlighted the importance of stakeholders' understanding of strategic plans to ensure alignment of decisions with institutional goals. However, failure to involve stakeholders in strategic planning may negatively affect implementation and reduce program acceptability (Kujala et al., 2022).

Another important area is information dissemination, which ensures that stakeholders are well-informed and actively engaged in school programs and projects. Effective communication fosters transparency, cooperation, and shared responsibility among stakeholders. Smith and Goodwin (2014) noted that involving stakeholders in planning enhances implementation, while Ice et al. (2015) emphasized that collaborative efforts improve school climate and student engagement. Open communication also strengthens trust and promotes active participation, both of which are essential to achieving successful educational outcomes (Alomes, 2020; Nacino, 2022).

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is another critical component of stakeholder involvement. Engaging stakeholders in M&E processes enhances accountability, transparency, and decision-making. According to Zaman et al. (2023), stakeholder participation throughout the project lifecycle ensures that diverse perspectives are considered, leading to improved program design and outcomes. Similarly, Zaucha and Kreiner (2021) highlighted that stakeholder engagement contributes to sustainability and effectiveness. However, Patton (2018) cautioned that both over-involvement and under-involvement of stakeholders may affect the objectivity of evaluation processes, emphasizing the need for balanced participation.

Furthermore, collaboration and partnership among stakeholders are essential in strengthening school leadership and institutional effectiveness. While collaboration enhances innovation and shared decision-making, it also presents challenges such as managing diverse perspectives and fostering trust (Olalowo, 2021). Nevertheless, strong partnerships among stakeholders—including educators, families, and community members—lead to improved educational outcomes and better alignment between school programs and societal needs (Maqhubela, 2025). In the Philippine context, stakeholder involvement remains a fundamental component of effective school operations, as schools



rely on the collective contributions of internal and external stakeholders to achieve their goals (De Vera, 2022).

Empirical studies further support the importance of stakeholder involvement in education. Kipkemoi et al. (2023) found that stakeholder engagement significantly influences academic performance, particularly in resource management, discipline, and curriculum implementation. Similarly, Gichohi (2015) reported that inclusive stakeholder participation positively contributes to academic achievement. Kanana (2015) also found that teacher, parent, and student involvement enhances motivation, discipline, and overall academic outcomes.

However, some studies highlight challenges and inconsistencies in stakeholder engagement. Ileri (2017) found that stakeholder participation in strategic planning is often partial, while Shanko (2020) identified barriers such as limited resources, inadequate funding, and lack of incentives. Yadav (2023) also observed limited stakeholder involvement in monitoring and evaluation, suggesting the need for capacity-building initiatives and structured engagement mechanisms.

In the Philippine setting, the findings are mixed. Guzman (2022) found that stakeholders are highly involved in school improvement processes, yet this involvement does not always translate into improved school performance. Similarly, De Vera (2022) reported high stakeholder engagement but found no significant relationship with the level of school-based management implementation. These findings suggest that stakeholder involvement alone may not guarantee improved outcomes without effective implementation strategies.

Conversely, other local studies demonstrate positive relationships between stakeholder engagement and school outcomes. Millano and Callo (2024) found that stakeholder involvement significantly contributes to the sustainability of school programs and projects. Amaba (2024) also reported a strong positive relationship between stakeholder participation and school performance. Cabardo (2016) highlighted that the level of school-based management implementation influences stakeholder participation, while Paraiso (2022) emphasized that increased community involvement leads to improved student motivation, attendance, and academic performance.

Overall, the literature underscores the importance of stakeholder involvement in enhancing the success and sustainability of school programs and projects. Key areas such as planning and decision-making, information dissemination, monitoring and evaluation, and collaboration play vital roles in achieving effective educational outcomes. However, variations in findings indicate that the impact of stakeholder engagement depends on contextual factors such as leadership, resource availability, and implementation practices. These insights provide a strong foundation for the present study and guide the development of strategies to strengthen stakeholder participation and improve school-community partnerships.

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is anchored on Freeman's Stakeholder Theory (2010), which asserts that organizations operate within a broad network of individuals and groups who influence, or are influenced by, the achievement of organizational goals. Freeman (2010) defines stakeholders as "any individual or group of people who have an interest in a particular issue and whose interests are believed to affect or be affected by the achievement of the organization." In the school context, this perspective underscores the roles of both internal stakeholders—such as school heads, teachers, and staff who hold legal and contractual responsibilities—and external stakeholders—such as parents, community members, partner agencies, and local government units—who indirectly influence school operations. Consistent with the view of Kivits and Sawang (2021) and Bolling (2024), stakeholder



engagement in education is built on collaboration, shared influence, and reciprocal communication. The theory also emphasizes transparency, access to information, and opportunities for meaningful participation, aligning with Murugi and Mugwe's (2023) assertion that stakeholder understanding of school plans enhances effective implementation.

In the Philippine basic education landscape, these theoretical principles are reflected in participatory governance mechanisms, such as the School Improvement Plan (SIP), in which both internal and external stakeholders serve on the School Planning Team (SPT). Their involvement in identifying needs, setting goals, allocating resources, and evaluating school programs echoes the findings of Shanko (2020) and Guzman (2022), who emphasized that stakeholder collaboration strengthens program implementation and improves school performance. Effective stakeholder engagement also enhances initiatives such as Brigada Eskwela, the School-Based Feeding Program, and School Gardening, which require coordinated efforts across community groups to succeed. As Kujala et al. (2022) argued, excluding stakeholders from planning processes often leads to poor implementation outcomes, reinforcing the importance of their participation.

Guided by Stakeholder Theory, this study conceptualizes stakeholder involvement as a multidimensional process encompassing planning and decision-making, information dissemination, monitoring and evaluation, and partnership and collaboration. Planning and decision-making refer to stakeholders' participation in identifying priorities, resolving issues, and crafting strategic directions, consistent with Jadhav (2020) and Kumar (2024), who highlight the importance of collaborative decision-making in education. Information dissemination involves the active sharing of relevant, timely, and accurate information to support program success, aligning with Ice et al. (2015), Smith and Goodwin (2014), and Alomes (2020), who emphasized communication as a foundation for effective partnerships. Monitoring and evaluation, defined by Llego (2020) as mechanisms for tracking performance and outcomes, reflect stakeholders' roles in assessing progress, identifying gaps, and providing feedback—an idea reinforced by Zaman et al. (2023) and Zaucha and Kreiner (2021), who highlight the value of stakeholder participation in evaluation processes. Finally, partnership and collaboration refer to sustained cooperation among diverse stakeholders, where trust, shared goals, and open communication enable schools to address challenges and improve outcomes, as supported by Cabriga and Ching (2024) and Maqhubela (2025).

