**Chapter 1**

**INTRODUCTION**

Creating a proper school environment with equal opportunities to develop students to become responsible and productive citizens of the society is what every person involved in education aims to achieve. These persons may have direct or indirect involvement in schools which may create or build sustainable development and attainment of education goals and objectives for the betterment of the students, and for the benefit of society as well. They invest effort, time, and resources to make educational goals be realized.

On the contrary, some schools in the Philippines today face different problems which affect their sense of sustainable development and particularly affect performance as a whole. Such problems may account to lack of school facilities, lack of instructional materials, lack of competent teachers, unimplemented and undeveloped school programs and unstrengthen linkages.

Schools tend to think of what will be the solution of this seems to be perennial problems which cause schools to perform less on what the Department of Education expect them to achieve.

The underlying question is that who really makes up the school? Who or what may seem to be the problem after all? And at the same time could be the probable solution? Does performance only rely on students making? Or does it also account for their environment as well?

According to Henderson and Mapp, (2002) schools must have effective programs which engage families and communities that embrace a philosophy of partnership. The responsibility for children’s educational development is a collaborative enterprise among parents, school staff, and community members. Thus, this only goes to show that whatever problems or success that a school may encounter, inside or outside factors have either posit a positive or negative effect.

Thus, this study was conducted to look into the extent of support provided by internal and external stakeholders of schools as perceived by the students as it may have an effect on their academic performance.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study is based on the stakeholders theory of R. Edward Freeman (1984) which stressed stakeholder analysis focuses on how to define quality in education and serve the needs of its constituents. This entails forging a consensus between stakeholders in the educational process. Stakeholders include learners, faculty, industry, and the community. By including these stakeholders in defining quality, more useful benchmarks may be created. These benchmarks may include dropout rates, response rates on assignments, student evaluations, the quality of the teaching package, the degree of freedom in pace and content, and the level of independence of the students.

The core idea of stakeholder theory is that organizations that manage their stakeholder relationships effectively will survive longer and perform better than organizations that do not.

This study is also based on Sergiovanni’s theory (1999) of community which states that community consists of two ideal extremes: community and society. Being part of a community refers more to a family-type relationship that focuses on the -we- as opposed to the -I-. Success is defined by the overall success of community and not solely on individual successes. In contrast, in a societal environment participants are more isolated and lonely as they each have certain agendas for justifying their interaction with others. Most schools, according to Sergiovanni (1999), reflect more of a societal phenomenon than on one based on community.

**Conceptual Framework**

Sustainability is the ability of a staff to maintain the core beliefs and values (culture) of a program and use them to guide program adaptations over time while maintaining improved or enhanced outcomes (Century and Levy, 2002).

Among schools, this sustainability is a prevailing motivator for them to continue good and best practices of their school most especially in sustainable development of the core target of the school programs and that is enhancement of students’ performance. Consequently, this sustainable development among students’ performance is affected by several factors.

Thus, the concept that operates in this study is that school's stakeholders support has a relationship with high school students’ academic performance. The independent variables are the extents of the support provided by the schools internal stakeholders namely the administrator or the principal, students, teachers, and the Parent Teacher Association(PTA),and external stakeholders namely the Local Government Unit/Local School Board (LGU/LSB)and the parents, while the dependent variable is the students’ academic performance.

Figure 1 is the conceptual framework showing the relationship between variable
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**Figure 1.**  A conceptual paradigm showing the relationship between the independent and dependent variables of the study.

**Statement of the Problem**

This study aims to find out the extent of school’s selected stakeholders’ support and its relationship to academic performance as perceived by the students.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of support provided by the following schools stakeholders as perceived by Grade 9 students and when taken as a whole and when grouped according to:
2. Internal stakeholders:
3. School Administrator/Principal
4. Student clubs/organizations
5. Teachers
6. PTA(Parent Teacher Association)

2. External Stakeholders:

1. Local Government Unit(LGU)/Local School Board(LSB)
2. Parents
3. What is the level of academic performance of Grade 9 students?

1. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of the school’s stakeholders’ support and the level of academic performance of Grade 9 students?

**Hypothesis of the Study**

The hypothesis tested in this study is:

There is no significant relationship between the school’s stakeholders’ support provided and the level of academic performance of high school students.

**Significance of the Study**

The information that will be acquired from this study will benefit the school administrators, students, teachers, Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), Local Government Unit (LGU)/Local School Board (LSB), parents and the Department of Education.

**School administrator.** This study will provide him/her with basis for monitoring the academic performance of students and how important is his/her role in developing the students’ school performance. He/she will also be aware of the different supports that other stakeholders provide for the students which could affect their performance in school which later on may be considered as basis for future instructions. Detected problems in this study might provide him/her feedbacks in determining the areas that need to be attended and prioritized pursuant to the school’s thrust.

**Students**. They refer to the ultimate beneficiaries of this study. Students will get to know the level of importance that schools’ stakeholders do for them in their education. They will be better helped in their needs and will be given enough support and understanding by the people around them like their teachers, classmates, guidance counselors, parents, and the community. Through the needed support and encouragement with the addition of improved services, they are likely to improve on their performance as a student and as a progressing individual. Moreover, they will have a better understanding of themselves as they see a new perspective within them.

**Teachers.** Considered as second parents in school, this study will help the teachers understand the vitality of their roles to learners’ improvement. They can have enough background on what probably the challenges and difficulties that their learners encounter in the light of the support that schools stakeholders provide for them. They will be given a chance to reflect on the approaches’ used and support they provide inside or outside the classroom in dealing with their students and they will be able to improve it basing on the information gathered in this study.

**Parent Teacher Association (PTA).** This study will help them provide the necessary assistance for the students. They will have an in depth idea on how their roles and responsibilities matter or affect the school and students’ performance.

**Local Government Unit/ Local School Board( LGU/LSB).** This study will help them understand more the level of importance their roles play on strengthening education. It can help them evaluate effort and assistance they have offered and eventually level them up to ensure full implementation of programs which can create a sustainable development of the school being supported.

**Parents.** This study will be a great help for them, since they are considered as co-partners in the development of their child academically. This study will help them to see clearly, the importance of the roles they play in the life of their children in school. Thus, crystallizing such role, they will be able to identify the problems of their children and provide the support they need in order to cope with such challenges they encounter in school. They will be guided on how to deal better with their children as builders of unity and love in the family.

**Department of Education.** This study will be of a useful basis for the department in reviewing some programs and services implemented that strengthens stakeholders’ involvement in the lives of the students in school. They can have the information in monitoring the academic performance of students and support systems and the feedbacks gained from this study will help them identify some priorities that need to be given more focus and which will be of immediate attendance to address students’ needs.

**Future researchers.** This study will be beneficial for future researchers as a study reference material. They may in the future, do similar related studies and will find the information generated in this study useful. This may also serve as guide for them in their studies and in considering comparisons.

**Scope and Limitations of the Study**

This study focused on extent of schools stakeholders’ support and its relationship to academic performance as perceived by the students.

The respondents of this were the Grade 9 students of La Granja National High School enrolled in S.Y. 2015-2016.

This study is limited only on independent variables as to extent of schools stakeholders’ support as perceived by the students. Schools’ stakeholders are limited to internal stakeholders namely: school administrator/principal, student clubs/organizations, teachers, Parent Teacher Association and the external stakeholders namely: Local Government Unit/Local School Board and the Parents. The dependent variable is the academic performance which refers to the general weighted average grade of Grade 9 students for the last two school years, S.Y. 2013-2014, and S.Y. 2014-2015.

**Definition of Terms**

For better understanding of the study, the terms are defined conceptually and operationally:

Academic Performance**.** It refers to the achievement distinguished from the potential ability, capacity or attitude (Good, 1982).

In this study, it refers to the academic ratings of high school students. Their level of academic performance is categorized based on DepEd’s K+12 curriculum-based standard grading system/scale S.Y.2014-2015, to wit:

90 – 100 Outstanding
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80 - 84 Satisfactory

75 - 79 Fairly Satisfactory

Below 75 Did not Meet Expectations

External Stakeholders. They refer to anyone outside a particular ​[company](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/company) who is affected by its ​[success](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/success) or ​[failure](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/failure), for ​[example](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/example), ​[customers](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/customer), ​[companies](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/company) that ​[sell](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/sell) it ​[supplies](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/supply), or ​[banks](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/bank) that ​[lend](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/lend) it ​[money](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/money). (http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/external-stakeholder).

In this study, they refer to the Local Government Unit/Local School Board and the Parents who are outside of the school context as a structure but offer necessary assistance and support to La Granja National High School and its students.

Internal Stakeholders **.** They refer to persons who ​work  for and ​owns, or have ​shares in, a particular ​[company](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/company) and are likely to want the ​[company](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/company) to be ​[successful](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/successful) .(http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/internal-stakeholder)

In this study, they refer to the school administrator/principal, student clubs/organizations, teachers and Parent Teacher Association of La Granja National High School who are directly involved in school operations inside the school.

Level/Extent**.** It means the space or degree to which a thing extends; length, area, volume, or scope. (Webster’s Dictionary, 2006)

In this study, it refers to the degree of schools stakeholders’ support which the Grade 9 students perceived to be as to very high extent, high extent, moderate extent, low extent and very low extent.

Local Government Unit(LGU). Refers to a body politic and corporate endowed with powers to be exercised by it in conformity with law.  As such, it performs dual functions, governmental and proprietary.

(<https://bataspinoy.wordpress.com/2011/04/05/definition-and-functions-of-lgu/>)

In this study the term refers to the Local School Board who belongs to the external stakeholders of the school. Particularly it refers to members of the Education Committee appointed by the Local government to assist La Granja National high School and its functions.

Parents. Refer to a father or a mother; an ancestor; precursor, or progenitor; a source, origin, or cause; A protector or guardian.(<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/parent>)

In this study, the term refers to the Parents or guardians of Grade 9 students of La Granja National High School who are identified as external stakeholders.

Perception. It means the way you think about or understand someone or something.

(http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/perception).

In this study, this refers to the understanding and view of La Granja National High School Grade 9 students about the extent of support that the internal and external stakeholders of their school provide for them.

Parents and Teachers Association. Refers to an organization of parents and teachers that tries to help and improve a particular school. (<http://www.ldoceonline.com/School-topic/PTA>)

In this study the term refers to the Association of Parents and Teachers of La Granja National High School as part of internal stakeholders.

School Administrator. This refers to a person whose job is to manage a company, school, or other organization.

(http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/administrator)

In this study, it refers to principal of La Granja National High School who belongs to internal stakeholders.

Stakeholder**.** a ​[person](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/person) such as an ​[employee](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/employee), ​[customer](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/customer), or [citizen](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/citizen) who is ​[involved](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/involved) with an ​[organization](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/organization), ​[society](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/society), etc. and ​[therefore](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/therefore) has ​[responsibilities](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/responsibility) towards it and an ​[interest](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/interest) in ​[its](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/it-s) ​[success](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/success). (http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/stakeholder)

In this study, this word refers specifically to the school administrator/principal, student clubs/organizations, teachers, Parent and Teacher Association, Local Government Unit/Local School Board, and the parents who offer direct or indirect support and assistance to students of La Granja National High School and to the school as a whole.

