

Stakeholder Engagement and Learning Recovery Outcomes in a Philippine Public Elementary School: A Descriptive-Correlational Study

Joel P. Erazo II¹

¹Graduate School, Cebu Technological University - Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: August 2026 Keywords: Community Participation Learning Recovery Parental Involvement Philippines School Leadership Stakeholder Engagement	Learning recovery requires coordinated support from families, communities, teachers, and school leaders. This study examined stakeholder engagement and its association with learning recovery outcomes at Bacay Elementary School in Minglanilla, Cebu, Philippines. Methods: A descriptive-correlational design and purposive sampling were used during School Year 2025-2026. The respondent sample comprised 20 teachers, 20 parents, and 10 community representatives (N = 50). A modified structured questionnaire measured parental involvement, community participation, and teacher-administrator coordination. Aggregate pre-test and post-test subject scores, teacher-rated motivation, and a chi-square test were reported in the study. Teachers rated overall stakeholder engagement strongly (M = 4.40, SD = 0.58). Parental involvement received the highest domain mean (M = 4.45, SD = 0.56), followed by teacher-administrator coordination (M = 4.39, SD = 0.59) and community participation (M = 4.36, SD = 0.59). Scores increased from 60 to 84 in English, 57 to 80 in Science, and 62 to 87 in Mathematics, corresponding to relative increases of approximately 40% in each subject. Motivation ratings were very high (M = 4.35-4.50). Stakeholder engagement was associated with program effectiveness (chi-square = 15.62, p = .004), although degrees of freedom and an effect size were not available. The most frequent implementation barriers were insufficient materials (f = 26), high learner-teacher ratios (f = 25), and time constraints (f = 20). The supplied aggregate data indicate strong stakeholder engagement, descriptive improvement in learning outcomes, and a statistically significant association between engagement and program effectiveness. Because the study was single-site, non-random, and correlational, the findings should not be interpreted as causal.

1. Introduction

School closures and instructional disruption intensified an already serious learning crisis, with the Philippines facing acute foundational-learning risk (World Bank, 2022). International recovery guidance emphasizes reaching learners, assessing current learning levels, prioritizing foundational skills, improving instructional efficiency, and supporting well-being (World Bank, UNICEF, UNESCO, & OECD, 2022). In the Philippines, the National Learning Recovery Program was adopted to improve literacy and numeracy and accelerate progress through coordinated public- and private-sector participation (Department of Education, 2023). The policy sits within a broader statutory commitment to learner-responsive basic education and shared educational governance (Republic Act No. 10533, 2013; Republic Act No. 9155, 2001).

Learning recovery is not solely an instructional problem. Learners' opportunities to engage with remediation are shaped by the support available at home, access to community resources, and the capacity of teachers and administrators to coordinate assessment, scheduling, feedback, and follow-up. A second-order meta-analysis covering five decades of research concluded that parental involvement is positively associated with academic achievement, although effects differ by the form of involvement and study design (Kim, 2022). Evidence reviews of community-school approaches likewise identify family and community engagement, integrated student supports, expanded learning opportunities, and collaborative leadership as recurring features of effective implementation (Maier et al., 2017). Within schools, leadership and teacher-administrator coordination influence the organizational conditions under which interventions are delivered. A systematic review and meta-analysis found that principal behaviors were associated with student achievement, teacher well-being, instructional practice, and organizational health, while also cautioning that much of the evidence is observational rather than causal (Liebowitz & Porter, 2019). This distinction is especially important for school-based recovery research, where stakeholder engagement and program outcomes may reflect the same underlying school climate, resources, and leadership processes. The study was framed by sociocultural and ecological perspectives. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory locates learning within guided interaction and culturally situated activity (Vygotsky, 1978), while Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory explains development through interacting family, school, community, and policy environments (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Together, these perspectives suggest that learning recovery is supported when learners receive aligned assistance across their immediate and institutional contexts. They provide a conceptual rationale for examining parental involvement, community participation, and teacher-administrator coordination as related dimensions of stakeholder engagement.