Within this framework, the level of stakeholder involvement is shaped not only by their roles and capacities but also by demographic factors such as age, sex, educational attainment, and average monthly family income, which may influence participation patterns. Stakeholder involvement was measured on a five-point scale ranging from very low to very high to assess their engagement in school programs and projects. By integrating Freeman's Stakeholder Theory (2010) with empirical insights from both foreign and local literature, this framework provides a coherent foundation for examining how stakeholders contribute to school governance and how their involvement can support the development of an enhanced partnership plan for the school year 2025–2026.

Objectives

The study aimed to determine the level of stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects in a public school in a small-sized school division in the Central Philippines during the School Year 2025–2026, as a basis for an enhanced partnership plan. Specifically, this study sought to determine: 1) the level of stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects in terms of planning and decision-making, information dissemination, monitoring and evaluation, and partnership and collaboration; 2) the level of stakeholders' involvement when grouped according to



the aforementioned variables; and 3) whether there is a significant difference in the level of stakeholders' involvement when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Methodology

This chapter discusses the research design, the study locale, respondents, the data-gathering instrument, validity and reliability, the data-gathering procedure, analytical schemes, and statistical tools.

Research Design

This study used a descriptive research design to determine the level of stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects among 41 internal and 41 external stakeholders. Descriptive research is a methodology that focuses on systematically collecting and analyzing numerical data to present an accurate depiction of existing conditions (Creswell, 2018). It enables the researcher to describe the situation or condition of a phenomenon as it exists at the time of the study without seeking to establish causal relationships. Data are typically gathered through structured instruments such as questionnaires, interviews, and observations. This research design is appropriate for the study as it allows for a clear, systematic, and comprehensive understanding of stakeholders' engagement with school programs and projects.

Locale of the Study

This research undertaking was conducted at Olympia Island Integrated School in Bais City, Negros Oriental, Philippines. Bais City is a third-class city in the second district of Negros Oriental. Situated within the serene embrace of the ocean, island communities offer a unique setting that extends to their educational institutions. The school, surrounded by scenic vistas and shaped by its natural environment, provides a distinctive learning environment.

The integrated school is located approximately five (5) kilometers from the division office. Travel from the city involves a 20-minute tricycle ride to the Canibol wharf, followed by a 15-minute boat ride. Pump boats serve as the main mode of transportation; however, travel is influenced by weather and tides, with low tide sometimes requiring walking, depending on where the boat can dock.

Olympia Elementary School, founded in 1925, offers Kindergarten through Grade 6. Bais City Olympia National High School, formerly an annex of Bais City National High School, opened in 2009 and was formally established as a separate school on December 9, 2014. Both schools are located on a small island in Barangay Olympia, and in 2023, the initiatives of former school leaders were merged into the current integrated school. The school occupies a 500-square-meter lot in a mountainous area and accommodates 8 elementary teachers, 8 junior high school teachers, and 3 senior high school teachers. The Senior High School offers the Academic Track with two strands: the General Academic Strand (GAS), which prepares students for university life, and Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS), which develops skills in liberal arts, critical thinking, and communication. Currently, the integrated school is led by a single school head, who is also the researcher. The dedicated team of educators and staff fosters a love of learning while instilling values of respect, integrity, and responsibility. Through a comprehensive curriculum that integrates academics, arts, sports, and extracurricular activities, Olympia Island Integrated School aims to prepare students for success in future endeavors. With a strong sense of community and commitment to excellence, the school continues to be a leading educational institution in the region, shaping the leaders of tomorrow.



Respondents of the Study

The study involved 82 stakeholders, consisting of 41 internal and 41 external participants. Internal stakeholders included 19 teaching personnel, 2 non-teaching personnel, and 20 parents, while external stakeholders comprised 10 barangay officials, 30 alumni, and 11 private individuals. Purposive sampling, a form of non-probability sampling in which participants are selected based on specific criteria, was employed to ensure that all respondents possessed relevant experience or involvement with school programs and projects (Ames et al., 2019). Table 1 presents the detailed distribution of respondents.

Data Gathering Instrument

A researcher-made questionnaire was used to determine stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects. The instrument consisted of two parts: Part I collected respondents' personal profiles, including age, sex, highest educational attainment, and average monthly family income, while Part II measured the level of stakeholders' involvement across four domains: planning and decision-making, information dissemination, monitoring and evaluation, and partnership and collaboration. Each domain contained eight items, for a total of 32 items. Respondents rated all items using a five-point Likert scale, with scores ranging from 5 – Always, 4 – Often, 3 – Sometimes, 2 – Rarely, and 1 – Almost Never.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

The research instrument was subjected to tests of validity and reliability. Validity, defined as the degree to which a test measures what it is intended to measure (Choudhary, 2020), was established through face and content validation by a panel of three experts. The first validator is a School Principal I and a Doctor of Philosophy graduate with decades of experience. The second validator is a School Principal II and a Doctor of Philosophy graduate with experience in research and validation of educational instruments. The third validator is a School Principal III, Doctor of Education graduate, and part-time professor. The researcher incorporated the suggestions, comments, and recommendations of the validators into the final version of the questionnaire. The evaluation criteria set by Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates were used, with interpretations as follows: Excellent (4.04–5.00), Very Good (3.28–4.03), Good (2.52–3.27), Poor (1.76–2.51), and Very Poor (1.00–1.75). The average rating of the three validators was 5.00, interpreted as excellent, indicating that the instrument is valid.

Reliability, which assessed the stability and internal consistency of a measure (Choudhary, 2020), was determined through a dry run with 30 stakeholders from Okiot Elementary School, a nearby public elementary school not included in the main study. The gathered data were analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha, with a computed alpha of 0.982, interpreted as excellent according to Taber (2017). This result indicates that the research instrument is highly reliable for measuring stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects.