Students. Refer toone who is enrolled or attends classes

 at a school, college, or university.(http://www.thefreedictionary.com/student)

In this study, students refer to or are involved as internal stakeholders. Specifically refer to organizations headed by students who represent the rest of the students like the Supreme Student Government and other student clubs and organizations in La Granja National High School.

Teachers. Refer to one that [teaches](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/teaches); especially**:**  one whose occupation is to instruct. (http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/teacher)

In this study the term refers to the teachers of La Granja National High School who are part of internal stakeholders.

Sustainability. Refers to the ability to be sustained, supported, upheld, or confirmed. (dictionary.reference.com/browse/sustainability)

In this study, sustainability means the goal meant to be achieved by the schools stakeholders as part of the schools thrust.

**Chapter 2**

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES**

Several studies have been made in other countries, as well as in the Philippines, with direct or indirect bearing on the subject to be studied. Those included in this chapter provided the theoretical framework of the study.

**Schools Stakeholders**

A stakeholder is an individual or group with an interest in the success of an organization in fulfilling its mission—delivering intended results and maintaining the viability of its products, services and outcomes over time. (<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/stakeholderlores.pdf>)

Hence, an education stakeholder includes students, academics, employment and careers advisors, teaching and learning managers, employers of recent graduates, business deans, professional bodies, libraries, PTAs and other parent organizations. The roles of each stakeholder in a school district provide an integral part to the entire organization. According to Watson and Reigeluth, education is undergoing a systemic perceptual change, as a result of society’s dissatisfaction with individual learner’s achievement in the education arena. In education, most systemic transformation efforts involve stakeholders that are critical to achieving the desired changes, as asserted by Watson and Reigeluth. To foster a better understanding of the roles of the stakeholders in the educational arena, It is necessary to explain the roles of six distinctive educational stakeholders-school board members, superintendent, site administrator, teachers, parents, and students-who are closely involved in the overall operations of schools. It is also important to describe influential factors for each of the stakeholders’ roles, which may better define the significance of each educational stakeholder.

According to Coleman (1988, 1990), social capital is a resource embedded in social relations between different actors. In his theoretical considerations, Coleman distinguishes between certain characteristics of social relations as driving forces of action. Coleman regards a sense of trust in the reciprocity of a relation between two actors as especially important, which entails a belief that the relation is important for both actors and consists of expectations and obligations. Moreover, social relations are utilized as valuable channels for information and produce shared norms as well as sanctions, which can be useful in processes of action. Furthermore, Coleman explains that a social relation needs to be close and embedded in the appropriate context in order to create social capital. According to Coleman, social capital is the third important resource besides economic resources and human capital, and indicates a child’s social background. Social capital is not necessarily connected to the family’s economic resources or human capital and therefore exerts an independent effect on children’s school performance. Thus, children from non-privileged backgrounds can profit from close and strong social ties. In line with his general theoretical assumptions, Coleman emphasizes the relevance of families’ social capital (besides parental economical and human capital) for a child to acquire human capital. In this context, Coleman distinguishes between social capital within the family and social capital between the family and the family’s environment. With regard to the latter point, Coleman illustrated the importance of social relations between the family and the family’s academic environment by revealing the relevance of this relation for the creation of human capital by generating intergenerational closure over many contacts to different actors. A strong and close relationship between parents, children and teachers creates a climate of discipline and trust, which is beneficial for children’s learning progress.

The process of education is concerned chiefly with the interaction between the stakeholders (students, teacher, professional bodies, libraries, PTAs and other parent organizations together with the classroom practices that occur within the school environment) and students’ academic achievement. Parents within the context of the family and home provide the child with the security, support and guidance necessary for his or her proper intellectual and moral growth.

Furthermore, the quality of students’ performance remains at top priority for educators. It is meant for making a difference locally, regionally, nationally and globally. Educators, trainers, and researchers have long been interested in exploring variables contributing effectively for quality of performance of learners. These variables are inside and outside school that affect students’ quality of academic achievement. These factors may be termed as *student factors, family factors, school factors and peer factors* (Crosnoe, Johnson & Elder, 2004).

**Stakeholders in Education**

Adams (2005) acknowledged that the existing relationship between the impact of stakeholders and students’ academic performance has not been quite clear, it is not worthy that various experts and researchers had endeavored to establish a solid relationship between the impact of stakeholders and students’ academic performance. The teacher is employed primarily to impart knowledge as well as contribute to existing knowledge. According to Berlak (2000), academic success is, no doubt, the main focus of all educational activities which has received tremendous attention from stakeholders. However, prediction of academic success is still not clear. Apparently, predictability of academic achievement is a complex (and by no means an easy) task.

**Internal Stakeholders**

Internal stakeholdersare those who work within the school system on a daily basis and who largely control what goes on there. They include school staff, district staff, and, to some extent, school boards.

(<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/stakeholderlores.pdf>)

Some stakeholders have very close links with an organisation and would be greatly affected by it success or failure and these are known as internal stakeholders the pupils, teachers, head teacher, and local authority.

According to Victoria Homes Elementary School in Muntinlupa City, Students, teachers, and administrators and parents can be considered internal stakeholders in an educational institution. Each one of them plays an important role for the success and development of a school. Without the students, there will be no teachers. And without the administration and the parents, the organization’s mission, vision/goals cannot be achieved.

Internal stakeholders participate in the creation of the training and they directly determine its process and result. They are mostly the staff of the school organization (teachers, administrative staff, other school employees, school managers: headmaster and his/her staff). They have a critical interest in the organizational achievements and in their own professional motivations.(http://www.expero2.eu/expero1/hypertext/m\_cap\_2.htm)

**External Stakeholders**

External stakeholdersare those outside the day-to-day work of the schools who have a strong interest in school outcomes but who do not directly determine what goes into producing those outcomes.

(<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/stakeholderlores.pdf>)

Moreover, the distinction between internal and external

education stakeholders is important. With respect to a school improvement effort, such as a school wide reading model, internal stakeholders clearly have greater capacity to produce positive change in schools, but they don’t have all of the power needed to sustain it. Because of factors that can affect organizational performance over time (such as staff attrition, shifting priorities and “mission drift”), improved outcomes achieved one year can easily fade the next. For this reason, external stakeholders also have a critical role to play in sustaining improved outcomes. When the long-term success of a school system is deemed important, we must ask: “To whom do the schools belong?” and “Who has a long-term vested interest in the success of our schools and students?” In answering these questions, we quickly find ourselves at the doorstep of our constituents: the families who send their children to our schools, the taxpayers who support the schools, and the businesses who hire our graduates. In this light, external stakeholders can be highly motivated and can become powerful drivers to help achieve and sustain positive change in our schools.

**School Administrator/School Head**

School administrators who work in elementary, middle and high schools are also known as principals. They usually have master’s or doctoral degree in educational leadership or administration.

In addition, Education administrators manage the overall operation of schools. In addition, they set and oversee academic standards and ensure that teachers have the tools and resources, such as training, necessary to meet these standards.

The site administrator represents the single most influential stakeholder in the school setting (Spillane, Camburn, and Pareja, 2007), and is expected to set the academic tone for students, parents, staff, and community members through effective participatory leadership. Effective site administration leadership develops a collaborative team approach to decision making and problem solving (U. S. Department of Labor, 2008), while simultaneously and consistently developing and maintaining district wide policies and guidelines. Additionally, the successful site administrator employs a distributive approach to routine school operations to ensure maximum involvement of other internal and external stakeholders (Spillane, Camburn, and Pareja, 2007).

**School Administrator and Quality Education**

According to the study of John Aluko Orodho(2014) ,World Bank (2008) posits that much research has demonstrated that retention and the quality of education depends primarily on the way schools are managed, more than the abundance of available resources, the capacity of schools to improve teaching and learning is strongly influenced by the quality of the leadership provided by the headteacher. Concerted effort to improve school leadership is one of the most promising points of intervention to raise retention, the quality and efficiency of secondary education. Well managed schools contribute to educational quality and enhance retention (Graig & duParisis, 1998).

As stated by,(Goker, 2006) ,For the past two decades, legislators and the public have provided external pressures to encourage schools to develop and change places of education. Leadership and School Restructuring have been in the forefront of school reform in the effort to focus on school improvement and student achievement.

On the other hand, basing on the study of Hallinger and Heck, (1996) they emphasized the fact that administrative leadership was among the factors that made the greatest difference in student understanding and learning. However, the nature of this relationship remained open to debate and research.

In addition, studies of Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982) which studies considered pioneering efforts directed toward a deeper understanding of instructional leadership roles of a school principal. These researchers emphasized that a school principal, through his or her activities, roles, and behaviors in managing school structures does not affect student achievement directly.

**Student Clubs/Organizations as Stakeholders**

The administrative structure in educational institutions makes provision for student leadership. In line with this provision, Students’ Representative Councils (SRC) are found in most educational institutions. In most cases, the representatives are elected by the students themselves after school administration nominates candidates for various positions. In other cases, students are allowed to nominate and elect their own leaders. Student leaders exhibit some unique characteristics that endear them to the hearts of their colleagues. They are great orators who sound very convincing. They seem to know all the problems of their colleagues and are quick to promise having antidotes to all such problems. A careful analysis of events however reveals that all the characteristics displayed by most student leaders are just for the purposes of winning their confidence which are expected to be translated into votes for them. The involvement of school administration in the choice of school prefects stems out of the concern about the calibre of students put in leadership positions. Whilst students insist on electing radical and fearless colleagues who would always champion their course, school administrators advocate for brilliant and moderate student leaders who would not embarrass the school

Student leaders are generally expected to compliment the efforts of faculty in the effective running of their institutions. They also serve as the mouthpiece of students in the promotion of cordial relationship between students and faculty. Research has provided sufficient information about the key characteristics of student leaders. However, there is a growing need for continued improvement and reflective practice on the continuous development of leadership skills. It has been observed that much time is expended by student leaders in the performance of their role to the detriment of their academic work.

As stakeholders, students need to be involved in the administration and smooth management of distant education programmes. Astin (1985) stated that the more students are involved in student activities, including leadership activities, the greater their success in learning and personal development will be. On student leadership position and academic performance, Cress et al. (2001) concluded that all students have leadership potential and that institutions of higher education can uncover and develop this potential with targeted programs that will also increase the student’s educational success. They also asserted that educational institutions will be successful in developing tomorrow’s leaders when they provide connections between academic programs and community activities and express a strong desire, through their stated mission, to create a “legacy of leaders in businesses, organizations, governments, schools, and neighborhoods”

A study carried out by the Office of Institutional Research (2011) demonstrated that serving as a club leader, no matter how many terms served, had lasting impact and was a positive contributing factor in relation to student academic performance, especially with regard to facilitating graduation. This study revealed that remedial students who served as club leaders outperformed non‐club leader remedial students in terms of retention rate, GPA and Good Standing rate at the second year. Remedial student club leaders continued to maintain a significantly higher 3‐year retention rate than non‐club leader remedial students while maintaining levels of GPA and Good Standing that were similar to that of non‐club leader remedial students at the third year.