Despite national policy attention, school-level evidence is needed to describe how these stakeholder dimensions operate in specific Philippine public-school contexts and how they relate to learner recovery indicators. The present study therefore examined

stakeholder profiles, the perceived level of stakeholder engagement, \ learning recovery outcomes, the association between engagement and program effectiveness, and implementation concerns at Bacay Elementary School. The null hypothesis stated that stakeholder engagement was not significantly associated with the effectiveness of the Learning Recovery Programs.

2. Methods

2.1 Study design and setting

The study used a descriptive-correlational, cross-sectional design. It was conducted at Bacay Elementary School in Barangay Tulay, Minglanilla, Cebu Province, during School Year 2025-2026. The school occupies approximately 1,900 square meters in a shared compound with Tulay National High School and the Barangay Hall. The study revealed an expected enrollment of 1,001 learners, 32 teaching personnel, and 2 non-teaching staff. The school is approximately 1.1 km from the district office, 1.2 km from the national highway, and 19 km from the division office.

2.2 Participants and sampling

Non-random purposive sampling was used. Respondents were eligible if they were teachers, parents, or community representatives in the research locale, had at least one year of relevant professional or community involvement as applicable, and were willing to participate. The final respondent sample comprised 20 teachers (40%), 20 parents (40%), and 10 community representatives (20%), for a total of 50 respondents. Teacher respondents supplied the stakeholder-engagement ratings.

2.3 Instrument and measures

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire described in the study as an adapted and contextualized instrument. The questionnaire was identified there as Reyes, Cruz, and Bautista (2021). The questionnaire contained four components: respondent profiles; 30 stakeholder-engagement statements; a teacher-completed learning-recovery effectiveness tool; and a multiple-response checklist of implementation issues.

Stakeholder engagement was measured across three 10-item domains: parental involvement and support, community participation and collaboration, and teacher-administrator coordination and communication. Items used a five-point agreement scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Domain means from 4.21 to 5.00 were interpreted as strongly agree, 3.41 to 4.20 as agree, 2.61 to 3.40 as neutral, 1.81 to 2.60 as disagree, and 1.00 to 1.80 as strongly disagree.

Program effectiveness was represented by aggregate pre-test and post-test scores in English, Science, and Mathematics; teacher-rated learner motivation and participation; and whether targeted learning gaps were closed. The supplied questionnaire instructed teachers to complete the tool for each learner after program implementation, but learner-level records, sample size, score distributions, and the exact aggregation procedure were not included. Accordingly, the outcome values are descriptively rather than as estimates of a population effect.

2.4 Data collection and ethical safeguards

The researcher obtained administrative permission from the Public Schools District Supervisor for Minglanilla 1. After approval, questionnaires were distributed personally and respondents were given approximately 15-20 minutes to complete them. The transmittal letter, dated October 2025, stated that responses would be kept strictly confidential and used for research purposes. The supplied thesis did not report an institutional research-ethics approval number, a written informed-consent process, or learner assent procedures; these details should be confirmed by the author before external journal submission.

2.5 Statistical analysis

Frequencies and percentages summarized respondent profiles and implementation issues. Weighted means and standard deviations summarized stakeholder-engagement ratings. Relative score change was calculated as $(\text{post-test score} - \text{pre-test score}) / \text{pre-test score} \times 100$. A chi-square test at $\alpha = .05$ assessed the association between stakeholder engagement and program effectiveness. The study provided chi-square and p values but not the contingency table, analytic sample size, degrees of freedom, expected cell counts, confidence intervals, or an effect-size measure; therefore, these statistics could not be independently verified or extended.

3. Results

3.1 Respondent characteristics

The respondent groups were evenly represented by teachers and parents, with a smaller purposively selected community group. The teaching cohort was predominantly female, married, graduate-qualified, and experienced. Parents were mainly 31-40 years old and female, and most had at least some college education. Community representatives included barangay officials, Parent-Teacher Association officers, local business owners, a youth leader, and a private-sector representative.

