**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 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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **School Administrator/ School Head** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **(X)** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Almost Always (5) | 22 | 16.30 |  |  |
| Often(4) | 79 | 58.52 |  |  |
| Sometimes(3) | 32 | 23.70 |  |  |
| Rarely(2) | 1 | 0.74 |  |  |
| Not at all(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 perceive 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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Students** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **(X)** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Almost Always (5) | 5 | 3.70 |  |  |
| Often(4) | 31 | 22.96 |  |  |
| Sometimes(3) | 64 | 47.41 |  |  |
| Rarely(2) | 25 | 18.52 |  |  |
| Not at all(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 perceive students’ clubs/organizations to have a high extent of support. However, 25 or 18.52 % found students’ clubs/organizations as rarely supportive, which mean low extent of support and 10 or 7.41 % of the students perceive 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 that student clubs/organizations have an evident support to students as they perceive 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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Teachers** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **(X)** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Almost Always (5) | 62 | 45.93 |  |  |
| Often(4) | 49 | 36.30 |  |  |
| Sometimes(3) | 20 | 14.81 |  |  |
| Rarely(2) | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Not at all(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 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 students’ perception on the extent of teachers support is 3.979 which is verbally interpreted as high support. (see Appendix E)

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **PTA** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **(X)** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Almost Always (5) | 14 | 10.37 |  |  |
| Often(4) | 38 | 28.15 |  |  |
| Sometimes(3) | 58 | 42.96 |  |  |
| Rarely(2) | 21 | 15.56 |  |  |
| Not at all(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 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. (see Appendix E)

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**  **(X)** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Almost Always (5) | 9 | 6.67 |  |  |
| Often(4) | 33 | 24.44 |  |  |
| Sometimes(3) | 59 | 43.70 |  |  |
| Rarely(2) | 25 | 18.52 |  |  |
| Not at all(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 E).

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Parents** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **(X)** | **Verbal Interpretation** |
| Almost Always (5) | 50 | 37.04 |  |  |
| Often(40 | 52 | 38.52 |  |  |
| Sometimes(3) | 22 | 16.29 |  |  |
| Rarely(2) | 9 | 6.67 |  |  |
| Not at all(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 to be high with a mean of 3.863. (see Appendix D)

The data indicates that also nearly half of the students believe 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.

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 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.

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.

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

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

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.

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.

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 schools’ 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 students’ 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.

Table 10. Grade 9 Students’ Academic Performance

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Performance** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  **(%)** | **Mean**  **(X)** | **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 high school students for its survey last 3 years ago and recently which indicates a very satisfactory rating among its enrolees.

**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 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 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 Schools Stakeholders Extent of Support as perceived by the students and Students’ 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** |

Table 18. Summary table of the Relationship Between Extent of School’s Stakeholders Support as perceived by the students and Students’ level of Academic Performance.

The summary table revealed 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.

This means that the extent of support of the 5 school’s stakeholders do not affect 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.

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 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 influence on the academic performance of the students.

This conforms to the study of Joyce Epstein and John Hopkins (2003) where they stated that parent, family, and community involvement means different things to different people. A research-based framework, developed and describes six types of involvement— parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community—that offer a broad range of school, family, and community activities that can engage all parties and help meet student needs. Successful school-parent community partnerships are not stand-alone projects or add-on programs but are well integrated with the school’s overall mission and goals. Research and fieldwork show that parent-school-partnerships improve schools, strengthen families, build community support, and increase student achievement and success.