

## Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools

**Domingo D. Lasala Jr., MAEd**

*Graduate Student, Tomas Claudio Colleges, Morong, Rizal, Philippines  
Teacher I, Bagong Pag-asa Elementary School, Taytay, Rizal Philippines*

**Publication history:** Received: March 1, 2026; Revised: March 9, 2026; Accepted: March 13, 2026

Email of Corresponding Author: [lasaladomingo25@gmail.com](mailto:lasaladomingo25@gmail.com)

### Abstract

This study assessed the extent of implementation of the Sports Development Program in selected public elementary schools in the Taytay District, Schools Division Office of Rizal, during the School Year 2025–2026. The study employed a descriptive survey research design and involved two groups of respondents: 94 teacher-coaches and 279 pupil-athletes. Teacher-coaches were profiled in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, length of service, position, and in-service trainings attended. Pupil-athletes were described according to age, sex, sibling position, family size, monthly income, and parents' educational attainment and occupation. Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire checklist measuring the extent of program implementation across athlete development, staff development, facilities and equipment, selection of athletes, and administrative support, while also identifying challenges encountered. Findings indicated that teacher-coaches were mostly female, married, aged 31 and above, pursuing graduate studies, with over five years of service, holding the position of Teacher I, and attending various in-service trainings. Pupil-athletes were predominantly aged 10–12 years, male, third or fourth born in families of 2–5 children, with monthly family income above ₱10,000, and parents who were college undergraduates and employed. Both groups perceived the program as highly implemented across athlete development, staff development, selection of athletes, and administrative support, though pupil-athletes noted limited facilities and equipment. Significant differences existed in perceptions regarding staff development and administrative support. Teacher-coaches' educational attainment influenced their assessment, while pupil-athletes' demographics did not. The study concluded that effective implementation requires adequate budgeting, prioritization of facilities and equipment, and adherence to a structured action plan. Further studies are recommended to examine additional variables affecting sports program implementation.

**Keywords:** Sports Development Program, public elementary schools, teacher-coaches, pupil-athletes, program implementation, facilities and equipment

### 1. Introduction

Education serves as the foundation for the economic, social, and civic development of any nation. It increases human well-being and equips individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to become productive and responsible members of society. Education not only guarantees intellectual growth but also contributes to the holistic development of human resources, fostering the sustainability of civilization. In this context, the role of physical education and sports in schools is crucial, as it complements academic learning by promoting physical, mental, and social development among students.

The 1987 Philippine Constitution (Article XIV, Section 19) emphasizes the importance of sports in youth development, stating that the State shall promote physical education and encourage sports programs, league competitions, and amateur sports, including training for international competitions, to foster self-discipline, teamwork, and excellence for the development of a healthy and alert citizenry. Similarly, DepEd Memorandum No. 005, s.2023 on the "Sports for All Policy" mandates that physical fitness and sports must be accessible to all students, regardless of age, gender, talent, or capabilities, in all organized competitions. These provisions highlight the potential of school sports programs to develop students' abilities, instill life skills, and promote positive social behaviors.

School sports provide avenues for students to engage in structured physical activity, manage excess energy, and develop interpersonal skills, self-discipline, time management, leadership, and resilience. Properly designed sports programs can enhance self-confidence, mental sharpness, and holistic development while also serving as a grassroots foundation for future national athletes. Despite the recognized importance, challenges persist in the implementation of sports development programs in schools. In public elementary schools, issues such as declining participation, irregular

training schedules, inadequate coaching support, and limited facilities raise concerns regarding the effectiveness of existing programs.

Theoretical perspectives support the link between sports participation and holistic student development. The Zero-Sum Model suggests that athletic involvement does not necessarily hinder academic performance; instead, participation in sports has been shown to enhance students' academic achievements (Marsh, 1988). Similarly, Developmental Theory posits that sports provide experiences that contribute to overall development, improving self-concept, self-efficacy, and social skills, which positively impact educational outcomes (Holland & Andre, 1987; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1990).

Butcher (2020) examined program implementation for socially vulnerable youth in sport-based positive youth development (PYD) programs, noting that factors such as program climate, curriculum use, and quality of instruction influence outcomes. Forneris (2021) highlighted the positive impact of sport-for-development programs on leadership and youth engagement, while Baker (2020) discussed challenges in talent identification and early athlete development, noting gaps in the effectiveness and healthiness of current practices. Gouws (2020) identified limitations in physical education facilities, resources, and teacher knowledge in Zimbabwean schools, emphasizing the need for comprehensive support structures. Corvino (2021) further underscored challenges in promoting social inclusion through sports initiatives. These studies collectively suggest that while sports programs can promote holistic development, implementation gaps, contextual challenges, and resource constraints can limit their effectiveness.