Data Gathering Procedure

To gather the necessary data for the study, the researcher followed a systematic procedure. First, a letter requesting permission to conduct the study was submitted to the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent. Upon receiving approval, letters, together with the superintendent's



approved authorization, were sent to the school heads of all component schools. Following this, the school heads manually distributed the research instrument to teaching personnel, non-teaching personnel, parents, and alumni, with the researcher's contact information provided for inquiries or clarifications.

Research Ethics Protocol

The researcher ensured that all respondents' participation was voluntary, with informed consent obtained prior to data collection. Respondents were informed of the academic purpose of the study and were allowed to withdraw at any time without consequences. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained, with the researcher having sole access to all data.

To safeguard personal and sensitive information, the researcher adhered to the guidelines of the Data Privacy Act of 2012, implementing necessary security measures to protect the data. This commitment to ethical standards fostered trust among participants and enhanced the integrity of the research findings. Throughout the research process, the researcher followed these protocols to uphold the highest level of professionalism and respect for human rights.

Analytical and Statistical Schemes

Objective No. 1 employed the descriptive-analytical scheme and mean to determine the level of stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects. Objective No. 2 likewise used the descriptive-analytical scheme and the mean to determine the level of stakeholders' involvement, grouping them according to the aforementioned variables. Objective No. 3 employed the comparative analytical scheme and the Mann-Whitney U test to determine whether there is a significant difference in stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Results and Discussion

This section summarizes the study's findings, which come from careful data gathering, in-depth analysis, and thoughtful interpretation. After this, meaningful conclusions were drawn from the initial phase, offering valuable insights.

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Planning and Decision Making, Information Dissemination, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Partnership and Collaboration

Table 1

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Planning and Decision Making

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>		
1. Get involved in the school improvement plans and plan school projects that will make the school academically friendly and reputable.	3.91	High Level
2. Assist in deciding if the school plan/project design is consistent with organizational purpose, goals, and objectives.	3.87	High Level



3. Participate in identifying the priority improvement area to increase the chances of success in the implementation of school programs and projects.	3.89	High Level
4. Take time to help create an implementation plan that will put the project plan into action, and monitor the program to determine whether or not their decision was a good one.	3.74	High Level
5. Get involved in the review of the decision made and its impact (both good and bad).	3.78	High Level
6. help in identifying the pros and cons of the issue and eliminating alternatives for the choices by weighing the evidence option from the pros and cons first.	3.77	High Level
7. participate in meetings related to decision-making and implementing strategic plans.	4.09	High Level
8. Get involved in the budget planning for school programs, projects, and activities.	3.89	High Level
Overall Mean	3.87	High Level

Table 1 presents the level of stakeholders' involvement in planning and decision-making for school programs and projects, with an overall mean of 3.87, interpreted as high. Stakeholders reported the highest engagement in attending meetings related to decision-making and implementing strategic plans (Mean = 4.09), indicating active participation in supporting school-led initiatives. Conversely, stakeholders were less involved in creating and monitoring implementation plans (Mean = 3.74), suggesting limited initiative in this aspect. Internal stakeholders, such as teachers, cited time constraints due to teaching loads and additional responsibilities, while external stakeholders often deferred to school leaders, influenced by voluntary participation, competing obligations, and limited confidence or knowledge. These findings align with Amaba (2024), who emphasized high stakeholder involvement in school decision-making, and are supported by Cabardo (2016) and Ireri (2017), who reported moderate or partial participation of stakeholders in school planning processes.

Table 2

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Information Dissemination

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>		
1. Share useful information in sourcing funds for school projects and programs.	3.80	High Level
2. help disseminate information about the different activities initiated by the schools.	3.91	High Level
3. spearhead in the dissemination of the school's curricular and extracurricular activities.	3.73	High Level
4. help disseminate and convince civic community members to extend assistance to schools' special activities.	3.76	High Level



5. help relay to community stakeholders the accomplishments, achievements, and awards received by the school.	3.88	High Level
6. help in the mobilization, management, and raising of needed school resources.	3.78	High Level
7. volunteer in giving out the good news to the community via the social media of the school projects and activities.	3.83	High Level
8. Share important information for transparency with other stakeholders about the status of school programs and projects.	3.95	High Level
Overall Mean	3.83	High Level

Table 2 presents stakeholders' involvement in information dissemination for school programs and projects, with an overall mean of 3.83, interpreted as high. Stakeholders were most engaged in sharing important information to maintain transparency about school initiatives (Mean = 3.95), highlighting their role in promoting trust and encouraging community participation (De Vera, 2022). Conversely, they were less active in spearheading the dissemination of curricular and extracurricular activities (Mean = 3.73), indicating limited initiative in leading information campaigns. Constraints such as limited resources and centralized management of school social media contribute to this pattern (Shanko, 2020). Overall, stakeholders play a significant role in communicating information, but leadership in dissemination remains limited.

Table 3

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Monitoring and Evaluation

Item	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>		
1. Help monitor the school's development of various programs, projects, and activities.	3.89	High Level
2. Share my knowledge, experience, and perspective that can significantly enhance the school projects and activities.	3.87	High Level
3. help examine the project program in relation to its goals, timeline, and budget.	3.74	High Level
4. participate in the review and evaluation of school projects and programs.	3.77	High Level
5. Suggest recommendations for the sustainability of school programs and projects.	3.76	High Level
6. Provide opinions before, during, and after the implementation of school programs and projects.	3.71	High Level
7. Help analyze the results achieved by the school project's performance based on the current results against the project grade.	3.70	High Level
8. Provide timely feedback on whether the school programs/projects are achieving their objectives.	3.65	High Level



Overall Mean **3.76** **High Level**

Table 3 presents stakeholders' involvement in monitoring and evaluating school programs and projects, with an overall mean of 3.76, interpreted as high. Stakeholders were most engaged in monitoring the development of programs and projects (Mean = 3.89), highlighting their role in promoting accountability and supporting program sustainability (Zaman et al., 2023). Conversely, they were least active in providing feedback on whether programs were achieving their objectives (Mean = 3.65), suggesting limited participation in deeper evaluative processes. Factors such as workload, limited time, lack of expertise, and insufficient feedback mechanisms contribute to this lower engagement (Yadav, 2023). Overall, while stakeholders are willing to assist in monitoring, their evaluative input remains less consistent, underscoring the need for structured participatory mechanisms to enhance institutional effectiveness.