Table 1. Selected characteristics of respondents

Respondent group	Characteristic	Summary
Teachers (n = 20)	Age	Mean 40.0 years (SD 8.56); 41-50: 8 (40%); 31-40: 7 (35%); 21-30: 3 (15%); >50: 2 (10%)
Teachers (n = 20)	Gender and civil status	Female: 18 (90%); married: 17 (85%)
Teachers (n = 20)	Education	Master's degree: 10 (50%); master's units: 7 (35%); bachelor's degree: 3 (15%)

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Respondent group	Characteristic	Summary
Teachers (n = 20)	Experience and performance	>6 years: 17 (85%); mean service 7.55 years (SD 1.07); very satisfactory rating: 20 (100%)
Teachers (n = 20)	Professional development	Division-level training: 20 (100%)
Parents (n = 20)	Age and gender	31-40: 14 (70%); 21-30: 5 (25%); 41-50: 1 (5%); female: 15 (75%)
Parents (n = 20)	Education	College graduate: 8 (40%); college level: 7 (35%); high school graduate: 4 (20%); high school level: 1 (5%)
Parents (n = 20)	Monthly family income	PHP 30,001-40,000: 7 (35%); PHP 40,001-50,000: 6 (30%); PHP 20,001-30,000: 6 (30%); PHP 10,001-20,000: 1 (5%)
Parents (n = 20)	Primary income source	Private employment: 13 (65%); small business: 4 (20%); government: 2 (10%); other: 1 (5%)
Community representatives (n = 10)	Role	Barangay official: 3 (30%); PTA officer: 3 (30%); local business owner: 2 (20%); youth leader: 1 (10%); private sector: 1 (10%)

3.2 Stakeholder engagement

All three engagement domains were rated in the strongly agree range. Parental involvement and support had the highest mean ($M = 4.45$), followed by teacher-administrator coordination and communication ($M = 4.39$) and community participation and collaboration ($M = 4.36$). The overall mean was 4.40 ($SD = 0.58$). Item-level values are provided in Appendix A.

Table 2. Stakeholder-engagement domain scores

Domain	M	SD	Interpretation
Parental involvement and support	4.45	0.56	Strongly agree
Community participation and collaboration	4.36	0.59	Strongly agree
Teacher-administrator coordination and communication	4.39	0.59	Strongly agree
Overall	4.40	0.58	Strongly agree

3.3 Learning recovery outcomes

Aggregate scores increased across the three subjects. English rose by 24 points (60 to 84), Science by 23 points (57 to 80), and Mathematics by 25 points (62 to 87). Relative increases were 40.0%, 40.4%, and 40.3%, respectively. Teacher-rated motivation and participation were very high in all three subjects, and the table marked the learning gap as closed for each subject. No learner-level sample size, variance, or paired inferential test was supplied, so these changes should be interpreted as descriptive program indicators.

Table 3. Aggregate learning recovery indicators by subject

Subject	Pre	Post	Change	Relative change	Motivation M	Motivation	Gap closed
English	60	84	+24	40.0%	4.45	Very high	Yes
Science	57	80	+23	40.4%	4.35	Very high	Yes
Mathematics	62	87	+25	40.3%	4.50	Very high	Yes

3.4 Association between engagement and program effectiveness

The chi-square test rejected the null hypothesis at the .05 level, indicating an association between stakeholder engagement and program effectiveness (chi-square = 15.62, $p = .004$).