The results of the study revealed that students’ perception of their leadership role is high. This high perception however has no relationship with age, level, employment status, prior leadership experience or gender. It is also concluded that high academic performance is not dependent on perceived student leadership characteristics, role expectations, and duties and responsibilities. However, perceived leadership role expectation was found to be the least potent contributor to academic performance of students.( Paul Dela Ahiatrogah and, Albert  Kobina Koomson, 2011)

However, Waters, Marzanno, and McNulty (2003) reported that leadership behaviours significantly correlated with student achievement.

Furthermore,all schools everywhere, all the time should consider student engagement their ultimate objective for learners. The question of whether students have a sustainable connection to learning, schools and education does not merely affect the economy; it drives democracy and sustains healthy social interdependence for everyone. When schools disengage students, adults must assume responsibility and do something to change the situation.

Determining the optimal amount of involvement in student organizations has implications for educators and student affairs professionals (Keeling, 2004). The extent to which students are actively engaged in the school experience can have either a positive or a negative effect on academic success (Community College Survey of Student Engagement, 2008; Holland & Andre, 1987).

**Teachers as Stakeholders**

The teacher, along with the student, plays an interactive role in the education process because one cannot function without the other. “The empowerment of teachers will facilitate the empowerment of students (Short and Greer, 2002).” Teacher empowerment takes the form of providing teachers with a significant role in decisions making, control over their work environment and conditions, and opportunities to serve in a range of professional roles (Short and Greer, 2002). The teacher as a stakeholder is expected to possess the professional knowledge to lead the students in instruction. In addition to serving in an instructional role the teacher can be a mentor, supervisor, counselor, and community leader. The teacher can be a mentor to students or other teachers. The teacher is motivated to fulfill their role with an understanding of how important teachers are to society. Without teachers, our society would not be able to function as a global competitor.

As expressed byAhmad Othman Bourini, a curriculum specialist at the curriculum department of the Ministry of Education in Dubai, “The classroom teacher is an influential factor that determines the success of a curriculum as he would be the one who takes the responsibility to implement it and ensures meeting the students’ needs. He is one of the major stakeholders whom we highly consider in the process of designing the curriculum.”

**Teachers and Academic Achievement**

The results reveal large differences among teachers in their impacts on achievement and show that high quality instruction throughout primary school could substantially offset disadvantages associated with low socioeconomic background. These differences among teachers are not, however, readily measured by simple characteristics of the teachers and classrooms. Consistent with prior findings, there is no evidence that a master’s degree raises teacher effectiveness. In addition, experience is not significantly related to achievement following the initial years in the profession. These findings explain much of the contradiction between the perceived role of teachers as the key determinant of school quality and the body of research showing that observed teacher characteristics including experience and education explain little of the variation in student achievement. ( Steven G. Rivkin, Eric A. Hanushek, And John F. Kain, 2005).

However, Kara and Russell (2001) comment that there has been no consensus on the importance of specific teacher factors, leading to the common conclusion that the existing empirical evidence does not find a strong role for teachers in the determination of academic achievement.

Finally, according to Olanipekun, Shola Sunday, Aina, Jacob Kola(2014), the teacher is a very important resource in any educational system. According to them, the most important educational resources is teacher.

**Parent and Teacher Association**

The National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) has established and promulgated a set of National Standards for Family-School Partnerships which includes language consistent with efforts both to improve individual student outcomes and to advocate for and support school improvement efforts. (http://www.pta. org/1216.htm),

Parents-Teacher Association is mandatory in the basic education in the Philippines. This institution provides additional help to the school specially those problems concerning the school and learners. The Department of Education established this in order for the school to have an opportunity to reach out with the community to where it belongs.

Following Muller and Kerbow (1993), there are three main areas or “contexts” in which parental involvement takes place: at home (Yap and Enoki, 1995; White, 1982; Lee, 1993; Zellman and Waterman, 1998; Fehrmann et al., 1987), (b) in the community

(Coleman, 1987; Jaggia and Kelley-Hawke, 1999; Muller and Kerbow, 1993) and in the school (Stevenson and Baker, 1987; Epstein, 1992, Epstein and Dauber,1991; Muller and Kerbow, 1993). From a policy perspective, parental involvement in the school is perhaps the most important area for analysis since this can be controlled directly (as opposed to indirectly through parental involvement in the home) by educators and administrators (Feuerstein, 2000). Parental involvement in schools can occur in a variety of ways. Among these are volunteering directly in the classroom, (b) attending or participating in children's activities at school and (c) participating in a PTG. Empirical support for the effect of parental involvement in these three areas is mixed. Stevenson and Baker (1987, p. 1350), using a sample of 179 teachers and children, test the effect of parental involvement in “activities of the school such as PTO and parent-teacher conferences” on student achievement. They find that parental involvement is associated with higher student achievement. Using a sample of 42 elementary schools in a “large suburban area,” Griffith (1996) also finds support for the effect of parental involvement on student achievement. Hara and Burke (1998) conclude that parental involvement can positively affect student achievement in inner-city schools. However, recent research by Okpala and colleagues (2001) finds no significant relationship between the number of parental volunteer hours and fourth grade mathematics achievement.

According to Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Wentzel, (1999) the quality of parent–teacher relationship has consequences for children’s achievement.

**Parent- Teacher Association and School Governance**

Kamba (2010) observed that involving stakeholders in governance and management of schools improves the quality of education system. Parental involvement in schools takes different kinds and forms or aspects. PTA constitutes part of the formal structures of governance through which parents and the community are enabled to participate in the education of their children. It is assumed that through such structures educational provision is enhanced, and school governance and educational quality is improved. According to Azeem (2010) school governance generally becomes weak due to poor parental involvement in school financial management and key decision making areas.

The Scottish Parents Teachers Council (SPTC) offers the following definition of PTA which is very fitting in the parental involvement discourse (Edwards and Redfern, 1988a): “A local people who recognize that the education of a child is a process of partnership between parents and teachers( Ijaz Ahmad Tatlah et al. PTA contributes to educational development in various ways and because of their nature and status are meant to perform different but complementary roles in the school.

**Local Government Unit**

Notwithstanding the devolution of many basic services to LGUs, basic education is still largely the responsibility of the central government and is delivered through the Department of Education (DepEd). However, LGUs do provide supplementary funding support to public basic education because they have access to a sustainable source of financial resources that are earmarked for the basic education subsector, the Special Education Fund (SEF).

Thus, if one assumes that all of the SEF expenditures of all LGUs are spent on school level MOOE and if the SEF were distributed across LGUs in direct proportion to enrollment, then per student SEF spending would equal to PhP692. This figure is substantially higher than the average DepEd school level MOOE allocation of PhP293 per student at both the elementary and secondary level (Manasan and Castel 2009). Thus, LGUs are considered major partners of the national government in the delivery of basic education services. Their participation particularly in providing funding support is critical in achieving the Education For All targets.

` However, based on the study of Gargallano (2015) it was found out that one of the financial supports of the National Government through the LGU which is the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program(4 Ps) has no significant relationship on the scholastic performance of the students.

**Local School Board**

Public education in the Philippines is a centrally managed service delivered through the Department of Education (DepEd). At the local level, the DepEd maintains schools divisions and districts corresponding to the three biggest local government units – the provinces, cities and municipalities. The divisions and districts in turn supervise elementary (Grades I to VI) and high schools (1st to 4th year) that comprise the basic education system in the country. A local school board (LSB) is a special body created by virtue of Republic Act No. 7160, popularly known as the Local Government Code of 1991 (LGC 91). Its main duty is to allocate the Special Education Fund (SEF) to meet the supplementary needs of the local public school system. LSB is chaired by the city mayor, co-chaired by the schools division superintendent, and made up of the following members: the chair of the education committee of the Sangguniang Panlungsod (city council), the city treasurer, a representative of the

Sangguniang Kabataan (youth council), and duly elected representatives of the city PTA league, the city teachers' organization, and the non-academic personnel of city public schools.(<http://pcij.org/blog/wpdocs/Robredo_Reinventing_School_Boards.pdf>)

**Local School Board and Academic Performance**

In recent decades, however, school boards have been the target of criticism by those who perceive them as outdated and incapable of effectively leading educational reforms to improve students’ academic achievement, particularly in urban areas (Carol, Cunningham, Danzberger, Kirst, McCloud, & Usdan, 1986; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger, Carol, Cunningham, Kirst, McCloud, & Usdan, 1987; Danzberger, Kirst, & Usdan, M.D., 1992; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; Finn, 1991; HarringtonLueker, 1996; Kirst, 1994; NSBF, 1999; Olson, 1992; Streshly & Frase, 1993; The Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Todras, 1993; Whitson, 1998; Wilson, 1994).

Resnick (1999) states that school boards have traditionally focused on financial, legal, and constituent issues, and have left responsibility for students’ academic achievement to their administrators and educators. Today, however, school boards risk being judged ineffective if they do not develop policies and support programs explicitly designed to improve students’ academic achievement, oversee and evaluate the implementation and performance of these policies and programs, and demonstrate improved and/or high academic achievement (Carol et al., 1986; NSBF, 1999; Resnick, 1999; Speer, 1998). The National School Boards Foundation [NSBF] (1999) proclaimed that a school board’s primary goal must be to improve academic achievement. The NSBF released the 1999 report, Leadership Matters: Transforming Urban School Boards, to help school boards improve students’ academic achievement. The National School Boards Association [NSBA] has urged local school boards to make the improvement of student achievement a major objective (Speer, 1998). In addition to national organizations, state and local groups have begun working to focus school boards on academic achievement. In a 1997- 1998 national survey, school board members identified student achievement as their foremost concern (ASBJ, 1998). School board presidents, superintendents, and high school principals in a survey of 92 Wisconsin school districts frequently recommended concentration on student achievement and school improvement as a change that would improve the effectiveness of their school boards (Anderson, 1992). Unfortunately, a lack of time and established procedures, as well as the demands of numerous crises, often may preclude many school boards from devoting time directly to the improvement of students’ academic achievement (Carol et al., 1986).

**Parents as stakeholders**

In the early years, parents are their children’s first teachers — exploring nature, reading together, cooking together, and counting together. When a young child begins formal school, the parent’s job is to show him how school can extend the learning you began together at home, and how exciting and meaningful this learning can be. As preschoolers grow into school age kids, parents become their children’s learning coaches. Through guidance and reminders, parents help their kids organize their time and support their desires to learn new things in and out of school.

(http://www.pbs.org/parents/education/going-to-school/supporting-your-learner/role-of-parents/)

Involvement allows parents to monitor school and classroom activities, and to coordinate their efforts with teachers to encourage acceptable classroom behavior and ensure that the child completes schoolwork. Teachers of students with highly involved parents tend to give greater attention to those students, and they are more likely to identify at earlier stages problems that might inhibit student learning. Parental involvement in school, and positive parent-teacher interactions, have also been found to positively affect teachers’ self-perception and job satisfaction.