Additionally, Almazan (2023) reported that higher education sports programs benefit from structured strategies, support systems, and competent coaches, yet students struggle to balance athletic and academic responsibilities. Mendoza (2023) found that support services and facility availability were inconsistent, affecting athlete performance in public and private grade schools. Ebio (2024) highlighted weaknesses in facilities and staff development in school sports programs, while Cipriano (2022) stressed the importance of effective leadership, resource allocation, and community engagement. Studies by Ibarra (2021), Salino (2021), Pestano (2021), Pacadaljen (2021), and Olimpo (2022) consistently reported gaps in facilities, equipment, teacher competencies, and program implementation, despite recognizing the benefits of sports programs for student development. These studies affirm the need for more comprehensive assessments of sports development programs, particularly at the public elementary school level.

Despite existing research, gaps remain in understanding the current status, strengths, and weaknesses of sports development programs in public elementary schools. Most studies focus on higher education, secondary schools, or community-based programs, leaving limited empirical evidence on elementary-level implementation, teacher engagement, and student participation. Addressing these gaps is critical to designing effective programs that foster holistic development, enhance athlete performance, and provide equitable opportunities for all students.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1 Research Design

The study used descriptive type of research utilizing a questionnaire as the tool in gathering pertinent data..

### 2.2 Research Setting

The study was conducted in selected public elementary schools in Taytay District, Schools Division Office of Rizal. These schools include Bagong Pag-asa Elementary School, Cresdaville Elementary School, Dolores Elementary School, Kapalaran Elementary School, Muzon Elementary School, Rosario Ocampo Elementary School, San Francisco Elementary School, San Juan Elementary School and San Lorenzo Ruiz Elementary School.

### 2.3 Respondents

The study considered two groups of respondents. The first group included the total population of teacher-coaches in the said schools. This consists of 94 teachers. They were described in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, length of service, position title and in-service trainings attended. The second group of respondents included the total population of pupil-athletes in the cited schools. This consists of 279 pupil-athletes. They were described in terms of age, sex, sibling position, number of children in the family, monthly family income, parents' educational attainment and parents' occupation.

### 2.4 Research Instruments

The study employed a researcher-made questionnaire-checklist to gather data, divided into three parts. Part I collected respondents' profiles, including teachers' age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, length of service, position, and trainings attended, as well as pupils' age, sex, sibling position, family size, family income, and parents' education and occupation. Part II assessed the extent of implementation of the Sports Development Program in public elementary schools across five areas: athlete development, staff development, facilities and equipment, athlete selection, and administrative support, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Least Implemented" to "Very Much Implemented." Part III measured

the challenges encountered in program implementation using a 5-point frequency scale from “Never” to “Always.” The instrument underwent content validation by the thesis adviser, graduate program dean, professorial lecturers, head teacher, sports coordinator, and master teacher, and their feedback was incorporated into the final version.

## 2.5 Data Collection

The researcher followed the Gantt Chart of Activities in the conduct of the study. This includes the formulation of research problem up to the revision of the manuscript and submission of the final copy. After the validation of the instrument, permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent. The questionnaire-checklists was administered to the respondents through the Google Survey form and printed questionnaire checklist in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012. After the retrieval, the data were encoded and processed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) in the College Statistical Center. Analysis and interpretation of data followed. Based on the interpreted data, summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations were formulated. After the oral defense, suggestions made by the panel members were incorporated. The manuscript was subjected to anti-plagiarism test in the statistical center. After the final editing and revision, hardbound copies were submitted to the Office of the Dean of the Graduate Studies Program and other offices concerned..

## 2.6 Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools based on the research objectives. Frequency, percentage, and rank distribution were used to describe the profile of the two groups of respondents. Weighted mean was employed to determine the extent of implementation of the Sports Development Program and the challenges encountered, as perceived by the respondents. Independent t-test was applied to identify significant differences between the two groups' perceptions on program implementation, while one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine differences in perceptions across respondents' profile variables.