Table 4. Chi-square test of association

Variables	chi-square	df	p	Decision	Interpretation
Stakeholder engagement x program effectiveness	15.62	Not reported	.004	Reject H0	Significant association

3.5 Implementation issues and concerns

Insufficient teaching materials and learning resources was the most frequently cited implementation problem ($f = 26$), followed by overcrowded classrooms or high learner-teacher ratios ($f = 25$) and time constraints arising from other academic responsibilities ($f = 20$). Limited parental support ($f = 19$) and low learner motivation or inconsistent attendance ($f = 14$) were also prominent. Because respondents could identify multiple concerns, frequencies are not mutually exclusive.

Table 5. Ranked issues encountered in Learning Recovery Program implementation

Rank	Issue or concern	Frequency
1st	Insufficient teaching materials and learning resources	26
2nd	Overcrowded classrooms or high learner teacher ratio	25
3rd	Time constraints due to other academic responsibilities	20
4th	Limited parental support or engagement in learning recovery activities	19
5th	Learners' low motivation or inconsistent attendance	14
6th	Limited professional development or training for teachers on LRP strategies	12
7th	Lack of community participation or collaboration	11
8th	Difficulty in tracking learners' progress and learning gaps	10
9th	Inadequate monitoring and feedback mechanisms for program effectiveness	9

Note. Multiple responses were permitted; frequencies therefore do not sum to the respondent sample.

4. Discussion

4.1 Principal findings

The study presents a consistent descriptive pattern: teachers perceived stakeholder engagement to be strong across parental, community, and school-leadership domains; aggregate subject scores and motivation ratings improved after recovery activities; and the chi-square test indicated an association between engagement and program effectiveness. Parental involvement received the highest domain mean, but the narrow spread among the three domains suggests that the school experienced engagement as a connected system rather than as a single dominant source of support.

The parental-engagement result is consistent with meta-analytic evidence that family involvement is positively associated with achievement, while the type and context of involvement matter (Kim, 2022; Wang & Wei, 2024). In the present school, the highest-rated parental practices concerned interest in academic progress, encouragement to complete recovery tasks, monitoring participation, and motivating attendance. Planning participation and attendance at scheduled meetings received comparatively lower ratings. This pattern suggests that home-based encouragement was stronger than formal co-design of program activities, offering a practical target for improvement.

Community participation was also rated strongly, particularly resource provision, perceived influence on learner motivation, and support for initiatives addressing learning gaps. The lower-rated community items involved attendance at recovery-related school activities and collaboration in organizing learning events. Evidence on community schools similarly emphasizes that resources alone are insufficient; durable gains are most likely when engagement is integrated with expanded learning opportunities and collaborative leadership (Maier et al., 2017). Bacay Elementary School's community profile - including barangay, PTA, business, youth, and private-sector representatives - provides a plausible base for more systematic co-planning and monitoring.

Teacher-administrator coordination was strongest for timely updates, open communication of challenges, and the perceived contribution of coordination to program effectiveness. Regular progress meetings, professional development, and scheduling coordination were rated slightly lower, although still positively. These priorities align with evidence that school leadership is associated with instructional practice, staff well-being, and organizational health (Liebowitz & Porter, 2019). For recovery programs, coordination should translate communication into protected planning time, actionable learner-progress reviews, and rapid decisions about resources and instructional support.

4.2 Interpretation of learning outcomes and association

The pre-test to post-test score pattern is educationally encouraging: each subject improved by 23-25 points, and motivation ratings remained very high. These figures support continued monitoring and targeted intervention. Regression to the mean, concurrent instruction, maturation, differences in test difficulty, or selective inclusion of learners could also contribute to aggregate changes.

The chi-square result provides evidence of an association but should be interpreted cautiously. Without the underlying contingency table and degrees of freedom, assumptions concerning expected cell counts cannot be checked, and without Cramer's V or a comparable index, the strength of the association is unknown. In addition, engagement and effectiveness may have been classified from related teacher measures, creating common-method dependence. The result therefore supports the proposition that engagement and perceived effectiveness move together in this setting, not that stakeholder engagement independently caused the observed score changes.

