

Stakeholder Engagement: Basis for a Collaborative Partnerships Program

Sunder L. Gapuz

Institute of Graduate and Professional Studies, Lyceum-Northwestern University,
Dagupan City, Philippines

Abstract

Stakeholder participation can expand the resources, expertise, and community support available to schools. This study assessed stakeholder engagement in educational initiatives in the Schools Division of Nueva Ecija during School Year 2024-2025 and used the findings as the basis for a collaborative partnerships program. A descriptive-correlational design was employed. Using simple random sampling, 210 stakeholders completed a researcher-designed questionnaire covering their demographic profile and level of engagement in educational initiatives. Frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and the chi-square test of independence were used. Respondents were predominantly female (63%), commonly aged 36-40 years (26%), and largely held a master's degree or had earned master's units (71% combined). Most reported monthly household incomes between PHP 11,000 and PHP 30,000. The overall stakeholder-engagement mean was 4.02, interpreted as Engaged. The highest rated practices were contributing resources to school projects ($M = 4.75$), participating in school improvement planning and implementation ($M = 4.67$), and being consulted

on school policies and decisions ($M = 4.55$). Regular attendance at meetings received the lowest rating ($M = 2.33$). Educational attainment (chi-square = 21.83, $p = .009$), gender (chi-square = 24.252, $p = .004$), and monthly household income (chi-square = 29.371, $p = .001$) were significantly associated with engagement, whereas age was not (chi-square = 14.112, $p = .118$). A ten-component collaborative partnerships program was proposed to strengthen communication, resource mobilization, joint planning, stakeholder recognition, capacity building, feedback, and inclusive participation.

Keywords: stakeholder engagement; collaborative partnerships; school-community relations; educational initiatives; social capital; Nueva Ecija

Introduction

Stakeholder engagement is an important condition for the success and sustainability of educational initiatives. Community members, local businesses, government officials, parents, and civic organizations can provide schools with financial resources, volunteer services, specialized knowledge, policy support, and community networks. When these contributions are coordinated around shared educational goals, schools may develop more responsive programs and stronger learning environments.

The source dissertation situates stakeholder engagement within Stakeholder Theory, Social Capital Theory, Network Theory, and the Theory of Collaborative Advantage. Stakeholder Theory emphasizes the need to recognize the interests and contributions of all parties affected by school operations. Social Capital Theory explains how trust-based networks facilitate collective action and resource exchange. Network Theory focuses on how the strength and structure of relationships affect information flow and access to support. The Theory of Collaborative Advantage proposes that organizations working together can achieve outcomes that no single participant could accomplish independently (Freeman, 2017; Huxham & Vangen, 2015; Putnam, 2015).

Previous works cited in the dissertation associate stakeholder participation with improved student outcomes, school reform, technology adoption, curriculum development, and community support (Acar, 2019; Park & Datnow, 2019; Santos, 2021; Smith & Wohlstetter, 2020). In the Philippine setting, the source manuscript also identifies a need for localized evidence showing how stakeholder characteristics and engagement patterns operate within the Schools Division of Nueva Ecija.

This study therefore evaluated stakeholder engagement during School Year 2024-2025. It aimed to describe the respondents' demographic characteristics, determine their level of engagement in educational initiatives, test the relationship between demographic profiles and

engagement, and develop a collaborative partnerships program based on the findings.

Methods

Research Design

The study used a descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component summarized the stakeholders' demographic characteristics and engagement in educational initiatives. The correlational component examined whether demographic factors were significantly associated with engagement levels.

Research Locale, Participants, and Sampling

The research was conducted in the Schools Division of Nueva Ecija during School Year 2024-2025. The sample consisted of 210 stakeholders selected through simple random sampling. The source manuscript describes the participants broadly as stakeholders connected with the division and identifies community members, local businesses, government officials, and other external partners as the intended stakeholder groups.

Research Instrument and Data Collection

Data were collected using a researcher-designed questionnaire with two major sections. Part I gathered demographic information, including age,

gender, stakeholder type, occupation, educational attainment, and monthly household income. Part II contained 15 statements measuring engagement in educational initiatives using a five-point scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The instrument was developed from a review of relevant literature and related studies. The submitted manuscript states that the wording was calibrated to the respondents' knowledge level but does not report formal validity evidence or reliability coefficients.

Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage were used to describe the demographic profile. Weighted mean was used to summarize stakeholder engagement. Means of 4.50-5.00 were interpreted as Very High, 3.50-4.49 as High, 2.50-3.49 as Moderately High, 1.50-2.49 as Moderately Low, and 1.00-1.49 as Very Low in the methodology. In the results tables, the verbal engagement equivalents were reported as Very Much Engaged, Engaged, Moderately Engaged, and Slightly Engaged. The chi-square test of independence, at the .05 significance level, tested relationships between demographic characteristics and engagement. Cramer's V was reported as an effect-size measure.

Ethical Considerations

The study obtained informed consent, maintained participant confidentiality, anonymized personal information, restricted data access to

authorized personnel, and recognized the participants' right to withdraw without consequence. The manuscript states that the study observed the principles of honesty, integrity, privacy, and respect.

Results And Discussion

Demographic Profile of the Stakeholders

The respondents represented varied educational, age, gender, and economic groups. Most had earned master's units (41%) or held a master's degree (30%). Respondents aged 36-40 years formed the largest age group (26%), closely followed by those aged 35 years or younger (25%). Females comprised 63% of the sample. The most common monthly household-income bracket was PHP 11,000-PHP 20,000 (34%).

Table 1. Demographic profile of the respondents (N = 210)

Variable/category	Frequency	Percentage
Highest educational attainment		
Doctoral degree	6	3%
Earned doctoral units	55	26%
Master's degree	63	30%
Earned master's units	86	41%

Variable/category	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
61-64 years	6	3%
56-60 years	6	3%
51-55 years	19	9%
46-50 years	29	14%
41-45 years	42	20%
36-40 years	55	26%
35 years or younger	53	25%
Gender		
Male	78	37%
Female	132	63%
Monthly household income		
PHP 31,000 or more	32	15%
PHP 21,000-PHP 30,000	59	28%
PHP 11,000-PHP 20,000	71	34%
PHP 5,000-PHP 10,000	42	20%
Less than PHP 5,000	6	3%

Note. Stakeholder type and occupation were listed as study variables in the methodology and questionnaire, but corresponding descriptive results were not presented in the submitted results table.

The distribution indicates that the partnership program must accommodate differences in educational background, age, gender, and economic capacity. The large proportion of respondents with graduate-level education may support strategic and technical participation. At the same time, income differences may affect the time, transportation, or financial resources that stakeholders can devote to school activities. The predominance of female respondents also suggests the importance of examining possible barriers to male participation.

Stakeholder Engagement in Educational Initiatives

Stakeholders obtained an overall mean of 4.02, interpreted in the source table as Engaged. Engagement was strongest in resource contribution, school-improvement planning, policy consultation, volunteerism, training, school events, and communication. More limited engagement was reported for wider-community outreach and formal meeting attendance.

Table 2. Stakeholder engagement in educational initiatives

Engagement indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Contributes resources (time, money, or materials) to support school projects	4.75	Very Much Engaged
Participates in school improvement planning and implementation	4.67	Very Much Engaged
Is regularly consulted on school policies and decisions	4.55	Very Much Engaged
Volunteers for school-related activities or initiatives	4.51	Very Much Engaged
Participates in training or workshops offered by the school	4.50	Very Much Engaged
Actively participates in school events and activities	4.42	Very Much Engaged

Engagement indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Actively communicates with school officials about educational initiatives	4.40	Very Much Engaged
Provides feedback or suggestions to improve school programs	4.35	Very Much Engaged
Collaborates with other stakeholders to support educational initiatives	3.90	Engaged
Feels informed about educational initiatives implemented in the school	3.85	Engaged
Feels that input is valued and considered by the school administration	3.63	Engaged

Engagement indicator	Mean	Interpretation
Engages in partnerships with the school to support student learning and development	3.53	Engaged
Believes contributions have a positive impact on educational outcomes	3.53	Engaged
Supports school efforts to engage with the wider community	3.33	Moderately Engaged
Regularly attends meetings related to educational initiatives	2.33	Slightly Engaged
Overall	4.02	Engaged

Note. The verbal interpretations reproduce those used in the source results table.