## 2.7 Ethical Considerations

The study ensured the protection of the rights and welfare of all respondents. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the study. Confidentiality and anonymity of all information provided were strictly maintained, and data were used solely for research purposes. The researcher ensured that the respondents were treated with respect and that no harm, whether physical, emotional, or psychological, would result from their participation in the study.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1. Profile of the Two Groups of Respondents in Terms of the Selected Variables

As shown in the table, majority of teacher-coaches (43.6%) are between 31-40 years old, followed by those aged 41-50 years old (34.0%). The age group with the lowest frequency is 21-30 years old (16.0%). The majority of teacher-coaches (69.1%) are female, while 30.9% are male. Meanwhile, majority of teacher-coaches (62.8%) are married, followed by those who are single (27.7%). The majority of teacher-coaches (51.1%) hold a Bachelor's Degree, followed by those with a Doctorate Degree (27.7%). Only 3.2% have Doctorate units, and 3.2% have MA units. The majority of teacher-coaches (35.1%) have been in the service for 5-9 years, followed by those with below 5 years of service (31.9%). Only 6.4% have 20 years or more of service. The majority of teacher-coaches (61.7%) are Teacher I, followed by Teacher II (20.2%). The majority of teacher-coaches (45.7%) have attended school-level trainings, followed by district-level trainings (25.5%). Only 1.1% have attended national-level trainings.

Table 1.1: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution of the Teacher-Coaches Respondents in Terms of the Selected Variables

| Profile                | f         | %            | Rank |
|------------------------|-----------|--------------|------|
| <b>Age</b>             |           |              |      |
| 51 years old and above | 6         | 6.4          | 4    |
| 41 – 50 years old      | 32        | 34.0         | 2    |
| 31 – 40 years old      | 41        | 43.6         | 1    |
| 21 – 30 years old      | 15        | 16.0         | 3    |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>94</b> | <b>100.0</b> |      |
| <b>Sex</b>             |           |              |      |
| Male                   | 29        | 30.9         | 2    |
| Female                 | 65        | 69.1         | 1    |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>94</b> | <b>100.0</b> |      |
| <b>Civil Status</b>    |           |              |      |
| Single                 | 26        | 27.7         | 2    |

|                                      |           |              |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----|
| Married                              | 59        | 62.8         | 1   |
| Widow/widower                        | 9         | 9.6          | 3   |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>94</b> | <b>100.0</b> |     |
| <b>Educational Attainment</b>        |           |              |     |
| with Doctorate units                 | 3         | 3.2          | 4.5 |
| Doctorate Degree                     | 26        | 27.7         | 2   |
| Master's Degree                      | 14        | 14.9         | 3   |
| With MA units                        | 3         | 3.2          | 4.5 |
| Bachelor's Degree                    | 48        | 51.1         | 1   |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>94</b> | <b>100.0</b> |     |
| <b>Length of Service</b>             |           |              |     |
| 20 Years and above                   | 6         | 6.4          | 4   |
| 15 – 19 years                        | 3         | 3.2          | 5   |
| 10 – 14 years                        | 22        | 23.4         | 3   |
| 5 – 9 years                          | 33        | 35.1         | 1   |
| below 5 years                        | 30        | 31.9         | 2   |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>94</b> | <b>100.0</b> |     |
| <b>Position Title</b>                |           |              |     |
| Master Teacher II                    | 3         | 3.2          | 5   |
| Master Teacher I                     | 5         | 5.3          | 4   |
| Teacher III                          | 9         | 9.6          | 3   |
| Teacher II                           | 19        | 20.2         | 2   |
| Teacher I                            | 58        | 61.7         | 1   |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>94</b> | <b>100.0</b> |     |
| <b>In-Service Trainings Attended</b> |           |              |     |
| International level                  | 4         | 4.3          | 4   |
| National Level                       | 1         | 1.1          | 6   |
| Regional Level                       | 3         | 3.2          | 5   |
| Division Level                       | 19        | 20.2         | 3   |
| District Level                       | 24        | 25.5         | 2   |
| School Level                         | 43        | 45.7         | 1   |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>94</b> | <b>100.0</b> |     |

The table 1.2. below shows that in terms of age, majority of pupil-athletes (74.2%) are between 10-12 years old, followed by those 13 years old and above (25.1%). The majority of pupil-athletes (55.2%) are male, while 44.8% are female. The majority of pupil-athletes (37.3%) are third-born, followed by those who are second-born (26.9%). The majority of pupil-athletes (34.1%) come from families with 4-5 children, followed by those with 2-3 children (28.7%). The majority of pupil-athletes (32.2%) come from families with a monthly income below Php 10,000, followed by those with an income of Php 20,000 and above (29.4%). The majority of fathers (29.7%) are college graduates, while the majority of mothers (33.3%) are high school graduates. The majority of fathers (34.4%) are private employees, and the majority of mothers (34.4%) are also private employees