(<http://www.childtrends.org/?indicators=parental-involvement-in-schools#sthash.wNRlCb7x.dpuf>)

The percentage of students whose parents reported involvement in their schools rose significantly between 1999 and 2007 across several measures, including attendance at a general meeting, a meeting with a teacher, or a school event, and volunteering or serving on a committee.  However, these proportions fell or remained the same in 2012. (<http://www.childtrends.org/?indicators=parental-involvement-in-schools#sthash.wNRlCb7x.dpuf>)

**Parents and Academic Performance**

It is generally accepted that the quality of family interactions has important associations with children’s and adolescents’ academic motivation and achievement, and with young adults’ eventual educational and occupational attainments. Thomas Kellaghan and his colleagues (1993) claim, for example, that the family environment is the most powerful influence in determining students’ school achievement, academic motivation, and the number of years of schooling they will receive.

Similarly, Coleman (1991) states that parents’ involvement in learning activities has substantial emotional and intellectual benefits for children. He observes, however, that because supportive and strong families are significant for school success, teachers confront increasing challenges as many children experience severe family disruption and upheaval. Although it is acknowledged that families are perhaps the most substantial influence on children’s school success, it is not always clear which family influences are the most important. In addition, research findings are inconclusive about the extent to which relationships between family interactions and academic performance are independent of a child’s family background and family structure. Parents play key roles as educational stakeholders. Parents’ primary objective is the assurance that their children will receive a quality education, which will enable the children to lead productive rewarding lives as adults in a global society (Cotton and Wikelund, 2001).

Academic achievement is a tenacious topic of interest within the research community because researchers have found it to be a gauge of students’ adjustment to school and their future success (Rao, et al. 2000). Different researchers have concluded that students performance is closely interlinked with different factors which affect the performance in a positive or negative way, these factors can be behavioral, psychological, and social. It was found that children and youngsters who perform well academically, experience positive schooling develop social capability, and engage in pro-social behavior and establish good relationships with parents, teachers and peers (Masten, et al. 1995).

There are many researches which have investigated that participation of parents in their educational matters is utmost important (Bergsten 1998). Many researchers have resulted that if the parents take part in their children’s educational activities on regular basis, it enhances the performance of the children (Driessen, et al. 2005).

Gannan (2012) held that the greatest determining factor in the academic success of students is parental involvement and parental encouragement. The author concluded in his study that: “Good schools make a difference, but parental involvement better predicts a child’s performance than the qualities of the school he or she attends” However, parental involvement has an unquestionable role to play in helping schools attain excellence in academic performance (Uemura, 1999; Gabathuse, 2010:1).

However, according to Singh, Bickley, et al., (1995) which states current knowledge regarding the nature and magnitude of the effects of parental involvement in secondary education that is inconsistent and limited in scope.

**The Role of Stakeholders in Education towards Optimal Learning Outcome**

All stakeholders have the potential to benefit from the educational process. At a macro level, parents, communities, and schools make up a complex network of interactions that require continual give-and-take from each in order to best serve the learner. This dynamic relationship between parents, communities, and schools is in a constant state of flux as the learner progresses from K-12 as the learner becomes more independent and requires more real-world application. From a micro perspective, parents, communities, and schools each maintain a series of sub-networks that contribute to the overall educational process as well. Understanding the contributions and the benefits required from parents (or learners), communities, and schools both from a macro and micro perspective presents the complex network that is the educational process. The basis for improving learner outcomes through the development of dynamic relationships between parents, communities, and schools stems from the creation of an overall learning community. Sergiovanni’s theory (1999) of community consists of two ideal extremes: community (gemienschaft) and society (gesellschaft). Being part of a community refers more to a family-type relationship that focuses on the -we- as opposed to the -I-. Success is defined by the overall success of community and not solely on individual successes. In contrast, in a societal environment participants are more isolated and lonely as they each have certain agendas for justifying their interaction with others. Most schools, according to Sergiovanni (1999), reflect more of a societal phenomenon than on one based on community. In defining community DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, and Many provide insight into what makes a professional learning community among educators: –educators committed to working collaboratively in ongoing processes of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous, job-embedded learning for educators- (as cited in DuFour, DeFour, and Eaker, 2008, p. 14). Although this particular definition pertains to educators, the essence of this definition (i.e., -commitment to working collaboratively in ongoing processes of collective inquiry and action research-) could pertain to any number of stakeholders (e.g., administrators, learners, parents, and community leaders) – each determining their level of appropriate participation.

**Academic Performance**

Academic achievement represents performance outcomes that indicate the extent to which a person has accomplished specific goals that were the focus of activities in instructional environments, specifically in school, college, and university. School systems mostly define cognitive goals that either apply across multiple subject areas (e.g., critical thinking) or include the acquisition of knowledge and understanding in a specific intellectual domain (e.g., numeracy, literacy, science, history). Therefore, academic achievement should be considered to be a multifaceted construct that comprises different domains of learning. Because the field of academic achievement is very wide-ranging and covers a broad variety of educational outcomes, the definition of academic achievement depends on the indicators used to measure it.

Academic achievement as measured by the GPA (grade point average) or by standardized assessments designed for selection purpose such as the SAT (Scholastic Assessment Test) determines whether a student will have the opportunity to continue his or her education (e.g., to attend a university).

In Philippine setting, the proper indicator of how well does a pupil/student perform academically is being contained to the grades he/she receives.

In the Philippines’ Department of Education has recently issued and ordered a grading system for K to 12 curriculum.

This includes the grading scale to be used.

Grade Scale: Descriptors

90 -100 Outstanding

85 - 89 Very Satisfactory

80 - 84 Satisfactory

75 - 79 Fairly Satisfactory

Below 75 Did not meet expectations

Educators, trainers, and researchers have long been interested in exploring variables contributing effectively for quality of performance of learners. These variables are inside and outside school that affect students’ quality of academic achievement. These factors may be termed as student factors, family factors, school factors and peer factors (Crosnoe, Johnson & Elder, 2004).

**Department of Education School-Based Management**

According to DepEd former Secretary Jesli A. Lapus, from the Manual on the Assessment of School-Based Management Practices of the Department of Education released in 2009, the Department has stepped up its efforts to decentralize education management – a strategy that is expected to improve the Department’s operating efficiency and upgrade education quality. Accelerating the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM),a key component of Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda or BESRA. With SBM, the school as key provider of education, will be equipped to empower its key officials to make informed and localized decisions based on their unique needs toward improving our educational system.

The said Manual on Assessment of School-Based Management Practices has been produced as a tool to help educators manage and run schools efficiently and effectively. It highlights the strategic importance of educating children and other stakeholders in participating in educational activities. This emphasis will make the task of school heads and teachers easier, as the community will be one with them in their efforts to improve the school. The content of this Manual has been developed and prepared with the participation of education specialists who have practical and diverse experiences in their field. The concepts have been pilot-tested in several projects such as the Third Elementary Education Project (TEEP), the Secondary Education Development and Improvement Project (SEDIP), Basic Education Assistance for Mindanao (BEAM) and Strengthening the Implementation of Basic Education in the Visayas (STRIVE). The projects have created tremendous positive changes and improvement in the schools. After being tried out in project sites, the concepts were further validated by school heads in remote schools. He can say with full confidence that these concepts have been tried, tested and passed strict scrutiny.

In implementing SBM, the Department is doing all it can to create an environment where all the people involved commit to make change happen under a decentralized setup. This change is ultimately geared towards the school children’s enjoyment of their right to quality education and other equally important rights such as the right to be safe and healthy, to be protected from harm and abuse, to play and to have leisure, to express their views freely, and to participate in decision-making according to their evolving capacities. For this new setup to succeed, our principals and teachers need to develop their people skills and managerial capabilities.

In the said SBM assessment tool, the school’s stakeholders were classified into internal and external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders includes the school administration/school head, student clubs/organizations, teachers, Parent-teacher Association and the external stakeholders includes Local Government Unit/Local School Board, School Governing Council, parent association representative and alumni.

The Division of La Carlota last November 25, 2014 made an evaluation about the School-based Management of La Granja National High School where the result rated the school as developing which is the second highest rating of the performance of the school-based management practices which includes stakeholders’ support. Such rating based on the School-Based Management tool, means La Granja National High School is in level 2 in which the school is introducing and sustaining continuous improvement process.

**Chapter 3**

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This chapter discussed the research design, the subject and respondents, the data gathering instruments and procedures, and the data analysis that were used in this study.

**Research Design**

This study used the descriptive type of research. This design was described by Ardales(2008) as appropriate for behavioural studies which aimed to find out what prevail in the present such as conditions, held opinions and beliefs, processes and effects, and developing trends.

This process goes beyond mere gathering of data to familiarize oneself with those things as the process will involve classification, measurement, evaluation, comparison, and establishing relationship between or among variables. It will also explore causes of phenomenon, test hypotheses, and develop generalizations, principles and theories as offshoots of analyzed data.

Since the purpose of this study was to determine, describe and report the school’s stakeholders’ support as perceived by Grade 9 students of La Granja National High School and their academic performance, the researcher deemed it proper and necessary to use the descriptive research design.

**Subjects and Respondents of the Study**

The subjects of this study were the external and internal stakeholders of La Granja National High School, while the respondents were the Grade 9 students enrolled in La Granja National High School, La Carlota City for school year 2015-2016.

The total population of La Granja National High School Grade 9 students enrolled for S.Y. 215-2016 is 135.

The researcher took all the Grade 9 students as respondents.

**The Data Gathering Instrument**

The research instrument used in this study is a survey questionnaire adapted from the standardized DepEd School-Based Management evaluation/assessment tool for assessing school management performance.

**The Data Gathering Procedure**

Permission to conduct the study was first secured at the Office of the Dean of the Graduate School and the La Carlota City College President.

A copy of the approved letter was attached to each questionnaire. After it was approved, a letter was then sent to the Principal of La Granja National High School, requesting approval of the study to be conducted among the Grade 9 students.

The researcher then administered the survey questionnaires to the respondents. The researcher interpreted each question to the respondents to unlock difficulties for better understanding of each item. These were retrieved immediately by the researcher after giving enough time for the students to accomplish it. The survey was conducted during school days.

As to the academic performance of students, the researcher sought the assistance of the Guidance office and teacher-advisers of Grade 9 students.

**Data Analysis**

After collecting the data, the researcher tallied, tabulated, and analyzed the data gathered using descriptive statistics.

Descriptive statistics was used for the description and generalization of a particular group under investigation, according to Subong (2005). It specifically describes the basic features by providing sample summaries about the sample and measures of the study.

To determine the extents of schools stakeholders’ support as perceived by the Grade 9 students provided by internal stakeholders namely: the administrator/principal, students, teachers, Parents and Teachers Association, and external stakeholders namely: the Local Government Unit/Local School Board, and the parents, the scale below will be used:

***Score Range Verbal Interpretation***

5- Very high

4- High

3- Moderate

2- Low

1. Very low

The above numerical values were interpreted using the mean score range and their interpretations below:

4.21-5.00 – Very High extent

3.41-4.20 – High Extent

2.61-3.40 – Moderate Extent

1.81- 2.60– Low Extent

1.00-1.80 – Very Low Extent

The mean was also used to determine the academic performance of Grade 9 students using their general average from S.Y. 2013-2014, and S.Y. 2014-2015 that were gathered form their form 137 at the Guidance Office and the scale introduced by the Department of Education under the k+12 Basic Education Curriculum was used:

90 – 100 Outstanding

85 - 89 Very Satisfactory

80 - 84 Satisfactory

75 - 79 Fairly Satisfactory

Below 75 Did not Meet Expectations

To determine whether or not there is significant relationship between extents of parental support and the level of academic performance, Chi-square test was used.