Table 4

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Partnership and Collaboration

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>		
1. collaborate with internal stakeholders in uplifting school and community relations.	3.91	High Level
2. participate in all school activities and social gatherings that promote school and community stakeholders' relations.	3.96	High Level
3. work harmoniously with fellow stakeholders to improve the implementation of school programs, projects, and activities.	3.94	High Level
4. collaborate with internal stakeholders to represent the school in community programs and activities.	3.85	High Level
5. Look for and recommend reliable partners to support the school programs and activities.	3.66	High Level
6. collaborate with fellow stakeholders to encourage parents' involvement in any school programs and activities.	3.91	High Level
7. Volunteer myself as a partner of the school in the implementation of school programs and activities.	3.88	High Level
8. Cooperate with school authorities in raising funds for school programs, projects, and activities.	3.87	High Level
Overall Mean	3.87	High Level

Table 4 shows stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects in terms of partnership and collaboration, with an overall mean of 3.87, interpreted as high. Stakeholders were most engaged in participating in school activities and social gatherings that strengthen relations with the school and community (Mean = 3.96), demonstrating active collaboration that fosters supportive learning environments (Cabriga & Ching, 2024). Conversely, they were least active in seeking or recommending reliable partners to support school programs (Mean = 3.66), reflecting limited opportunities and awareness, particularly in the island community setting. Challenges such as



restricted access to private or non-profit partners and limited knowledge about school initiatives hinder active partnership (Olalowo, 2021). Overall, while stakeholders participate effectively in school-community activities, expanding awareness and opportunities for collaboration could further enhance program support and sustainability.

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Planning and Decision Making, Information Dissemination, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Partnership and Collaboration When Grouped According to Age, Sex, and Family Income

Table 5

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Planning and Decision Making When Grouped According to Age

Items	Younger		Older	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. Get involved in the school improvement plans and plan school projects that will make the school academically friendly and reputable.	3.65	High Level	4.08	High Level
2. assist in deciding if the school plan/project design is consistent with organizational purpose, goals, and objectives.	3.61	High Level	4.02	High Level
3. participate in identifying the priority improvement area to increase the chances of success in the implementation of school programs and projects.	3.58	High Level	4.08	High Level
4. Take time to help create an implementation plan that will put the project plan into action, and monitor the program to determine whether or not their decision was a good one.	3.45	Moderate Level	3.92	High Level
5. Get involved in the review of the decision made and its impact (both good and bad).	3.42	Moderate Level	4.00	High Level
6. help in identifying the pros and cons of the issue and eliminating alternatives for the choices by weighing the evidence, considering the pros and cons first.	3.45	Moderate Level	3.96	High Level
7. participate in meetings related to decision-making and implementing strategic plans.	3.52	High Level	4.43	High Level



8. Get involved in the budget planning for school programs, projects, and activities.	3.55	High Level	4.10	High Level
Overall Mean	3.53	High Level	4.08	High Level

Table 5 shows that both younger and older stakeholders exhibit high involvement in planning and decision-making, with overall means of 3.53 and 4.08, respectively. Younger stakeholders are moderately less involved in reviewing decisions and weighing alternatives, while older stakeholders are slightly less active in creating implementation plans. This suggests a generational difference: younger stakeholders focus more on outcomes, whereas older stakeholders engage more in meetings and decision-making processes but less in hands-on execution. The finding highlights the importance of understanding stakeholders' roles to foster effective collaboration in school planning (Kumar, 2024).

Table 6

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Information Dissemination When Grouped According to Age

Items	Younger		Older	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. Share useful information on sourcing funds for school projects and programs.	3.45	Moderate Level	4.02	High Level
2. help disseminate information about the different activities initiated by the schools.	3.48	Moderate Level	4.18	High Level
3. spearhead in the dissemination of the school's curricular and extracurricular activities.	3.42	Moderate Level	3.92	High Level
4. help disseminate and convince civic community members to extend assistance to schools' special activities.	3.45	Moderate Level	3.94	High Level
5. help relay to community stakeholders the accomplishments, achievements, and awards received by the school.	3.58	High Level	4.06	High Level
6. help in the mobilization, management, and raising of needed school resources.	3.52	High Level	3.94	High Level
7. volunteer in giving out the good news to the community via the social media of the school projects and activities.	3.58	High Level	3.98	High Level



8. share important information for transparency with other stakeholders about the status of school programs and projects.	3.65	High Level	4.14	High Level
Overall Mean	3.52	High Level	4.02	High Level

Table 6 shows that both younger and older stakeholders demonstrate high involvement in information dissemination, with overall means of 3.52 and 4.02, respectively. Younger stakeholders are moderately less active in spearheading school activity dissemination, while older stakeholders show slightly higher engagement but similarly rely on others to lead. Most stakeholders contribute by sharing information on social media, ensuring transparency about school programs and projects. This highlights the importance of social media as a key communication channel and the need for active participation from all stakeholders to support school initiatives (Alomes, 2020).

Table 7

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Monitoring and Evaluation When Grouped According to Age

Items	Younger		Older	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. Help monitor the school's development of various programs, projects, and activities.	3.61	High Level	4.06	High Level
2. Share my knowledge, experience, and perspective that can significantly enhance the school projects and activities.	3.65	High Level	4.00	High Level
3. help examine the project program in relation to its goals, timeline, and budget.	3.48	Moderate Level	3.90	High Level
4. participate in the review and evaluation of school projects and programs.	3.42	Moderate Level	3.98	High Level
5. Suggest recommendations for the sustainability of school programs and projects.	3.48	Moderate Level	3.92	High Level
6. Provide opinions before, during, and after the implementation of school programs and projects.	3.45	Moderate Level	3.86	High Level
7. Help analyze the results achieved by the school project's performance based on the current results against the project grade.	3.52	High Level	3.80	High Level



8. Provide timely feedback on whether the school programs/projects are achieving their objectives.	3.52	High Level	3.73	High Level
Overall Mean	3.52	High Level	4.29	High Level

Table 7 indicates that both younger and older stakeholders show high involvement in monitoring and evaluation, with overall means of 3.52 and 4.29, respectively. Younger stakeholders are less active in reviewing and evaluating programs, while older stakeholders participate actively in monitoring but less in providing feedback. This generational difference suggests that younger stakeholders may lack full knowledge of school programs, and older stakeholders may defer feedback since they were not the primary implementers. The findings emphasize the importance of engaging all stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation process to improve program effectiveness and sustainability (Yadav, 2023).