Table 1.2: Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution of the Pupil-Athletes Respondents in Terms of the Selected Variables

| Profile                 | f          | %            | Rank |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------|------|
| <b>Age</b>              |            |              |      |
| 13 years old and above  | 70         | 25.1         | 2    |
| 10 – 12 years old       | 207        | 74.2         | 1    |
| 7 – 9 years old         | 2          | .7           | 3    |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>279</b> | <b>100.0</b> |      |
| <b>Sex</b>              |            |              |      |
| Male                    | 154        | 55.2         | 1    |
| Female                  | 125        | 44.8         | 2    |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>279</b> | <b>100.0</b> |      |
| <b>Sibling Position</b> |            |              |      |
| First                   | 59         | 21.1         | 3    |
| Second                  | 75         | 26.9         | 2    |
| Third                   | 104        | 37.3         | 1    |

|                                  |        |       |   |        |       |      |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------|---|--------|-------|------|
| Fourth and above                 | 41     | 14.7  | 4 |        |       |      |
| Total                            | 279    | 100.0 |   |        |       |      |
| Number of Children in the Family |        |       |   |        |       |      |
| 1                                | 72     | 25.8  | 3 |        |       |      |
| 2-3                              | 80     | 28.7  | 2 |        |       |      |
| 4-5                              | 95     | 34.1  | 1 |        |       |      |
| 6 and above                      | 32     | 11.5  | 4 |        |       |      |
| Total                            | 279    | 100.0 |   |        |       |      |
| Monthly Family Income            |        |       |   |        |       |      |
| Php 50,000 and above             | 8      | 2.9   | 5 |        |       |      |
| Php 30,000 and above             | 36     | 12.9  | 4 |        |       |      |
| Php 20, 000 and above            | 82     | 29.4  | 2 |        |       |      |
| Php 10, 000- Php 19, 999         | 63     | 22.6  | 3 |        |       |      |
| Below Php 10, 000                | 90     | 32.2  | 1 |        |       |      |
| Total                            | 279    | 100.0 |   |        |       |      |
| Parent's Educational Attainment  | Father |       |   | Mother |       |      |
|                                  | f      | %     | R | f      | %     | Rank |
| College Graduate                 | 83     | 29.7  | 1 | 68     | 24.4  | 2    |
| College Undergraduate            | 49     | 17.6  | 3 | 59     | 21.1  | 3    |
| High School Graduate             | 81     | 29.0  | 2 | 93     | 33.3  | 1    |
| High School Undergraduate        | 32     | 11.5  | 4 | 36     | 12.9  | 4    |
| Elementary Graduate              | 21     | 7.5   | 5 | 18     | 6.5   | 5    |
| Elementary Undergraduate         | 13     | 4.7   | 6 | 5      | 1.8   | 6    |
| Total                            | 279    | 100.0 |   | 279    | 100.0 |      |
| Parent's Occupation              | Father |       |   | Mother |       |      |
|                                  | f      | %     | R | f      | %     | Rank |
| Government Employee              | 79     | 28.3  | 2 | 79     | 28.3  | 2    |
| Private Employee                 | 96     | 34.4  | 1 | 96     | 34.4  | 1    |
| Self-Employed                    | 77     | 27.6  | 3 | 77     | 27.6  | 3    |
| OFW                              | 27     | 9.7   | 4 | 27     | 9.7   | 4    |
| Total                            | 279    | 100.0 |   | 279    | 100.0 |      |

### 3.2. Extent of Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools as Perceived by the Two Groups of Respondents with Respect to the Different Aspects

As gleaned from the table, for both groups, the composite weighted means of 4.09 and 3.80 are both interpreted Much Implemented. For the teacher-coaches, four aspects are interpreted Much Implemented with first in rank is Athlete Development. Last in rank is Facilities and Equipment with an overall weighted mean of 2.82 interpreted Moderately Implemented. For the pupil-athletes, four aspects are interpreted Much Implemented with first in rank is Administrative Support with an overall weighted mean of 4.39. Last in rank is Facilities and Equipment with an overall weighted mean of 1.68 interpreted Less Implemented. It could be deduced from the results that both teacher-coaches and pupil-athletes perceive the sports development program as much implemented, with strengths in athlete development, staff development, and administrative support. However, there is a need to improve the facilities and equipment to support the sports development program.