The strongest indicators show that stakeholders were willing to provide tangible resources and participate in planning and governance. Such forms of participation are consistent with social-capital and collaborative-

advantage perspectives, which emphasize resource exchange, shared goals, and collective responsibility. The lower rating for meeting attendance suggests that conventional meeting formats may be less accessible or less attractive than direct project involvement. Flexible schedules, virtual meetings, concise agendas, and asynchronous consultation may help convert stakeholders' willingness to contribute into more consistent participation.

Stakeholders were engaged, but not all dimensions reflected the same depth of influence. Ratings for whether input was valued, student-learning partnerships, and wider-community engagement were lower than ratings for resource contribution. This pattern suggests that partnership quality should not be measured only through donations or attendance. Schools should also create visible mechanisms showing how stakeholder feedback affects decisions and how community partners contribute to learning outcomes.

Relationship Between Demographic Profile and Engagement

Educational attainment, gender, and monthly household income were significantly associated with stakeholder engagement, while age was not. The reported Cramer's V values indicate weak-to-moderate or moderate associations.

Table 3. Chi-square tests of demographic profile and engagement

Profile variable	Chi-square	p-value	Decision	Cramer's V
Highest educational attainment	21.83	.009	Significant	.270
Age	14.112	.118	Not significant	.217
Gender	24.252	.004	Significant	.284
Monthly household income	29.371	.001	Significant	.313
Combined demographic profile (as reported)	24.266	.004	Significant	.284

Note. The source manuscript reports a combined demographic-profile test but does not explain how the combined chi-square statistic was computed. This should be clarified before publication.

The educational-attainment result suggests that participants with greater academic exposure may be more familiar with school processes or more confident in contributing to planning and policy discussions. The

gender association may reflect differences in representation, availability, or established social roles, although the design cannot determine why the relationship occurred. Household income produced the largest reported Cramer's V, indicating that economic capacity may shape stakeholders' ability to contribute time, money, transportation, or other resources. Age was not significantly associated with engagement, supporting age-inclusive partnership strategies.

Because the analyses were cross-sectional and based on self-reported data, these associations should not be interpreted as causal. Engagement may also depend on unmeasured factors such as professional experience, trust in school leadership, previous partnership experiences, distance from the school, and the relevance of specific initiatives.

Proposed Collaborative Partnerships Program

The dissertation proposed a ten-component program designed to address uneven engagement, improve communication, mobilize resources, strengthen collaborative planning, and recognize stakeholder contributions. A condensed journal-ready version is presented below.

Table 4. Condensed collaborative partnerships program

Program component	Primary purpose	Key activity/time frame	Success indicator
1. Stakeholder Engagement Workshops	Build understanding of stakeholder roles and effective communication	Workshops for parents, teachers, local government, alumni, and community leaders; 3 months	At least 80% attendance and positive feedback
2. Resource Mobilization Campaign	Secure financial, material, and human resources for school programs	Fundraising and local-business partnerships; 6 months	At least PHP 200,000 raised and five new partnerships

Program component	Primary purpose	Key activity/time frame	Success indicator
3. Collaborative Planning Meetings	Include stakeholders in school-improvement planning	Monthly review and joint planning meetings; ongoing	At least three school-improvement plans developed annually
4. Stakeholder Recognition Program	Acknowledge stakeholder contributions	Annual recognition event, certificates, and public acknowledgment	At least 90% attendee satisfaction

Program component	Primary purpose	Key activity/time frame	Success indicator
5. Capacity-Building Sessions	Develop stakeholder competencies in education-related roles	Training on teaching methods, community engagement, and resource management; twice yearly	At least 75% report skill improvement
6. Communication Platform Development	Create continuous communication and collaboration channels	Website, app, or social-media platform; 4 months	At least 60% active stakeholder use
7. Community Outreach Initiatives	Broaden community support for educational initiatives	Clean-up drives, educational fairs, and skill-building workshops; ongoing	At least three successful outreach events per year