Table 8

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Partnership and Collaboration When Grouped According to Age

Items	Younger		Older	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. collaborate with internal stakeholders in uplifting school and community relations.	3.68	High Level	4.06	High Level
2. participate in all school activities and social gatherings that promote school and community stakeholders' relations.	3.69	High Level	4.14	High Level
3. work harmoniously with fellow stakeholders to improve the implementation of school programs, projects, and activities.	3.58	High Level	4.16	High Level
4. collaborate with internal stakeholders to represent the school in community programs and activities.	3.45	Moderate Level	4.10	High Level
5. Look for and recommend reliable partners to support the school programs and activities.	3.39	Moderate Level	3.82	High Level
6. collaborate with fellow stakeholders to encourage parents' involvement in any school programs and activities.	3.58	High Level	4.12	High Level
7. Volunteer myself as a partner of the school in the implementation of school programs and activities.	3.61	High Level	4.04	High Level



8. Cooperate with school authorities in raising funds for school programs, projects, and activities.	3.61	High Level	4.02	High Level
Overall Mean	3.57	High Level	4.06	High Level

Table 8 shows that both younger and older stakeholders exhibit high involvement in partnership and collaboration, with overall means of 3.57 and 4.06, respectively. Younger stakeholders are less proactive in seeking new partners, with their lowest engagement in recommending reliable partners (3.39), while older stakeholders show a similar trend (3.82). Both groups, however, actively participate in school activities and work collaboratively with existing program implementers. This indicates that stakeholders favor direct collaboration over initiating new partnerships. The findings support Maqhubela (2025), highlighting that collaboration among internal and external stakeholders enhances school effectiveness and educational outcomes.

Table 9

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Planning and Decision Making When Grouped According to Sex

Items	Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. get involved in the school improvement plans and planning school projects that will make the school academically friendly and reputable.	3.44	Moderate Level	4.22	High Level
2. assist in deciding if the school plan/project design is consistent with organizational purpose, goals, and objectives.	3.34	Moderate Level	4.20	High Level
3. participate in identifying the priority improvement area to increase chances of success in the implementation of school programs and projects.	3.41	Moderate Level	4.20	High Level
4. take time to help create an implementation plan that will put the project plan into action and monitor the program to determine whether or not their decision was a good one.	3.13	Moderate Level	4.14	High Level
5. get involved in the review of the decision made and its impact (both good and bad).	3.19	Moderate Level	4.16	High Level
6. help in identifying the pros and cons of the issue and eliminating alternatives for the choices by weighing the evidence, considering the pros and cons first.	3.22	Moderate Level	4.12	High Level



7. participate in meetings related to decision-making and implementing strategic plans.	3.47	Moderate Level	4.48	High Level
8. Get involved in the budget planning for school programs, projects, and activities.	3.31	Moderate Level	4.26	High Level
Overall Mean	3.31	Moderate Level	4.22	High Level

Table 9 indicates that female stakeholders demonstrate higher involvement in planning and decision-making (overall mean 4.22, high level) compared to males (overall mean 3.31, moderate level). Males are less proactive in creating and reviewing implementation plans, while females show stronger engagement in meetings and strategic discussions, though both sexes primarily participate in executing rather than initiating plans. This suggests that males and females tend to focus on their comfortable roles within decision-making and implementation rather than contributing fully to initial planning. The finding aligns with Kujala, Sachs, Leinonen, Heikkinen, and Laude (2022), emphasizing that limited stakeholder involvement in strategic planning can negatively impact program implementation.

Table 10

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Information Dissemination When Grouped According to Sex

Items	Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. Share useful information in sourcing funds for school projects and programs.	3.25	Moderate Level	4.16	High Level
2. help disseminate information about the different activities initiated by the schools.	3.34	Moderate Level	4.28	High Level
3. spearhead in the dissemination of the school's curricular and extracurricular activities.	3.09	Moderate Level	4.14	High Level
4. help disseminate and convince civic community members to extend assistance to schools' special activities.	3.16	Moderate Level	4.14	High Level
5. help relay to community stakeholders the accomplishments, achievements, and awards received by the school.	3.44	Moderate Level	4.16	High Level
6. help in the mobilization, management, and raising of needed school resources.	3.31	Moderate Level	4.08	High Level
7. volunteer in giving out the good news to the community via the social media of the school projects and activities.	3.38	Moderate Level	4.12	High Level
8. Share important information for transparency with other stakeholders	3.45	Moderate Level	4.28	High Level



about the status of school programs and projects.

Overall Mean	3.30	Moderate Level	4.17	High Level
---------------------	-------------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------------

Table 10 shows that female stakeholders are more active in information dissemination (overall mean 4.17, high level) compared to male stakeholders (overall mean 3.30, moderate level). Males are less likely to spearhead dissemination efforts, while females excel in sharing information and promoting transparency, though both groups tend to avoid leadership roles or resource mobilization. This indicates that while both sexes contribute to communication about school initiatives, there is room to encourage more proactive and leadership-oriented engagement. The finding aligns with Betta and Boronina (2018), highlighting that transparency and active stakeholder participation are key to successful project implementation and fostering trust among stakeholders.

Table 11

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Monitoring and Evaluation, When Grouped According to Sex

Items	Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. Help monitor the school's development of various programs, projects, and activities.	3.41	Moderate Level	4.20	High Level
2. Share my knowledge, experience, and perspective that can significantly enhance the school projects and activities.	3.34	Moderate Level	4.20	High Level
3. help examine the project program in relation to its goals, timeline, and budget.	3.25	Moderate Level	4.06	High Level
4. participate in the review and evaluation of school projects and programs.	3.16	Moderate Level	4.16	High Level
5. Suggest recommendations for the sustainability of school programs and projects.	3.22	Moderate Level	4.10	High Level
6. Provide opinions before, during, and after the implementation of school programs and projects.	3.22	Moderate Level	4.02	High Level
7. Help analyze the results achieved by the school project's performance based on the current results against the project grade.	3.28	Moderate Level	3.98	High Level
8. Provide timely feedback on whether the school programs/projects are achieving their objectives.	3.15	Moderate Level	3.96	High Level



7. participate in meetings related to decision-making and implementing strategic plans.	3.92	High Level	4.23	High Level
8. Get involved in the budget planning for school programs, projects, and activities.	3.84	High Level	3.93	High Level
Overall Mean	3.76	High Level	3.96	High Level

Table 13 shows that both lower- and higher-income respondents are actively involved in planning and decision-making, with overall means of 3.76 (high level) and 3.96 (high level), respectively. Respondents with lower income were most engaged in participating in meetings related to decision-making and strategic plans, while the least were involved in analyzing the pros and cons of issues. Higher-income respondents were most active in strategic planning meetings, but least involved in creating implementation plans.