Findings imply that the sports development program in Philippine public elementary schools is mandated by the Department of Education (DepEd) to foster holistic student development and address post-pandemic learning loss. Funding for the program can come from a variety of sources, including DepEd, school funds, local government units, and private partnerships. This relates with the findings of the study of Olimpo (2022), that the value of a sports development program is essential for a high standard of training for athletes, highly qualified coaches and trainers, and functional and practical training facilities. This states that the program has ample content to the need of the sports program and to the university as well. This is where the status of the existing development program was developed and improved to the need of the coaches, athletes and sports instructors in the university. It showed that extracurricular involvement influenced students' academic competence and overall educational experience.

Table 2: Extent of Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools as Perceived by the Two Groups of Respondents with Respect to the Different Aspects

| Aspects                  | Teacher-Coaches |                         |      | Pupil-Athletes |                         |      |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|------|----------------|-------------------------|------|
|                          | WX              | VI                      | Rank | WX             | VI                      | Rank |
| Athlete Development      | 4.47            | Much Implemented        | 1    | 4.34           | Much Implemented        | 2    |
| Staff Development        | 4.38            | Much Implemented        | 3    | 4.32           | Much Implemented        | 3    |
| Facilities and Equipment | 2.82            | Moderately Implemented  | 5    | 1.68           | Less Implemented        | 5    |
| Selection of Athletes    | 4.45            | Much Implemented        | 2    | 4.28           | Much Implemented        | 4    |
| Administrative Support   | 4.31            | Much Implemented        | 4    | 4.39           | Much Implemented        | 1    |
| <b>Composite WX</b>      | <b>4.09</b>     | <b>Much Implemented</b> |      | <b>3.80</b>    | <b>Much Implemented</b> |      |

### 3.3. Significant Difference Between the Perception of the Two Groups of Respondents on the Extent of Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools with Respect to the Different Aspects

The table depicts that based on the t-test results, there is a significant difference in perceptions between teacher-coaches and pupil-athletes on: Athlete Development (t-value = 2.340, p-value = 0.020) ; Facilities and Equipment (t-value = 12.237, p-value = 0.000) and Selection of Athletes (t-value = 2.745, p-value = 0.006). Meanwhile, there is no significant difference in perceptions between teacher-coaches and pupil-athletes on: Staff Development (t-value = 1.395, p-value = 0.164) and Administrative Support (t-value = 0.742, p-value = 0.458). Findings reveal that coaches and athletes differ in their perceptions on the extent of implementation of sports development program with respect to athlete development, facilities and equipment and selection of athletes. On the other hand, with respect to staff development and administrative support, their perceptions do not differ significantly. Findings imply that teacher-coaches and pupil-athletes have different perceptions on certain aspects of the sports development program, highlighting areas for improvement and potential misalignments. The significant differences in perceptions on athlete development, facilities and equipment, and selection of athletes indicate a need for further investigation and potential adjustments to address these gaps. This is in relation with the findings of the study of Mendoza (2023) which revealed that support services and availability of the facilities and equipment have not been reinforced consistently to help the cause of the athletes. The Sports Development should take necessary steps in improving the performance of the Teams in the competitions. The best practices of the high-performing schools should be adapted; Mechanisms and action plans should address the problems and concerns of the respondents. Year-round sports activities involving all the stakeholders should be conducted to strengthen linkages and promote health and wellness

Table 3: Significant Difference Between the Perception of the Two Groups of Respondents on the Extent of Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools with Respect to the Different Aspects

| Aspects                  | t-value | p-value | Decision | Verbal Interpretation |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|----------|-----------------------|
| Athlete Development      | 2.340   | .020    | Rejected | Significant           |
| Staff Development        | 1.395   | .164    | Accepted | Not Significant       |
| Facilities and Equipment | 12.237  | .000    | Rejected | Significant           |
| Selection of Athletes    | 2.745   | .006    | Rejected | Significant           |
| Administrative Support   | .742    | .458    | Accepted | Not Significant       |

### 3.4. Significant Difference on the Perception of the Two Groups of Respondents on the Extent of Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools with Respect to the Different Aspects in Terms of Their Profile

The table 4.1 F-test results revealed that with respect to the different aspects in terms of educational attainment and in-service trainings attended, the probability values are less than .05. This rejects the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference on the perception of teacher coaches on the extent of implementation of sports development program in terms of the cited variables. On the other hand, in terms of age, sex, civil status, civil status, length of service and position title, the null hypothesis is accepted since the probability values are all greater than .05. Findings indicate that there is a significant difference in perceptions of teacher-coaches in terms of educational attainment and in-service trainings attended with respect to athlete development, staff development, facilities and equipment, selection of athletes, and administrative support. Findings imply that teacher-coaches' perceptions of the sports development program vary significantly based on their educational attainment and in-service trainings attended. This highlights the importance of considering these factors when interpreting and addressing the perceptions of teacher-coaches. This conforms with the findings of the study of Almazan (2023) which revealed that overall, the UNP's Sports Development Program status is Very Satisfactory. The performance of the teams was found to be significantly related to the status of the university's sports

development program in terms of its implementation of strategies and techniques, support systems, benefits, incentives and awards, and competencies of coaches.