**Chapter 4**

**PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered. The data are arranged comprehensively to answer the statements of the problem using the appropriate Statistical tools. This study aims to find out the *School’s Stakeholders’ Support and Its Relationship to Academic Performance as Perceived by the Students.*

**Schools Stakeholders Support**

There were 6 school’s stakeholders who were the subjects of this study. Their extent of support to the school was revealed as perceived by 135 Grade 9 students of La Granja National High School.

School Administrator/Principal. The extent of support provided by the school administrator/principal as perceived by Grade 9 students is presented in table 1.

Table 1. Students’ Perception on the extent of support of School Administrator/Principal

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School Administrator/ School Head** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **()** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Very High (5) | 22 | 16.30 |  |  |
| High (4) | 79 | 58.52 |  |  |
| Moderate (3) | 32 | 23.70 |  |  |
| Low (2) | 1 | 0.74 |  |  |
| Very low (1) | 1 | 0.74 |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **135** | **100** | **3.697** | **High** |

Table 1 reveals that out of 135 students, 79 or 58.52 % rated their School Administrator/Principal support as often which means high support, 32 or 23.70 % rated sometimes which means moderate support, 22 or 16.30 % rated almost always which means very high support, 1 or 0.74 % rated rarely which means low support and 1 or 0.74 % rated not at all which means very low support. Over all, the mean for school administrator/principal extent of support as perceived by the students is 3.697 which is verbally interpreted as high support. (see Appendix D).

This signifies that more than half of Grade 9 high school students perceived their school administrator/principal as being a supportive stakeholder of the school.

The result is in conformity with the study of John Aluko Orodho(2014) ,which cites that World Bank (2008) posits that much research has demonstrated that retention and the quality of education depends primarily on the way schools are managed, more than the abundance of available resources, the capacity of schools to improve teaching and learning is strongly influenced by the quality of the leadership provided by the head teacher. And the study of Graig & duParisis (1998) which states that well managed schools contribute to educational quality and enhance retention.

Student Clubs/Organizations. The extent of support provided by the student clubs/organizations as perceived by Grade 9 students is presented in table 2.

Table 2. Students’ Perception on the extent of support of Student Clubs/Organizations

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Students** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **()** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Very High (5) | 5 | 3.70 |  |  |
| High (4) | 31 | 22.96 |  |  |
| Moderate (3) | 64 | 47.41 |  |  |
| Low (2) | 25 | 18.52 |  |  |
| Very low (1) | 10 | 7.41 |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **135** | **100** | **2.947** | **Moderate** |

Table 2 shows that 64 or 47.41 % of Grade 9 students rated students’ clubs/organizations support as sometimes, which means moderate support, while 31 or 22.96 % responded often, which means they perceived students’ clubs/organizations to have a high extent of support. However, 25 or 18.52 % found students’ clubs/organizations as rarely supportive, which means low extent of support and 10 or 7.41 % of the students perceived students’ clubs/organizations as very low in support with their response of not at all. Overall, the mean for the Students’ clubs/organizations support as perceived by the students is 2.947 as moderate extent of support. (see Appendix D).

The result points out student clubs/organizations have an evident support to students as they perceived it to be moderate.

This result conforms to the study of Greenleaf (2003) which states that students consider the building of trust as the central issue for leadership by means of service. It was in line with this problem that most student leaders profess that they want to serve their fellow students instead of lording it over them.

Teachers. The extent of support provided by teachers as perceived by Grade 9 students is presented in table 3.

Table 3. Students’ Perception on the extent of Teachers support

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teachers** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **()** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Very High (5) | 62 | 45.93 |  |  |
| High (4) | 49 | 36.30 |  |  |
| Moderate (3) | 20 | 14.81 |  |  |
| Low (2) | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Very low (1) | 4 | 2.96 |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **135** | **100** | **3.979** | **High** |

Table 3 reveals that out of 135 students, 62 or 45.93 % responded almost always, which means they found their teachers as providing very high extent of support. This is followed by 49 or 36.30 % of the students rated their teachers as often, meaning, they found the extent of support of their teachers as high . Twenty (20) or 14.81 % posted sometimes, interpreted as moderate extent of support, and 4 or 2.96 % of the students rated their teachers not at all which means very low extent of support. Over all, the mean of students’ perception on the extent of teachers support is 3.979 which is verbally interpreted as high support. (see Appendix D)

The data shows that more than half of the students believed that their teachers are doing their roles positively and that they provide as much support to students.

This result is in conformity with the study of Short and Greer, (2002) that the teacher, along with the student, plays an interactive role in the education process because one cannot function without the other. “The empowerment of teachers will facilitate the empowerment of students.”

Parent-Teacher Association. The extent of support provided by the PTA as perceived by Grade 9 students is presented in table 4

Table 4. Students’ Perception on the extent of PTA support

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parent-Teacher Association** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **()** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Very High (5) | 14 | 10.37 |  |  |
| High (4) | 38 | 28.15 |  |  |
| Moderate (3) | 58 | 42.96 |  |  |
| Low (2) | 21 | 15.56 |  |  |
| Very low (1) | 4 | 2.96 |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **135** | **100** | **3.259** | Moderate |

Table 4 reveals that 58 or 42.96 % of the students, rated the PTA sometimes, which means that they find the PTA support as moderate, while 38 or 28.15 % responded often which means they feel that the PTA support as high, 21 or 15.56 % rated rarely, which means they find the PTA support as low, 14 or 10.37 % of them responded almost always, which means that they feel that the PTA support is very high and 4 or 2.96 % of them rated not at all which means that they find the PTA support to be very low. Over all, as perceived by the students, the mean for PTA support is 3.259 interpreted as moderate. (see Appendix D)

The data shows that nearly half of the students believed that the PTA support is moderately felt through their involvement in some school operations which directly affect the students.

The data agrees with the study of Edwards and Redfern, (1988) which cites The Scottish Parents Teachers Council (SPTC), definition of PTA: “A local people who recognize that the education of a child is a process of partnership between parents and teachers ( Ijaz Ahmad Tatlah et al.). PTA contributes to educational development in various ways and because of its nature and status is meant to perform different but complementary roles in the school.

Local Government Unit/Local School Board. The extent of support provided by the LGU/LSB as perceived by Grade 9 students is presented in table 5.

Table 5. Students’ Perception on the extent of LGU/LSB support

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **E. LGU/LSB** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **()** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Very High (5) | 9 | 6.67 |  |  |
| High (4) | 33 | 24.44 |  |  |
| Moderate (3) | 59 | 43.70 |  |  |
| Low (2) | 25 | 18.52 |  |  |
| Very low (1) | 9 | 6.67 |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **135** | **100** | **3.075** | **Moderate** |

Table 5 reveals that 59 students or 43.70 % rated the LGU/LSB sometimes, which means moderate support. Thirty-three or 24.44 % responded often and find the LGU/LSB support as high, 25 or 18.52 % of them rated rarely which means low support, 9 or 6.67 % of them responded almost always which means very high support and 9 or 6.67 % of them rated not at all and find the LGU/LSB support as very low. Over all, students perceived the LGU/LSB support to be moderate with the mean of 3.075. (see Appendix D).

The result indicates that nearly half of the students perceived LGU/LSB support as moderate. They perceived and experience the assistance and involvement of the LGU/LSB as a stakeholder directly in the school.

The result is in consonance to the study of Manasan and Castel (2009) which states that LGUs are considered major partners of the national government in the delivery of basic education services. Their participation particularly in providing funding support is critical in achieving the Education for All targets.

Parents. The extent of support provided by the parents as perceived by Grade 9 students is presented in table 6.

Table 6. Students’ Perception on the extent of Parents support

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parents** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **()** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Very High (5) | 50 | 37.04 |  |  |
| High (4) | 52 | 38.52 |  |  |
| Moderate (3) | 22 | 16.29 |  |  |
| Low (2) | 9 | 6.67 |  |  |
| Very low (1) | 2 | 1.48 |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **135** | **100** | **3.863** | **High** |

Table 6 shows that 52 or 38.52 % of the students rated their parents’ support often which means high support, 50 or 37.14 % of them responded almost always which means very high support, while 22 or 16.29 % of them responded sometimes meaning they find their parents’ support as moderate, 9 or 6.67 % of them rated rarely which means low support and 2 or 1.48 % responded not all which indicates a very low support from their parents. Over all, data reveals that students perceived their parents support as high with a mean of 3.863. (see Appendix D)

The data indicates that also nearly half of the students believed that their parents have become supportive of them as they are able to rate them with high extent. Thus, it follows how parents have become so concerned of their child’s education and performance in school, so necessary assistance is consistently given to them by their parents.

This result conforms to the study of Coleman (1991) which states that parents’ involvement in learning activities has substantial emotional and intellectual benefits for children.

Furthermore according to Cotton and Wikelund, (2001) Parents’ primary objective is the assurance that their children will receive a quality education, which will enable the children to lead productive rewarding lives as adults in a global society.

Over-all Internal stakeholders. The over- all extent of support provided by the internal stakeholders as perceived by Grade 9 students is presented in table 7.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Internal School Stakeholders** | **Mean** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| School Administrator/Principal | 3.697 | High |
| Student cubs/organizations | 2.947 | Moderate |
| Teachers | 3.979 | High |
| Parent-Teachers Association | 3.259 | Moderate |
|  | **3.471** | **High** |

Table 7. Over-all school’s internal stakeholders’ support as perceived by Grade 9 students

Table 7 shows that internal school’s stakeholders’ support such as the school administrator/principal, students ‘clubs/organizations, teachers, and PTA are perceived by the students as high with a mean of 3.471.( see Appendix D)

The data shows that internal stakeholders support is perceived by students to be evident in ways of providing the necessary help and assistance to the school. Their roles being played in education are being experienced by the students in ways or things which directly affects them.

According to Victoria Homes Elementary School in Muntinlupa City, Students, teachers, and administrators and parents as internal stakeholders plays an important role for the success and development of a school. Without the students, there will be no teachers. And without the administration and the parents, the organization’s mission, vision/goals cannot be achieved.

Over-all External stakeholders. The over- all extent of support provided by the external stakeholders as perceived by Grade 9 students is presented in table 8.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **External School Stakeholders** | **Mean** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Local Government Unit/Local School Board | 3.0698 | Moderate |
| Parents | 3.867 | High |
|  | **3.470** | **High** |

Table 8. Over-all school’s external stakeholders support as perceived by Grade 9 students

The data reveals that extent of support of external stakeholders namely the LGU/LSB and the parents, is high with the mean of 3.470.( see Appendix D)

This indicates that students perceived external stakeholders’ support as high. This shows that external stakeholders’ support is seen and experienced by the students in high amount through the assistance and necessary help that these stakeholders do in some of the schools’ operation which creates a direct impact to the students as how they perceived it to be.

According to Stan Paine and Richard McCann (2009) external stakeholders have a critical role to play in sustaining improved outcomes. The families who send their children to our schools, the taxpayers who support the schools, and the businesses who hire our graduates. In this light, external stakeholders can be highly motivated and can become powerful drivers to help achieve and sustain positive change in schools.