The findings suggest that, regardless of income, stakeholders tend to follow the majority decision rather than actively initiating or leading planning processes. Their engagement focuses on participation rather than innovation or leadership in school program implementation. This supports Kumar (2024), who emphasized that understanding each stakeholder group's roles fosters collaboration and a more effective educational system.

Table 14

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Information Dissemination When Grouped According to Family Income

Items	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. Share useful information on sourcing funds for school projects and programs.	3.71	High Level	3.89	High Level
2. help disseminate information about the different activities initiated by the schools.	3.66	High Level	4.14	High Level
3. spearhead in the dissemination of the school's curricular and extracurricular activities.	3.61	High Level	3.82	High Level
4. help disseminate and convince civic community members to extend assistance to schools' special activities.	3.63	High Level	3.86	High Level
5. help relay to community stakeholders the accomplishments, achievements, and awards received by the school.	3.71	High Level	4.02	High Level



6. help in the mobilization, management, and raising of needed school resources.	3.76	High Level	3.80	High Level
7. volunteer in giving out the good news to the community via the social media of the school projects and activities.	3.68	High Level	3.95	High Level
8. Share important information for transparency with other stakeholders about the status of school programs and projects.	3.68	High Level	4.18	High Level
Overall Mean	3.69	High Level	3.96	High Level

Table 14 shows that stakeholders with both lower- and higher-income families are actively involved in information dissemination, with overall means of 3.69 (high level) and 3.96 (high level), respectively. Lower-income respondents were most engaged in mobilizing, managing, and raising needed school resources, but least likely to spearhead the dissemination of curricular and extracurricular activities. Higher-income respondents were most active in sharing information for transparency with other stakeholders, but least involved in resource mobilization and management. The results suggest that income levels influence the type of involvement: lower-income stakeholders may hesitate to lead promotional activities, while higher-income stakeholders may be less involved in fundraising or resource-related tasks. Overall, both groups contribute to disseminating information but focus on different aspects of school programs. This supports Alomes (2020), who emphasized that stakeholder contributions and open communication are essential for the effective implementation of school programs and projects.

Table 15

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Monitoring and Evaluation When Grouped According to Family Income

Items	Lower Mean	Interpretation	Higher Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. Help monitor the school's development of various programs, projects, and activities.	3.79	High Level	3.98	High Level
2. Share my knowledge, experience, and perspective that can significantly enhance the school projects and activities.	3.79	High Level	3.93	High Level
3. help examine the project program in relation to its goals, timeline, and budget.	3.61	High Level	3.86	High Level
4. participate in the review and evaluation of school projects and programs.	3.55	High Level	3.95	High Level



5. Suggest recommendations for the sustainability of school programs and projects.	3.58	High Level	3.91	High Level
6. Provide opinions before, during, and after the implementation of school programs and projects.	3.58	High Level	3.82	High Level
7. Help analyze the results achieved by the school project's performance based on the current results against the project grade.	3.47	Moderate Level	3.89	High Level
8. Provide timely feedback on whether the school programs/projects are achieving their objectives.	3.50	High Level	3.77	High Level
Overall Mean	3.86	High Level	4.30	High Level

Table 15 shows that stakeholders with both lower- and higher-income families demonstrate high levels of involvement in monitoring and evaluation, with overall means of 3.86 (high level) and 4.30 (high level), respectively. Lower-income respondents were most active in monitoring school programs and sharing knowledge to enhance projects, but were least involved in analyzing project outcomes. Higher-income respondents were most engaged in monitoring program development but least active in providing timely feedback on program objectives.

The findings suggest that lower-income stakeholders focus more on observation and knowledge-sharing rather than critical evaluation, while higher-income stakeholders emphasize oversight rather than detailed feedback. This indicates that income level may influence the type of participation, with both groups tending to monitor rather than fully engage in evaluative or analytical roles. The results are consistent with Zaman et al. (2023), who emphasized that active stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation improves decision-making, transparency, and overall project effectiveness.

Table 16

Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Partnership and Collaboration When Grouped According to Family Income

Items	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As a stakeholder, I...</i>				
1. collaborate with internal stakeholders in uplifting school and community relations.	3.66	High Level	4.14	High Level
2. participate in all school activities and social gatherings that promote school and community stakeholders' relations.	3.71	High Level	4.18	High Level



3. work harmoniously with fellow stakeholders to improve the implementation of school programs, projects, and activities.	3.76	High Level	4.09	High Level
4. collaborate with internal stakeholders to represent the school in community programs and activities.	3.66	High Level	4.02	High Level
5. Look for and recommend reliable partners to support the school programs and activities.	3.61	High Level	3.70	High Level
6. collaborate with fellow stakeholders to encourage parents' involvement in any school programs and activities.	3.71	High Level	4.09	High Level
7. Volunteer myself as a partner of the school in the implementation of school programs and activities.	3.76	High Level	3.98	High Level
8. Cooperate with school authorities in raising funds for school programs, projects, and activities.	3.61	High Level	4.09	High Level
Overall Mean	3.69	High Level	4.04	High Level

Table 16 shows that stakeholders from both lower- and higher-income families demonstrate high levels of involvement in partnership and collaboration, with overall means of 3.69 and 4.04, respectively. Respondents with lower income were most active in working harmoniously with fellow stakeholders and volunteering in program implementation, while least active in seeking or recommending reliable partners and supporting fundraising activities. Higher-income respondents were most engaged in participating in school and community activities, but least active in recommending partners to support school programs.

The findings suggest that, regardless of income level, stakeholders prefer collaboration with school personnel over independently initiating partnerships or fundraising. Their involvement focuses on contributing resources and working within existing structures rather than seeking external collaborations. This highlights a tendency to prioritize direct support and cooperation rather than advocacy for new partnerships. The results support Maqhubela (2025), who emphasized that collaboration among internal and external stakeholders enhances school effectiveness, fosters innovation, and aligns educational programs with societal needs.