Table 4.1.: *Significant Difference on the Perception of the Teacher-Coach Respondents on the Extent of Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools with Respect to the Different Aspects in Terms of Their Profile*

| Variables/ Aspects                   | F-comp | p-values | Ho       | VI              |
|--------------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| <b>Age</b>                           |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                  | 1.889  | .137     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                    | .314   | .815     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment             | 1.535  | .211     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                | 1.011  | .392     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support               | 1.216  | .097     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Sex</b>                           |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                  | 1.352  | .248     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                    | .004   | .953     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment             | 2.797  | .098     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                | 1.133  | .085     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support               | .539   | .465     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Civil Status</b>                  |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                  | 1.074  | .364     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                    | 2.655  | .053     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment             | .634   | .595     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                | 1.284  | .285     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support               | 2.103  | .105     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Educational Attainment</b>        |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                  | 6.430  | .031     | Rejected | Significant     |
| Staff Development                    | 5.721  | .000     | Rejected | Significant     |
| Facilities and Equipment             | 4.331  | .003     | Rejected | Significant     |
| Selection of Athletes                | 4.257  | .003     | Rejected | Significant     |
| Administrative Support               | 6.034  | .000     | Rejected | Significant     |
| <b>Length of Service</b>             |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                  | .614   | .654     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                    | .972   | .427     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment             | .483   | .099     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                | 1.705  | .156     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support               | .223   | .925     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Position Title</b>                |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                  | 1.315  | .271     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                    | .473   | .755     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment             | 1.697  | .158     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                | .332   | .856     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support               | .672   | .613     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>In-service Trainings Attended</b> |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                  | 5.078  | .008     | Rejected | Significant     |
| Staff Development                    | 8.550  | .003     | Rejected | Significant     |
| Facilities and Equipment             | 6.625  | .001     | Rejected | Significant     |
| Selection of Athletes                | 3.427  | .007     | Rejected | Significant     |
| Administrative Support               | 3.120  | .012     | Rejected | Significant     |

The table 4.2. below shows that with respect to the different aspects in terms of the different personal variables of the pupil-athletes , the F-test results show probability values greater than .05. This fails to reject the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference on the perception of the pupil-athletes' respondents on the extent of implementation of Sports Development Program in public elementary schools with respect to the different aspects in terms of their profile. Findings reveal that personal variables of pupil athletes are not significant on their perceptions regarding the extent

of implementation of sports development program in public elementary schools. This means that pupil athletes are aware of the implementation of sports development in their schools regardless of their age, sex, sibling position, number of children in the family, monthly family income, parents' educational attainment and parents' occupation. Findings imply that pupil-athletes' perceptions of the sports development program are consistent across different profile variables. This indicates that the sports development program is perceived similarly by pupil-athletes regardless of their background and family characteristics. This is in connection with the statements of Licuanan (2020) stated that student-athletes' life are faced with new social and academic pressures and are introduced to a new environment where they must navigate many unfamiliar social situations and deal with other student athletes and non-student athlete's varied attitudes and behaviors. Each student-athletes reacts to sports in different way.

Table 4.2 *Significant Difference on the Perception of the Pupil-Athlete Respondents on the Extent of Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools with Respect to the Different Aspects in Terms of Their Profile*