Over-all School’s Stakeholders Support. The over- all extent of support provided by all stakeholders specified in this study as perceived by Grade 9 students is presented in table 9.

Table 9. Over-all School’s Stakeholders support as perceived by Grade 9 students.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Stakeholders** | **Mean** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| School Administrator/Principal | 3.697 | High |
| Student clubs/organizations | 2.947 | Moderate |
| Teachers | 3.979 | High |
| Parent-Teachers-Association | 3.259 | Moderate |
| Local Government Unit/Local School Board | 3.075 | Moderate |
| Parents | 3.863 | High |
| **As a whole** | **3.470** | **High** |

Table 9 shows the overall perception of students on their school’s stakeholders. Teachers’ support gets the highest mean of 3.979 which is verbally interpreted as high. This is followed by parents’ support with the mean of 3.863 which also indicates high extent of support. School administrator/principal gets 3.697 interpreted as high. PTA with 3.259 mean is interpreted to have a moderate extent of support. It is followed by the LGU/LSB with the mean of 3.075 which means moderate extent of support. The lowest mean recorded among the stakeholders is 2.947, which shows that students perceived the support of the student clubs/organizations in their school as moderate. Over all, the mean for the extent of support for all schools stakeholders is 3.470 interpreted as high.

The result entails that students have a high perception on the over-all support of stakeholders as what they can see and experience in schools, that the direct or indirect presence of stakeholders is highly felt and recognized by them.

The result conforms to the study of Crosnoe, Johnson & Elder,(2004) which states that the quality of students’ performance remains at top priority for educators. It is meant for making a difference locally, regionally, nationally and globally. There are variables contributing effectively for quality of performance of learners. These variables are inside and outside school that affect students’ quality of academic achievement. These factors may be termed as *student factors, family factors, school factors and peer factors.*

**Academic Performance of Grade 9 High School Students**

Individual grades of students or their general weighted average during their grades 7 and 8 were determined through their form 137 records at the guidance office. The weighted mean average grade was computed using their grades for two consecutive school years 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 or during their grades 7 and 8. Grade 9 Academic Performance is presented in table 10.

Table 10. Grade 9 Students’ Academic Performance

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Performance** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **()** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| 90-100 | 39 | 28.89 |  |  |
| 85-89 | 45 | 33.33 |  |  |
| 80-84 | 43 | 31.85 |  |  |
| 75-79 | 8 | 5.93 |  |  |
| Below 75 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **135** | **100** | **86.77** | **Very Satisfactory** |

Table 10 shows the academic performance of Grade 9 students. Data revealed that out of 135 students, 45 or 33.33 % has a grade of 85-89, interpreted as very satisfactory. This is followed by 43 students or 31.85 % having a grade of 80-84, interpreted as satisfactory. Thirty-nine (39) or 28.89 % revealed a grade of 90-100 interpreted as outstanding. Eight (8) has a grade of 75-79 interpreted as fairly satisfactory. Nobody got the lowest rating 75. Over all, the general weighted mean for the academic performance of Grade 9 students is 86.77 interpreted as very satisfactory.

This means that nearly half of the students have either a grade of 85-89 interpreted as very satisfactory. It shows that students have good grades as they gain such rating.

The result supports the data of La Granja National High School Guidance Office about the academic performance of La Granja National High School students which indicates 55 % of its population has very satisfactory rating.

**Relationship Between School Administrator/Principal extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance**

The relationship between extent of support of school administrator / principal as perceived by the students and students’ academic performance is presented in table 11.

Table 11. Relationship Between School Administrator/Principal extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Extent of Support** | **Level of Academic Performance** | | | | | **Total** |
| **Outstanding** | **Very Satisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Fairly**  **Satisfactory** | **Did not Meet Expectations** |
| **Very High** | 7 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 22 |
| **High** | 24 | 21 | 30 | 4 | 0 | 79 |
| **Moderate** | 7 | 13 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 32 |
| **Low** | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| **Very Low** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| **Total** | **39** | **45** | **43** | **8** | **0** | **135** |

**X2 0.05 = 28.84**

**X2 = 12.79**

**Ho = accept**

The table shows that 39 of the students belong to outstanding level of academic performance. Out of 39, 24 perceived high extent of support for school/administrator, 7 perceived very high and 7 perceived moderate extent. One (1) perceived low and none perceived very low extent of support. Forty-five (45) students belong to very satisfactory level of academic performance; out of these, 21 of them perceived high extent of support for school administrator, 13 perceived moderate, 10 perceived very high extent of support and no one perceived low and very low support. For the satisfactory level of academic performance there were 43 students. Thirty (30) perceived high extent of support for school administrator, followed by 10 who perceived moderate support, 2 perceived very high extent, and none perceived very low extent. Eight (8) belong to fairly satisfactory level of academic performance; 4 of them perceived high extent, 2 perceived very high extent and 2 also for moderate extent. Nobody belong to did not meet expectations level of academic performance.

To determine whether or not the school administrator/principal and students’ academic performance are related, the Chi- square test was applied.

Based on the data gathered, for the School administrator/principal and students’ academic performance, the computed value of the Chi-square was derived at 12.79, which is less than the tabular value of 28.84 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between school administrator/principal support and students’ academic performance is accepted. This means that the extent of support of the school administrator/principal do not affect the grades of high school students.

This result agrees with the study of Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982) which studies considered pioneering efforts directed toward a deeper understanding of instructional leadership roles of a school principal. These researchers emphasized that a school principal, through his or her activities, roles, and behaviors in managing school structures does not affect student achievement directly.

This also conforms to the study of Hallinger and Heck, (1996) which they emphasized the fact that administrative leadership was among the factors that made the greatest difference in student understanding and learning. However, the nature of this relationship remained open to debate and research.

However, the result of this study is in contradiction to Spillane, Camburn, and Pareja, (2007), when they state that the site administrator represents the single most influential stakeholder in the school setting and is expected to set the academic tone for students, parents, staff, and community members through effective participatory leadership.

**Relationship Between Student clubs/organizations extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance**

The relationship between extent of support of student clubs/organizations as perceived by the students and students’ academic performance is presented in table 12.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Extent of Support** | **Level of Academic Performance** | | | | | **Total** |
| **Outstanding** | **Very Satisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Fairly**  **Satisfactory** | **Did not Meet Expectations** |
| **Very High** | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| **High** | 15 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 31 |
| **Moderate** | 14 | 27 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 64 |
| **Low** | 5 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 25 |
| **Very Low** | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| **Total** | **39** | **45** | **43** | **8** | **0** | **135** |

Table 12. Relationship Between Student Clubs/Organizations extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance.

**X2 0.05 = 28.84**

**X2 = 23.55**

**Ho = accept**

The table shows that 39 students belong to outstanding level of academic performance. Out of the 39, fifteen (15) perceived high extent of support for student club/organizations, 14 perceived moderate extent,5 perceived low, 4 perceived very high extent and one perceived very low extent of support. Forty-five students belong to very satisfactory level of academic performance. Twenty-seven (27) of them perceived the support of student clubs/organizations as moderate, 7 perceived low, 6 perceived high extent, 4 perceived very low extent and one perceived very high. For the satisfactory level of academic performance there are 43 students. Seventeen (17) of them perceived moderate extent for student clubs/organizations, followed by 12 who perceived low extent, 9 perceived high extent,5 perceived low extent and none perceived very high extent. Eight (8) belong to fairly satisfactory level of academic performance. Six of them perceived moderate extent for student clubs/organizations, 1 perceived high extent and 1 for low extent. Nobody belong to did not meet expectations level of academic performance.

To determine whether or not the student clubs/organizations and students’ academic performance are related, the Chi- square test is applied.

Based on the data gathered, for the student clubs/organizations and students’ academic performance, the computed value of the Chi-square is derived at 23.55, which is less than the tabular value of 28.84 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between students’ clubs/organizations support and students’ academic performance is accepted. This means that the extent of support of the school students’ clubs/organizations do not affect the grades of high school students.

This result conforms to the study made by the Office of Institutional Research by Paul Dela Ahiatrogah and, Albert  Kobina Koomson (2011) which states that students’ perception of their leadership role is high. This high perception however has no relationship with age, level, employment status, prior leadership experience or gender. It is also concluded that high academic performance is not dependent on perceived student leadership characteristics, role expectations, and duties and responsibilities. However, perceived leadership role expectation was found to be the least potent contributor to academic performance of students.

However, it contradicts with the study of Waters, Marzanno, and McNulty (2003) which states that leadership behaviours significantly correlated with student achievement of the school.

**Relationship Between Teachers Extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance**

The relationship between extent of support of teachers as perceived by the students and students’ academic performance is presented in table 13.

Table 13. Relationship Between Teachers extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Extent of Support** | **Level of Academic Performance** | | | | | **Total** |
| **Outstanding** | **Very Satisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Fairly**  **Satisfactory** | **Did not Meet Expectations** |
| **Very High** | 24 | 16 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 62 |
| **High** | 12 | 19 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 49 |
| **Moderate** | 3 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 20 |
| **Low** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Very Low** | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| **Total** | **39** | **45** | **43** | **8** | **0** | **135** |

**X2 0.05= 28.84**

**X2=8.80**

**Ho=accept**

The table shows that 39 students belong to outstanding level of academic performance. Out of 39 Twenty-four (24) perceived very high extent of support for teachers, 12 perceived high extent, 3 perceived moderate, and nobody perceived low and very low extent. Forty-five students belong to very satisfactory level of academic performance. Nineteen (19) of them perceived high extent support for teachers, 16 belong perceived high extent, 8 perceived moderate extent, 2 perceived very low extent and no one perceived low. For the satisfactory level of academic performance there are 43 students. Out of 43 Nineteen (19) perceived very high extent of support for teachers , followed by 14 who perceived high extent, 8 perceived moderate extent,2 perceived very low extent and none perceived low extent. Eight (8) belong to fairly satisfactory level of academic performance. Four (4) of them perceived high extent for teachers, 3 perceived very high extent, 1 perceived moderate extent, and no one perceived low and very low extent. Nobody belong to did not meet expectations level of academic performance.

To determine whether or not the teachers’ extent of support and students’ academic performance are related, the Chi- square test is applied.

Based on the data gathered, for the teachers’ support and students’ academic performance, the computed value of the Chi-square is derived at 8.80, which is less than the tabular value of 28.84 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between teachers support and students’ academic performance is accepted. This means that the extent of support of the teachers do not affect the grades of high school students.

The result agrees to the study made by Kara and Russell (2001) in which they state that there has been no consensus on the importance of specific teacher factors, leading to the common conclusion that the existing empirical evidence does not find a strong role for teachers in the determination of academic achievement.

It also conforms to the study made by Steven G. Rivkin, Eric A. Hanushek, And John F. Kain,(2005) which states that teachers characteristics and experience is not significantly related to achievement. These findings explain much of the contradiction between the perceived role of teachers as the key determinant of school quality and the body of research showing that observed teacher characteristics including experience and education explain little of the variation in student achievement.