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Planning and Decision Making, Information Dissemination, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Partnership and Collaboration When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, and Family Income



Table 17

Difference in the Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Planning and Decision Making When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, and Family Income

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	31	34.18	563.50	0.029		Significant
	Older	51	45.95				
Sex	Male	32	28.56	386.00	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Female	52	49.78				
Family Income	Lower	38	40.33	791.50	0.678		Not Significant
	Higher	44	42,51				

Table 17 presents the differences in stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects in the area of planning and decision-making according to age, sex, and Family Income. The results show that older stakeholders had a higher level of participation than younger stakeholders, with a significant difference reflected by a p-value of 0.029. Similarly, female stakeholders were more actively engaged than their male counterparts, as indicated by a p-value of 0.000, showing that sex significantly influences involvement in planning and decision-making activities. In contrast, the Family Income of stakeholders did not result in a significant difference in participation, with a p-value of 0.678, suggesting that socio-economic status does not significantly affect engagement in this area. These findings imply that older female stakeholders are more likely to take a prominent role in shaping school programs and policies, actively participating in strategic planning and decision-making. This pattern may be influenced by culturally and socially defined roles emphasizing nurturing and hands-on involvement in their children's welfare, as observed during volunteer-driven initiatives such as Brigada Eskwela, Gulayan sa Paaralan, and other school activities. Membership in programs like the Pantawid sa Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) may further encourage attendance and participation, as monitored by social welfare offices. The results support Millano and Callo (2024), who reported significant differences in engagement levels based on age and gender, highlighting the critical role of demographic factors in stakeholders' involvement in educational initiatives.

Table 18

Difference in the Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Information Dissemination When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, and Family Income

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
----------	----------	---	-----------	----------------	---------	------------	----------------



Age	Younger	31	35.66	609.50	0.083		Not Significant
	Older	51	45.05				
Sex	Male	32	28.77	392.50	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Female	52	49.65				
Family Income	Lower	38	38.79	733.00	0.337		Not Significant
	Higher	44	43.84				

Table 18 presents the differences in stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects in the area of information dissemination according to age, sex, and Family Income. The results indicate that age and Family Income do not significantly affect involvement, with p-values of 0.083 and 0.337, respectively, suggesting that younger and older stakeholders, as well as those from lower or higher-income families, participate similarly in sharing information about school initiatives. In contrast, sex significantly influences involvement, with a p-value of 0.000, showing that female stakeholders are more active than their male counterparts in disseminating information. This difference is attributed to females' greater aptitude in using social media, as well as their strong social roles within the school community, often serving as active members or officers of the Parents and Teachers Association (PTA). Their sense of responsibility, commitment to child development, and established presence in school activities enhance their effectiveness in sharing information, leading to faster and more efficient communication about school programs. These findings align with Alomes (2020), who emphasized that active stakeholder engagement and transparent communication are critical to successful program implementation, as they promote fairness, accountability, and collaboration among all parties involved.

Table 19

Difference in the Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Monitoring and Evaluation When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, and Family Income

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	31	31.24	472.50	0.002		Significant
	Older	51	47.74				
Sex	Male	32	29.28	409.00	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Female	52	49.32				
Family Income	Lower	38	34.83	582.50	0.018		Significant
	Higher	44	47.26				



Table 19 presents the differences in stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects in the area of monitoring and evaluation according to age, sex, and Family Income. The results show that all three variables significantly influence involvement, with p-values of 0.002 for age, 0.000 for sex, and 0.018 for Family Income, all below the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that older stakeholders, female stakeholders, and those from higher-income families are more actively involved in monitoring and evaluating school programs and projects. Specifically, older females with higher incomes demonstrate greater engagement in assessing program implementation, contributing their expertise, providing feedback, and ensuring accountability. Their higher level of involvement can be attributed to their social and cultural roles, maternal responsibilities, financial capacity to support initiatives, and a strong commitment to sustaining school progress. These findings suggest that demographic factors such as age, gender, and income not only affect awareness of school programs but also stakeholders' capacity to participate meaningfully, enhancing the effectiveness, oversight, and long-term success of school initiatives.

Table 20

Difference in the Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in School Programs and Projects According to Partnership and Collaboration When Grouped and Compared According to Age, Sex, and Family Income

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	31	36.79	644.50	0.161		Not Significant
	Older	51	44.36				
Sex	Male	32	27.98	367.50	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Female	52	50.15				
Family Income	Lower	38	37.53	685.00	0.158		Not Significant
	Higher	44	44.93				

Table 20 presents the differences in stakeholders' involvement in school programs and projects in the area of partnership and collaboration according to age, sex, and Family Income. The analysis revealed that age and Family Income had p-values of 0.161 and 0.158, respectively, which are greater than the 0.05 level of significance and thus interpreted as not significant. This indicates that involvement in partnership and collaboration does not differ significantly across age groups or income levels. In contrast, sex was found to be a significant factor, with a p-value of 0.000, suggesting that female stakeholders are more actively involved in partnership and collaborative activities than their male counterparts. Female stakeholders tend to engage directly with school implementers to identify and provide necessary resources, ensuring better execution of school programs. They dominate participation in meetings, assemblies, and volunteer-driven activities, enhancing student development, bridging gaps in educational quality, addressing financial and infrastructure limitations, and improving school-based management. These findings align with Olalowo (2021), who noted that male community members often hesitate to participate in school innovations when their skills are underutilized, and they are consistent with Republic Act 9155 (Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001) and Republic Act 8525 (Adopt-A-School Act), which



emphasize the importance of establishing school-community networks and encouraging active parental and organizational involvement to support public schools.

Conclusion

Stakeholders demonstrate a high level of involvement in school programs and projects, driven by trust, commitment, and support for school initiatives. They actively participate in planning, decision-making, and information dissemination, although monitoring, evaluation, and collaboration are sometimes limited by workload, time constraints, and insufficient feedback. Female and older stakeholders tend to be more engaged, and higher-income stakeholders participate more in monitoring and evaluation activities. To strengthen stakeholder engagement, schools may conduct workshops for strategic planning, establish official communication channels for information dissemination, form monitoring and evaluation committees, and encourage partnerships through school projects. Recognizing stakeholders' contributions can further motivate active participation. These measures aim to foster inclusive, effective, and sustainable involvement, ensuring the success of school programs and projects.