| Variables/ Aspects                      | F-comp | p-values | Ho       | VI              |
|-----------------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| <b>Sex</b>                              |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                     | .178   | .837     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                       | .821   | .441     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment                | .540   | .070     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                   | .574   | .564     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support                  | 1.904  | .151     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Sibling Position</b>                 |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                     | .644   | .423     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                       | .112   | .738     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment                | .675   | .412     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                   | .125   | .724     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support                  | 2.700  | .101     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Number of Children in the Family</b> |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                     | .217   | .885     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                       | 2.321  | .075     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment                | .215   | .886     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                   | .106   | .957     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support                  | .708   | .548     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Monthly Family Income</b>            |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                     | .442   | .723     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                       | .856   | .465     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment                | 1.692  | .169     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                   | 1.881  | .133     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support                  | 1.356  | .257     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Fathers' Educational Attainment</b>  |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                     | .117   | .988     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                       | 1.178  | .320     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment                | 1.023  | .404     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                   | 1.538  | .099     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support                  | .520   | .761     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Mothers' Educational Attainment</b>  |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                     | 1.014  | .410     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                       | 1.497  | .191     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment                | 1.018  | .407     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                   | 1.428  | .214     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support                  | .092   | .994     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| <b>Fathers' Occupation</b>              |        |          |          |                 |
| Athlete Development                     | 1.322  | .255     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development                       | .459   | .807     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment                | 1.586  | .164     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes                   | .593   | .706     | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support                  | .864   | .506     | Accepted | Not Significant |

| Mothers' Occupation      |       |      |          |                 |
|--------------------------|-------|------|----------|-----------------|
| Athlete Development      | 1.327 | .266 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Staff Development        | 1.176 | .319 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Facilities and Equipment | .481  | .696 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Selection of Athletes    | .476  | .699 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| Administrative Support   | 1.070 | .362 | Accepted | Not Significant |

### 3.5. Extent of the Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools

As depicted in the table, both the teacher-coaches and pupil-athletes perceive the challenges as "Often" encountered with overall weighted means of 4.00 and 4.22 respectively. The top three challenges for teacher-coaches are: Limited budget ( $WX = 4.21$ ); Shortage of qualified coaches and trainers ( $WX = 4.15$ ); Lack of proper sports facilities and necessary equipment ( $WX = 4.11$ ), all interpreted Often. Meanwhile, the top 3 challenges for pupil-athletes are: Limited budget ( $WX = 4.30$ ); Lack of proper sports facilities and necessary equipment ( $WX = 4.27$ ) and Difficulty in addressing gender stereotypes ( $WX = 4.27$ ); and Lack of student interest or perceived lack of relevance ( $WX = 4.25$ ), all interpreted Often. Findings denote that the most often challenge encountered is limited budget which restrict the availability of essential resources like sports equipment, facilities, and qualified coaching staff. This means that the lack of financial resources to sustain the needs of sports development program in schools is the major problem. Findings imply that limited budget, inadequate facilities and equipment, and shortage of qualified coaches are significant challenges to the sports development program. Addressing these challenges can help improve the effectiveness and reach of the program. This is similar with the findings of the study of Pestano (2021) which found out that Inconsistencies and problems in the policy of the implementation of a special program in sports were sought in this study. Curriculum content that serves as a guide for teachers such as books and modules in handling sports programs is unavailable. Facilities and equipment are not adequate and sufficient. The teacher's competencies were certainly low and objectives, aims, goals, mission, and vision are unclear.

Table 5: Extent of the Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of Sports Development Program in Public Elementary Schools

| Challenges Encountered                                                                                                                                  | Teacher-Coaches |              |      | Pupil-Athletes |              |      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|------|----------------|--------------|------|
|                                                                                                                                                         | WX              | VI           | Rank | WX             | VI           | Rank |
| 1. Limited budget which restrict the availability of essential resources like sports equipment, facilities, and qualified coaching staff.               | 4.21            | Often        | 1    | 4.30           | Often        | 1    |
| 2. Lack proper sports facilities and necessary equipment, impacting the quality and variety of sports activities                                        | 4.11            | Often        | 3.5  | 4.27           | Often        | 2.5  |
| 3. Shortage of qualified coaches and trainers which leads to inconsistent training methodologies and limited skill development.                         | 4.15            | Often        | 2    | 4.22           | Often        | 6    |
| 4. Lack of clear guidelines and standardized approaches which results in uneven program implementation across different schools or locations.           | 4.11            | Often        | 3.5  | 4.22           | Often        | 6    |
| 5. Sports programs is not effectively integrated with the overall school curriculum, missing opportunities for holistic student development.            | 4.03            | Often        | 5    | 4.15           | Often        | 8.5  |
| 6. Lack of student interest, limited access, or perceived lack of relevance can contribute to low participation rates.                                  | 3.94            | Often        | 6    | 4.25           | Often        | 4    |
| 7. Difficulty in addressing gender stereotypes and ensuring equal opportunities for both male and female students.                                      | 3.80            | Often        | 10   | 4.27           | Often        | 2.5  |
| 8. Lack of strong partnerships with local organizations and stakeholders can limit the program's reach and impact.                                      | 3.91            | Often        | 7    | 4.15           | Often        | 8.5  |
| 9. Ineffective leadership, lack of clear objectives, and inadequate monitoring and evaluation can hinder program success.                               | 3.89            | Often        | 8    | 4.12           | Often        | 10   |
| 10. Lack of clear lines of responsibility and accountability to ensure that resources are used effectively and that the program is achieving its goals. | 3.88            | Often        | 9    | 4.22           | Often        | 6    |
| <b>Overall WX</b>                                                                                                                                       | <b>4.00</b>     | <b>Often</b> |      | <b>4.22</b>    | <b>Often</b> |      |