On the other hand, it contradicts the study made by Olanipekun, Shola Sunday, Aina, Jacob Kola(2014), in which they concluded that the success of any teaching and learning process which influences students’ academic performance depend on how effective and efficient the teachers are and that the quality of a teacher has a positive correlation with student achievement in school.

**Relationship Between Parent-Teacher Association extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance**

The relationship between extent of support of PTA as perceived by the students and students’ academic performance is presented in table 14.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Extent of Support** | **Level of Academic Performance** | | | | | **Total** |
| **Outstanding** | **Very Satisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Fairly**  **Satisfactory** | **Did not Meet Expectations** |
| **Very High** | 11 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| **High** | 22 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| **Moderate** | 4 | 22 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 58 |
| **Low** | 2 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 21 |
| **Very Low** | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| **Total** | **39** | **45** | **43** | **8** | **0** | **135** |

Table 14. Relationship Between PTA extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance.

**X2 0.05=28.84**

**X2=56.06**

**Ho=reject**

The table shows that 39 students belong to outstanding level of academic performance. Out of 39 twenty-two (22) perceived high extent of support for PTA, 11 perceived very high extent, 4 perceived moderate, 2 perceived low and none perceived very low extent. Forty-five (45) students belong to very satisfactory level of academic performance. Twenty-two (22) of them perceived moderate extent of support for PTA, 10 perceived low extent, 9 perceived high extent, 2 perceived very high extent and 2 perceived very low extent. For the satisfactory level of academic performance there are 43 students. Out of 43 twenty-five (25) perceived moderate extent of support for PTA, followed by 8 who perceived low extent, 7 perceived high extent,2 perceived very low extent and one perceived very high extent. Eight (8) belong to fairly satisfactory level of academic performance. Seven (7) of them perceived moderate extent of support for PTA, and no one perceived very high, low, and very low extent. Nobody belong to did not meet expectations level of academic performance.

To determine whether or not the PTA extent of support and students’ academic performance are related, the Chi- square test is applied.

Based on the data gathered, for the PTA support and students’ academic performance, the computed value of the Chi-square is derived at 56.06, which is greater than the tabular value of 28.84 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between PTA support and students’ academic performance is rejected. This means that the extent of support of the PTA affects the grades of high school students.

This result is in line with the study made by Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Furrer & Skinner, (2003); Wentzel, (1999) that the quality of parent–teacher relationship has consequences for children’s achievement.

It also conforms to the study of Stevenson and Baker (1987) using a sample of 179 teachers and children, which test the effect of parental involvement in activities of the school like “parent-teacher organization and parent-teacher conferences” on student achievement. They find that parental involvement in school is associated with higher student achievement.

On the contrary, the result does not agree with the research of Okpala and colleagues (2001) which finds no significant relationship between the number of parental volunteer hours and fourth grade mathematics achievement.

**Relationship Between Local Government Unit/Local School Board Extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance**

The relationship between extent of LGU/LSB support as perceived by the students and students’ academic performance is presented in table 15.

Table 15. Relationship Between LGU/LSB extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Extent of Support** | **Level of Academic Performance** | | | | | **Total** |
| **Outstanding** | **Very Satisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Fairly**  **Satisfactory** | **Did not Meet Expectations** |
| **Very High** | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| **High** | 17 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 33 |
| **Moderate** | 13 | 21 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 59 |
| **Low** | 2 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 25 |
| **Very Low** | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| **Total** | **39** | **45** | **43** | **8** | **0** | **135** |

**X2 0.05=28.84**

**X2=26.02**

**Ho=accept**

The table shows that 39 students belong to outstanding level of academic performance. Out of 39 seventeen (17) perceived high extent of support for LGU/LSB, 13 perceived moderate, 6 perceived very high extent, 2 perceived low and one perceived very low extent. Forty-five (45) students belong to very satisfactory level of academic performance. Twenty-one (21) of them perceived moderate extent of support for LGU/LSB, 13 perceived low extent, 6 perceived high extent, 4 perceived very low extent and 1 perceived very high extent. For the satisfactory level of academic performance there are 43 students. Out of 43 twenty (20) perceived moderate extent of support for LGU/LSB, followed by 9 who perceived high extent, 8 perceived low extent,4 perceived very low extent and two perceived very high extent. Eight (8) belong to fairly satisfactory level of academic performance. Five (5) of them perceived moderate extent of support for LGU/LSB , 2 perceived low, and one perceived high extent. Nobody belong to did not meet expectations level of academic performance.

To determine whether or not the LGU/LSB extent of support and students’ academic performance are related, the Chi- square test is applied.

Based on the data gathered, for the LGU/LSB support and students’ academic performance, the computed value of the Chi-square is derived at 26.02, which is lesser than the tabular value of 28.84 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between LGU/LSB support and students’ academic performance is accepted. This means that the extent of support of the LGU/LSB does not affect the grades of high school students.

The result agrees with the studies done by several researchers namely Carol, Cunningham, Danzberger, Kirst, McCloud, & Usdan, (1986); Chubb & Moe, (1990); Danzberger, (1992), (1994); Danzberger, Carol, Cunningham, Kirst, McCloud, & Usdan, (1987); Danzberger & Usdan, (1994); Finn, (1991); HarringtonLueker, (1996);; NSBF, (1999); Olson, (1992); Streshly & Frase,(1993); Todras, (1993); Whitson, (1998); Wilson, (1994)which states that LGU/LSB is out-dated and incapable of effectively leading educational reforms to improve students’ academic achievement, particularly in urban areas.

It also supports the research of Resnick (1999 which states that school boards have traditionally focused on financial, legal, and constituent issues, and have left responsibility for students’ academic achievement to their administrators and educators.

However, it contradicts the 1997- 1998 national survey, where it has been found that school board members identified student achievement as their foremost concern (ASBJ, 1998). School board presidents, superintendents, and high school principals in a survey of 92 Wisconsin school districts frequently recommended concentration on student achievement and school improvement as a change that would improve the effectiveness of their school boards (Anderson, 1992).

**Relationship Between Parents’ Extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance**

The relationship between extent of parents’ support as perceived by the students and students’ academic performance is presented in table 16.

Table 16. Relationship Between Parents’ extent of support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic Performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Extent of Support** | **Level of Academic Performance** | | | | | **Total** |
| **Outstanding** | **Very Satisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Fairly**  **Satisfactory** | **Did not Meet Expectations** |
| **Very High** | 19 | 14 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 50 |
| **High** | 12 | 18 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 52 |
| **Moderate** | 6 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| **Low** | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| **Very Low** | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| **Total** | **39** | **45** | **43** | **8** | **0** | **135** |

**X2 0.05=28.84**

**X2=7.55**

**Ho=accept**

The table shows that 39 students belong to outstanding level of academic performance. Nineteen (19) perceived very high extent of support for parents 12 perceived high extent, 6 perceived moderate extent, 2 perceived low and no one perceived very low extent. Forty-five (45) students belong to very satisfactory level of academic performance. Eighteen (18) of them perceived high extent of support for parents, 14 perceived very high extent, 8 perceived moderate extent, 4 perceived low extent and 1 belong to very low extent. For the satisfactory level of academic performance there are 43 students. Seventeen (17) perceived high extent of support for parents, followed by 14 who perceived very high extent, 8 perceived moderate extent,3 perceived low extent and one perceived very low extent. Eight (8) belong to fairly satisfactory level of academic performance. Five (5) of them perceived high extent of support for parents, 3 perceived very high extent, and no one perceived moderate, low, and very low extents of support. Nobody belong to did not meet expectations level of academic performance.

To determine whether or not the parents’ extent of support and students’ academic performance are related, the Chi- square test is applied.

Based on the data gathered, for the parents’ support and students’ academic performance, the computed value of the Chi-square is derived at 7.55, which is lesser than the tabular value of 28.84 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between parents’ support and students’ academic performance is accepted. This means that the extent of support of the parents as perceived by the students does not affect the grades of high school students.

This result agrees with the study of Uemura, (1999) and Gabathuse, (2010) which reveals that parental involvement has an unquestionable role to play in helping schools attain excellence in academic performance.

It also conforms to the study made by Singh, Bickley, et al., (1995) which states current knowledge regarding the nature and magnitude of the effects of parental involvement in secondary education is inconsistent and limited in scope.

However, it opposes the study of Gannan (2012) in which he held that the greatest determining factor in the academic success of students is parental encouragement.

**Summary of the Relationship Between the School’s Stakeholders’ Extent of Support as perceived by the students and Students’ Academic performance.**

Table 17. Summary table of the Relationship Between Extent of School’s Stakeholders’ Support as perceived by the students and Students’ level of Academic Performance.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Schools’ Stakeholders** | **X2 computed value** | **X2 Tabular value** | **Interpretation** |
| **School Administrator/Principal** | **12.79** | **28.84** | **Not Significant** |
| **Students’ Clubs/Organizations** | **23.55** | **28.84** | **Not Significant** |
| **Teachers** | **8.80** | **28.84** | **Not Significant** |
| **PTA** | **56.06** | **28.84** | **Significant** |
| **LGU** | **26.02** | **28.84** | **Not Significant** |
| **Parents** | **7.55** | **28.84** | **Not Significant** |
| **As a whole** | **26.65** | **28.84** | **Not Significant** |

The summary table reveals that out of the 6 school’s stakeholders, five (5) which are school administrator/principal, student clubs/organizations, teachers, local government unit/local school board and parents posted no significant relationships on students’ academic performance and only the PTA as one of the 6 stakeholders revealed a significant relationship with students’ academic performance.

This means that the extent of support of the 5 school’s stakeholders as perceived by the students does not affect the academic performance of the students while students’ academic performance is influenced by the support of the Parent-Teacher Association of the school in moderation as it has acquired a moderate extent of rating from the students.

Over all, data shows that school’s stakeholders extent of support as perceived by the students has no significant relationship with the students’ academic performance as it derived using the Chi-square test 26.65 computed value which is lesser than the critical value of 28.84. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between school’s stakeholders’ extent of support as perceived by the students and students’ academic performance is accepted.

Thus, it means that the extent of support of school’s stakeholders as perceived by grade 9 students has no significant relationship on the academic performance of the students.

This result is in conformity with the study of Adams (2005) where he acknowledged that the existing relationship between the impact of stakeholders and students’ academic performance has not been quite clear, it is not worthy that various experts and researchers had endeavoured to establish a solid relationship between the impact of stakeholders and students’ academic performance.

This also agrees with the study of Berlak (2000) which states that academic success is, no doubt, the main focus of all educational activities which has received tremendous attention from stakeholders. However, prediction of academic success is still not clear. Apparently, predictability of academic achievement is a complex (and by no means an easy) task.

**CHAPTER 5**

**SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS**

This chapter presents the summary of the study, the findings based on the results, and the recommendations based on the outcome of the study.

**Summary**

This study sought to find out the school’s stakeholders’ support and its relationship to academic performance as perceived by the students.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of support provided by the following school’s stakeholders as perceived by Grade 9 students when taken as a whole and when grouped according to:
2. Internal stakeholders:
3. School Administrator/Principal
4. Student clubs/organizations
5. Teachers
6. PTA(Parent Teacher Association)

2. External Stakeholders:

1. Local Government Unit(LGU)/Local School Board(LSB)
2. Parents

2. What is the level of academic performance of Grade 9 students?

3.Is there a significant relationship between the extent of school’s stakeholders’ support and the level of academic performance of Grade 9 students?