Program component	Primary purpose	Key activity/time frame	Success indicator
8. Joint Student and Stakeholder Events	Promote collaboration in the learning environment	Science fairs, sports, arts exhibitions, or cultural celebrations; two to three times yearly	At least 80% attendance by students and stakeholders
9. Feedback Mechanism Implementation	Gather feedback and identify improvement areas	Surveys, focus groups, suggestion boxes, and digital channels; ongoing	At least 70% response rate
10. Stakeholder Capacity Mapping	Match stakeholder skills and resources with school needs	Skills inventory and capacity-mapping exercise; 3 months	At least 80% of stakeholders mapped

Note. The table condenses the objectives, activities, schedules, and indicators contained in the dissertation's proposed program.

The program addresses both transactional and relational dimensions of engagement. Resource mobilization supports immediate school needs, while workshops, planning meetings, communication platforms, feedback systems, and capacity mapping develop the trust and coordination required for sustainable partnerships. Recognition and joint events may strengthen belonging and motivation, while outreach initiatives connect school improvement with the broader community.

Conclusion And Recommendations

Stakeholders in the Schools Division of Nueva Ecija were generally engaged in educational initiatives, especially through resource contribution, planning, consultation, volunteerism, training, and school events. Engagement was less consistent in formal meeting attendance, community-wide outreach, and some dimensions of stakeholder influence. Educational attainment, gender, and household income were significantly associated with engagement, whereas age was not.

Schools should offer flexible or virtual participation options, particularly for meetings; reduce financial and logistical barriers for lower-income stakeholders; and develop strategies that encourage balanced

participation across genders. They should also institutionalize feedback loops so stakeholders can see how their input affects school decisions. Implementation of the proposed ten-component collaborative partnerships program may provide a structured approach to these priorities.

Future studies should use validated and reliability-tested instruments, report stakeholder type and occupation in the results, include qualitative interviews or focus groups, and examine school-level or contextual factors that may explain engagement. Longitudinal or intervention studies are also needed to determine whether the proposed program produces sustained improvements in participation and educational outcomes.

References

- Acar, E. (2019). The impact of stakeholder participation on student outcomes in Turkish schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(2), 234-248. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-03-2018-0045>
- Adams, R., & Hess, R. (2021). Digital transformation and stakeholder engagement in education. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 69(3), 431-450. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09834-4>

- Bourdieu, P. (2016). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Greenwood Press.
- Bryson, J. M. (2018). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Burt, R. S. (2017). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349-399. <https://doi.org/10.1086/421787>
- Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (2015). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65-91. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2015.9503272017>
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (3rd ed.). Westview Press.
- Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Garcia, L. (2018). Stakeholder engagement and school performance in Central Luzon. *Philippine Education Review*, 12(1), 78-92. <https://www.example.com/article123>
- Granovetter, M. S. (2017). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380. <https://doi.org/10.1086/225469>

- Harris, A., & Goodall, J. (2017). Engaging parents in education: Lessons from the UK. *Educational Review*, 69(1), 1-15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2015.1107580>
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2015). *Managing to collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage*. Routledge.
- Lin, N. (2016). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Manansala, M. (2020). The role of parental involvement in student performance in Metro Manila. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 99(2), 45-60. <https://doi.org/10.1234/pje.2020.0123>
- Park, V., & Datnow, A. (2019). Stakeholder collaboration in educational technology adoption. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 22(3), 59-71. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26732094>
- Portes, A. (2017). Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society*, 43(2), 175-211. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-014-9208-4>
- Putnam, R. D. (2015). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.
- Reyes, R. (2019). Community partnerships in rural education: A study in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 39(4), 500-515.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2019.1668714>

- Santos, J. (2021). The impact of stakeholder involvement on curriculum development in the Visayas. *Journal of Philippine Education Studies*, 27(1), 33-47. <https://doi.org/10.5678/jpes.2021.0105>
- Smith, C., & Wohlstetter, P. (2020). Parent and community involvement in schools: Insights from U.S. studies. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 28(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.28.4458>
- Wood, D. J., & Gray, B. (2016). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(2), 139-162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886391272016>