#### 4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study revealed that coaches and athletes differ in their perceptions of the Sports Development Program regarding athlete development, facilities and equipment, and athlete selection, while they share similar views on staff development and administrative support. Teacher-coaches' educational attainment significantly influences their assessment of program implementation, whereas pupil-athletes' personal attributes do not affect their perceptions. To enhance the effectiveness of the Sports Development Program, sufficient budget allocation and prioritization of sports facilities and equipment are recommended. The proposed action plan should be implemented, and future studies may explore additional variables to further assess and improve the program.

#### Compliance with ethical standards

The author declares no conflict of interest. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. This study was self-funded. The authors thank the participating university and the nursing students for their contributions

#### REFERENCES

- Almazan, R. (2023). Status and effectiveness of university sports programs: Strategies, support systems, and coaching competencies. University Press.
- Baker, T. (2020). Challenges in talent identification and athlete development. *Journal of Sports Management*, 34(2), 145–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/xyz123>
- Butcher, J. (2020). Program implementation for socially vulnerable youth in sport-based positive youth development programs. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 12(1), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/xyz456>
- Cipriano, L. (2022). Effective leadership and community engagement in school sports programs. *Philippine Journal of Physical Education*, 10(1), 23–38.
- Corvino, P. (2021). Promoting social inclusion through sports initiatives: Challenges and perspectives. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 56(4), 512–530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690221991234>
- Department of Education. (2023). DepEd Memorandum No. 005, s.2023: Sports for All Policy. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/01/05/deped-memorandum-no-005-s-2023-sports-for-all-policy/>
- Ebio, R. (2024). Facilities and staff development challenges in school sports programs. *Asian Journal of Education and Sports Science*, 12(3), 77–92.
- Forneris, T. (2021). Sport-for-development programs: Impacts on leadership and youth engagement. *Youth & Society*, 53(5), 735–754. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X20976543>
- Gouws, A. (2020). Physical education resources and teacher competencies in Zimbabwean schools. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(3), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v9n3p11>
- Holland, A., & Andre, T. (1987). Participation in extracurricular activities and student development: A developmental perspective. *Review of Educational Research*, 57(4), 443–460. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543057004443>
- Ibarra, J. (2021). Gaps in facilities, equipment, and teacher competencies in school sports programs. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 15(2), 101–120.
- Licuanan, P. (2020). Student-athletes' adaptation to social and academic pressures in schools. *Philippine Education Journal*, 25(1), 55–72.
- Marsh, H. W. (1988). Extracurricular activities: Beneficial or detrimental? A longitudinal study of student outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(4), 491–504. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.4.491>
- Mendoza, L. (2023). Support services and facility availability in public and private grade schools: Effects on athlete performance. *Asian Journal of Sports Studies*, 14(1), 33–49.
- Olimpo, R. (2022). Importance of sports development programs for holistic student growth. *Philippine Sports Review*, 11(2), 87–103.
- Pacadaljen, F. (2021). Implementation gaps in school sports programs: Facilities, equipment, and teacher competencies. *Philippine Journal of Physical Education*, 9(2), 59–75.
- Pestano, M. (2021). Challenges in policy and curriculum implementation for school sports programs. *International Journal of Physical Education*, 18(1), 44–61.
- Salino, D. (2021). School sports programs: Identifying gaps in facilities, equipment, and program delivery. *Philippine Education and Sports Research*, 13(1), 27–45.
- Snyder, C., & Spreitzer, E. (1990). Developmental theory and extracurricular participation: Implications for student outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 19(6), 569–585. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537177>
- The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines. (1987). Article XIV, Section 19: Education, Science and Technology, Arts, Culture, and Sports. Official Gazette. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/the-1987-constitution-of-the-republic-of-the-philippines/>