The subjects of this study were the 6 stakeholders such as the school administrator/principal, student clubs/organizations, teachers, Parent-Teacher Association, Local Government Unit/Local School Board, and parents and the respondents of this study were the Grade 9 high school students of La Granja National High School. The study utilized the descriptive method which involved collecting data through the use of a standardized questionnaire to capture the extent of support of the 6 school’s stakeholders, as perceived by Grade 9 students. Likewise, record from the Guidance office were availed to secure the academic performance of Grade 9 students.

The data gathered were analyzed and interpreted using the descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages and mean. The Chi-square test was applied to find out whether or not the variables were significantly related.

**Findings**

The major findings of the study were as follows:

1. Extent of Support of School’s Stakeholders

1.a School Administrator/Principal. out of 135 grade 9 students, 79 or 58.52 % rated their school administrator/principal support as often which means high support, 32 or 23.70 % rated sometimes which means moderate support, 22 or 16.30 % rated almost always which means very high support, 1 or 0.74 % rated rarely which means low support and 1 or 0.74 % rated not at all which means very low support. Over all, the mean for school administrator/principal extent of support as perceived by the students is 3.697 which is verbally interpreted as high support. It signifies that more than half of Grade 9 high school students perceived their school administrator/principal is achieving its sustainability in supporting the school as it acquired high perception from the students.

1.b. Student Clubs/Organizations. 64 or 47.41 % of Grade 9 students rated student clubs/organizations support as sometimes, which means moderate support, while 31 or 22.96 % responded often, which means they perceive student clubs/organizations to have a high extent of support. However, 25 or 18.52 % found student clubs/organizations as rarely supportive, which means low extent of support and 10 or 7.41 % of the students perceived student clubs/organizations as very low in support with their response of not at all. Overall, the mean for the student clubs/organizations support as perceived by the students is 2.947 as moderate extent of support. This pointed out that student clubs/organizations have an evident support to students as they perceived it to be moderate.

1.c Teachers. Out of 135 students, 62 or 45.93 % responded almost always, which means they found their teachers as providing very high extent of support. This is followed by 49 or 36.30 % of the students rated their teachers as often, meaning, they found their teachers to be giving high extent of support. Twenty (20) or 14.81 % posted sometimes, interpreted as moderate extent of support, and 4 or 2.96 % of the students rated their teachers not at all which means very low extent of support. Over all, the mean of student perception on the extent of teachers support is 3.979 which is verbally interpreted as high support. This shows that more than half of the students believed that their teachers are doing their roles positively and its sustainability has been perceived high by the students.

1.d Parent-Teacher Association. 58 or 42.96 % of the students, rated the PTA sometimes, which means that they find the PTA support as moderate, while 38 or 28.15 % responded often which means they feel that the PTA support is high, 21 or 15.56 % rated rarely, which means they find the PTA support as low, 14 or 10.37 % of them responded almost always, which means that they feel that the PTA support as very high and 4 or 2.96 % of them rated not at all which means that they find the PTA support to be very low. Over all, as perceived by the students, the mean for PTA support is 3.259 interpreted as moderate. It shows that nearly half of the students believed that the PTA support is moderately felt through their involvement in some school operations which directly affect the students.

1.e Local Government Unit/Local School Board. 59 students or 43.70 % rated the LGU/LSB sometimes, which means moderate support. Thirty-three or 24.44 % responded often and find the LGU/LSB support as high, 25 or 18.52 % of them rated rarely which means low support, 9 or 6.67 % of them responded almost always which means very high support and 9 or 6.67 % of them rated not at all and find the LGU/LSB support as very low. Over all, students perceived the LGU/LSB support to be moderate with the mean of 3.075. This indicates that nearly half of the students perceived LGU/LSB support as moderate. They perceived and experienced the assistance and involvement of the LGU/LSB as a stakeholder of the school.

1.f Parents. 52 or 38.52 % of the students rated their parents’ support often which means high support, 50 or 37.14 % of them responded almost always which means very high support, while 22 or 16.29 % of them responded sometimes meaning they find their parents’ support as moderate, 9 or 6.67 % of them rated rarely which means low support and 2 or 1.48 % responded not at all which indicates a very low support from their parents. Over all, data reveals that students perceived their parents support to be high with a mean of 3.863. Thus, it indicates that also nearly half of the students believed that their parents have become supportive of them as they are able to rate them with high extent. It follows how parents have become so concerned of their child’s education and performance in school, so the sustainable support and assistance that they are giving to their children is perceived high by the students.

1.g Over-all Internal stakeholders. Internal school’s stakeholders’ support such as the school administrator/principal, student clubs/organizations, teachers, and PTA are perceived by the students as high with a mean of 3.471. It shows that internal stakeholders support is perceived by students to be evident in ways of providing the necessary help and assistance to the school. Their roles being played in education are being experienced by the students in ways or things which directly affects them.

1.h Over-all External stakeholders. Extent of support of external school’s stakeholders namely the LGU/LSB and the parents is high with the mean of 3.470. This indicates that students perceived external stakeholders’ support to be high. This shows that external stakeholders support is seen and experienced by the students in high amount through the assistance and necessary help that these stakeholders do in some of the schools’ operation which creates a direct impact to the students as how they perceived it to be.

1.i Over-all School’s Stakeholders Support. Teachers got the highest mean of 3.979 which is verbally interpreted as high. This is followed by parents’ support with the mean of 3.863 which also indicates high extent of support. School administrator/principal gets 3.697 interpreted as high. PTA with 3.259 mean is interpreted to have a moderate extent of support. It is followed by the LGU/LSB with the mean of 3.075 which means moderate extent of support. The lowest mean recorded among the stakeholders is 2.947, which shows that students perceived the support of the student clubs/organizations in their school as moderate. Over all, the mean for the extent of support for all school’s stakeholders is 3.470 interpreted as high. This entails that students have a high perception on the over-all support of stakeholders as what they can see and experience in schools, that the direct or indirect presence of stakeholders’ support is highly felt and recognized by them giving in emphasis to sustainable development as a primary goal of each stakeholder for the school.

Therefore, sustainability as the core of each values and programs that each stakeholder is giving to the school imposes a positive perception to the students through the support they are giving to the school.

2. On the Academic Performance of Grade 9 students. Out of 135 students, 45 or 33.33 % has a grade of 85-89, interpreted as very satisfactory. This is followed by 43 students or 31.85 % having a grade of 80-84, interpreted as satisfactory. Thirty-nine (39) or 28.89 % revealed a grade of 90-100 interpreted as outstanding. Eight (8) has a grade of 75-79 interpreted as fairly satisfactory. Nobody got the lowest rating 75. Over all, the general weighted mean for the academic performance of Grade 9 students during their grade 7 and 8 of S.y. 2013-2014 and S.y.2014-2015 is is 86.77 interpreted as very satisfactory. This means that nearly half of the students have either a grade of 85-89 interpreted as very satisfactory. It shows that students have good grades as they gain such rating.

3.On the Relationship of school’s stakeholders’ extent of support and students’ academic performance. out of the 6 school’s stakeholders, five (5) which are school administrator/principal, student clubs/organizations, teachers, local government unit/local school board and parents posted no significant relationships on students’ academic performance. This means that the extent of support of the 5 school’s stakeholders do not affect the academic performance of the students. The PTA as one of the 6 stakeholders revealed a significant relationship with students’ academic performance. It means that the students’ academic performance is influenced by the support of the Parent-Teacher Association of the school in moderation as it has acquired a moderate extent of rating from the students. Over all, data shows that school’s stakeholders’ extent of support has no significant relationship with the students’ academic performance as it derived using the Chi-square test 26.65 computed value which is lesser than the critical value of 28.84. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between school’s stakeholders’ extent of support and students’ academic performance is accepted. Thus, the data shows that the extent of support of school’s stakeholders no matter how high as perceived by grade 9 students has no significant relationship on the academic performance of the students.

**Conclusions**

On the basis of the foregoing findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. School administrator/principal was perceived by the students as providing high support as well as the teachers, while moderate support is being provided by student clubs/organizations and the Parent-teacher Association. Over all, the extent of support of internal school’s stakeholders such as the school administrator/principal, student clubs/organizations, teachers, and Parent-teacher Association was perceived by the students as high.

Local Government Unit/Local School Board is perceived to be in moderate support and parents are perceived to be high in support. Over all, the extent of support of external stakeholders as perceived by the students is high.

Over all school’s stakeholders were perceived by the students as high extent of support with 3.470 mean.

Therefore, a sustainable support can be perceived by the students, in a way that it directly affects them.

1. Academic Performance of Grade 9 students are found very satisfactory with the mean of 86.77.
2. School’s stakeholders support namely the school administrator/principal, student clubs/organizations, teachers, Local Government Unit/Local School Board, and parents were found to be not significant on students’ academic performance, while the Parent-teacher Association was found to have a significant relationship on students’ academic performance. Over all, school’s stakeholders’ extent of support as perceived by the students has no significant relationship on students’ academic performance.

**Recommendations**

Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are given:

1. Since the extent of support of internal, external and over all stakeholders was found high, best practices should be sustained and regularly evaluated. The school must also continue to build strong relationships among the stakeholders involved through programs which promote unity and cooperation among the mentioned stakeholders like stakeholders’ summit every quarter to plan, implement, and evaluate programs of the school. Stakeholders such as school administrator/principal, teachers and parents must continue the strategies and techniques used in helping the students, and look for more ways or things that will be more beneficial to the students. Parent-Teacher Association, Local Government Unit/Local School Board and student clubs/organizations as they acquired a moderate support perception from the students must strengthen their programs and activities and utilize them to directly assist the students in school. They should also make time and effort to acquaint the students about their roles and responsibilities in school, they can call for a general assembly every opening of classes.
2. Since students’ level of academic performance is very satisfactory, the school must continue its academic practices and programs which strengthen and improve students’ academic performance.
3. Since over all school’s stakeholders has no significant relationship on students’ academic performance, stakeholders are encouraged to plan programs and activities pertaining to raising students’ academic achievement in school, or goals and objectives of the stakeholders must be re-visited and improved in which academic performance of the students must be given more emphasis.

For Parent-Teacher Association where moderate extent of support as perceived by the students has a significant relationship to academic performance, activities and programs must be sustained and strengthened. New programs and practices must be developed like Parent-Teacher Home Visit Project where educators and parents will visit students and their families at home, building trusting relationships, and shared instructional tools. Through this, they could enhance their social relationship as how the study of Coleman (1988,1990) stated that a strong and close relationship between parents and teachers to children creates a climate of discipline and trust, which is beneficial for children’s learning progress.

1. In order for relationship of stakeholders and school be strengthened, annual recognition of stakeholders’ support can be done. Giving of certificates or token which help recognize the efforts of stakeholders which may encourage them to do better and will inspire them to reflect among themselves what they have accomplished and what they wanted to achieve more for the school.
2. Further study is recommended to find out the extent of school’s stakeholders’ support and its relationship to academic performance as perceived by the students on a larger scale like in the whole Division of La Carlota City.