Acknowledgment

The researcher sincerely thanks everyone who made this study possible. Special gratitude is extended to Dr. Brenda L. Pasquil, her adviser, for guidance, patience, and support; to Dr. Jose Donnie S. Sajonia, Dr. Rey T. Eslabon, Dr. Renith S. Guanzon, and Dr. Gregorio Moyani, Jr., for their valuable insights and recommendations during the oral defense; and to the respondents for their time and cooperation. She also appreciates all others who contributed in any way to the completion of this work. Above all, she thanks the Almighty Father for His guidance, strength, and grace throughout this endeavor.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares the absence of any conflict of interest that could have influenced the content or conclusions of this paper. She affirms that no financial, personal, or professional relationships with other individuals or organizations have compromised the objectivity, integrity, or impartiality of the research work. As a final point, no external parties influenced the study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation.

References

- Alomes, B. (2020). *The Importance of stakeholders when it comes to creating successful learning outcomes*.
<https://naturalpod.com/the-importance-of-stakeholders-when-it-comes-to-creating-successful-learning-outcomes/>
- Amaba, V. (2024). Stakeholders' engagement and the performance level of secondary schools. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 11(5), 639-710.



- Ames, H., Glenton, C. & Lewin, S. Purposive sampling in a qualitative evidence synthesis: a worked example from a synthesis on parental perceptions of vaccination communication. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 19, 26 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-019-0665-4>
- Bolling, R. (2024, February 5). *Who are stakeholders in education?* Graduate Programs for Educators. <https://www.graduateprogram.org/2024/02/who-are-stakeholders-in-education/>
- Cabardo, J. R. O. (2016). Levels of participation of the school stakeholders in the different school-initiated activities and the implementation of school-based management. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 8(1), <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1133596.pdf>
- Cabriga, R., & Ching, M. (2024). Partnership and collaboration in Philippine schools: Stakeholder perspectives. *Asian Journal of Educational Development*, 11(1), 33–47.
- De Vera, V. N. (2022). Stakeholders' participation and its correlation with the implementation of school-based management. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 11(11), 101–106. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2022.855> (doi.org in Bing)
- Elepu, C., Acanga, A., & Mwesigwa, D. (2023). Stakeholder participation and academic performance: A study among primary schools in Alebtong District, Uganda. *American Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(1), 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.55284/ajel.v8i1.864>
- Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Parmar, B. L., & de Colle, S. (2010). *Stakeholder theory: The state of the art*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815768>
- Gichohi, G.W. (2015). Stakeholder involvement in schools in 21st century for academic excellence. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(2); 13-22.
- Guzman, J. (2022). Stakeholders' participation in school improvement plans and the school performance of secondary schools. *International Journal of Arts, Sciences and Education*, 3(1), 51-66
- Ice M, Thapa A, & Cohen J. (2019). Recognizing community voice and a youth-led school-community partnership in the school climate improvement process. *School Community Journal*. 25(1):9-28
- Ileri, V.M. (2017). *Roles of stakeholders and resource-related impediments to implementation of strategic plans in public secondary schools in Embu County, Kenya*. A Master of Education Thesis. Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Jadhav, A. (2020). A conceptual study of decision-making and thoughtful decision-making. SSRN <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3413706> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3413706>
- Kanana, M. R. E. (2015). *Influence of stakeholders' participation in primary school management on academic performance: the case of Uringu Division, Meru County, Kenya*. (Master Dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Kipkemoi, K. & Simon, K. (2023). Stakeholders' participation and academic performance in public secondary schools. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 24(11), 30-37 DOI: 10.9790/487X-2411073037
- Kivits, R., & Sawang, S. (2021). *Stakeholder theory. In the dynamism of stakeholder engagement. contributions to management science*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70428-5_1
- Kujala, J., Sachs, S., Leinonen, H., Heikkinen, A., & Laude, D. (2022). *Stakeholder engagement: past, present, and future*
- Kumar, R. (2024). Engaging stakeholders in educational decision-making. *Teachers Institute Journal of Education Policy*, 12(1), 45–59.



- Livala, S. D., Omikpa, F. S. & Eseyin, A. B. (2023). Communication and participation of stakeholders in the management of education in Nigeria. *Direct Research Journal of Education and Vocational Studies*. Vol. 5(5) Pp. 26-34
- Llego, M.A. (2020). *School monitoring, evaluation, and adjustment*.
<https://www.teacherph.com/school-monitoring-evaluation-and-adjustment-smea/>
- Millano, G. D. & Callo, E. C. (2024). Awareness level of internal and external stakeholders' participation in the implementation of sustainable school programs and projects: input to an effective stakeholders management plan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 5(2), 626 – 639. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.05.02.23
- Murugi, M. R., & Mugwe, M. (2023). Stakeholders' involvement and school leadership for effective implementation of strategic planning. *Journal of Research Innovation in Education*, 7(2), 277–286.
- Nacino JA. (2022). *Stakeholders' collaboration in the new normal education is a necessity! Schools Division of Nueva Ecija*
<https://depedne.net.ph/2022/02/10/stakeholders-collaboration-in-the-new-normal-education-a-necessity/>
- Olalowo, T. (2021). Challenges of stakeholder collaboration in school leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 29(3), 187–199.
- Paraiso, J. (2022). Stakeholders' involvement in school-based programs of Gosen Elementary School. *International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning*. 9(3), 63-72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6660108>
- Patton, M. Q. (2018). *State of the art in measuring development assistance*. World Bank Independent Evaluation Group. Washington, DC
- Shanko, S. (2020). Stakeholders' contribution and challenges of school improvement program implementation. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 7(5), 414-433 DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3885763
- Smith, C. F. & Goodwin, D. (2014). A guided empowerment self-audit as a school improvement strategy. *Research in Higher Education Journal* 25: 1-22
- Valencia, L. (2024). Stakeholders' involvement in school programs correlates with school performance. *Psych Educ*, 25(4), 533-544. Doi:10.5281/zenodo.137851108
- Yadav, P. K. (2023). Participatory monitoring and evaluation practices in Nepal: *Critical Discourses*.
- Zaman, B. D., Ford, M. B., & Zagt, T. K. (2023). Stakeholders' participation in M&E and performance of water supply projects in Australia: evidence from cotter dam. *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management*, 7(15), 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5282>
- Zaucha, J., & Kreiner, A. (2021). Engagement of stakeholders in the marine/maritime spatial planning process. *Marine Policy*, 132, 103394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.12.013>