4.3 Implementation implications

The barrier profile helps translate the findings into school-level priorities. Materials and learner-teacher ratios were more frequently cited than weaknesses in communication. This means that engagement strategies should mobilize concrete instructional support rather than rely only on meetings or advocacy. Parents and community partners can assist with take-home practice, attendance follow-up, learning spaces, and resource mobilization; administrators can protect intervention time, organize progress reviews, and target professional development; and teachers can use brief diagnostic cycles to match instruction to specific gaps. These actions reflect the integrated recovery approach promoted by the National Learning Recovery Program and international RAPID guidance (Department of Education, 2023; World Bank et al., 2022).

The enhancement program proposed in the study is summarized. Its five action streams - engagement assessment, parental support, community collaboration, teacher-administrator coordination, and program monitoring - require an indicative total budget of PHP 41,000. The program would be strengthened by adding explicit learner eligibility rules, baseline targets, attendance measures, subgroup reporting, fidelity indicators, and a documented schedule for the final monitoring stream.

4.4 Strengths and limitations

A strength of the study is its inclusion of teachers, parents, and varied community representatives within a concrete school-based recovery context. It also combines engagement dimensions, learner outcome indicators, and implementation barriers, thereby linking perceptions to operational concerns. The item-level results permit identification of specific practices that are relatively strong or in need of reinforcement.

The limitations are substantial and should guide interpretation. The study involved one school and a small purposive sample, limiting generalizability. Engagement ratings were supplied by teachers rather than independently by every stakeholder group. The adapted questionnaire's content-validation process and reliability coefficients were not disclosed. Learner-level *n*, grade level, missing-data handling, score distributions, and test comparability were unavailable. The chi-square contingency table, degrees of freedom, expected counts, and effect size were absent. Some descriptive tables contained arithmetic or labeling inconsistencies. Finally, administrative permission and confidentiality were documented, but institutional ethics approval and participant consent procedures were not fully described. Future work should use multi-site sampling, validated measures, linked learner-level data, pre-specified analyses, effect sizes with confidence intervals, and longitudinal or quasi-experimental designs.

5. Conclusion

At Bacay Elementary School, stakeholder engagement in Learning Recovery Programs was perceived as strong across parental, community, and teacher-administrator domains. Aggregate scores and motivation indicators improved after recovery activities, and the supplied chi-square result indicated an association between engagement and program effectiveness. The strongest defensible conclusion is that coordinated stakeholder support and positive recovery indicators co-occurred in this school. Sustaining these gains requires adequate learning materials, manageable instructional conditions, protected time, improved parent and community co-planning, teacher development, and more rigorous learner-level monitoring. Causal claims and wider generalization await stronger designs and complete analytic reporting.

References

- [1] Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- [2] Department of Education. (2023). Adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program in the Department of Education (DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/07/05/july-5-2023-do-013-s-2023-adoption-of-the-national-learning-recovery-program-in-the-department-of-education/>
- [3] Kim, S. W. (2022). Fifty years of parental involvement and achievement research: A second-order meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 37, 100463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100463>
- [4] Liebowitz, D. D., & Porter, L. (2019). The effect of principal behaviors on student, teacher, and school outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(5), 785-827. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319866133>
- [5] Maier, A., Daniel, J., Oakes, J., & Lam, L. (2017). *Community schools as an effective school improvement strategy: A review of the evidence*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/community-schools-effective-school-improvement-report>
- [6] Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). *Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001*. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2001/ra_9155_2001.html
- [7] Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). *Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2013/ra_10533_2013.html
- [8] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- [9] Wang, X., & Wei, Y. (2024). The influence of parental involvement on students' math performance: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1463359. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1463359>
- [10] World Bank. (2022). *Philippines learning poverty brief*. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099000207152223103>
- [11] World Bank, UNICEF, UNESCO, & OECD. (2022). *From learning recovery to education transformation: Insights and reflections from the 4th survey of national education responses to COVID-19 school closures*. World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/publication/rapid-from-learning-recovery-to-education-transformation>