

Level of Engagement on Shared Governance in Public Elementary Schools

Ronashiel V. Miranda, MAEd

Graduate Student, Tomas Claudio Colleges, Morong, Rizal Philippines

Teacher I, Baras Pinugay Elementary School, Baras, Rizal, Philippines

Publication history: Received: March 12, 2026; Revised: March 28, 2026; Accepted: April 4, 2026

Email of Corresponding Author: ronashiel.miranda@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study examined the level of engagement in shared governance among stakeholders in public elementary schools in the District of Baras, Division of Rizal, during the School Year 2025–2026. Utilizing a descriptive survey research design, the study involved three groups of respondents: school officials, parents, and Local Government Unit (LGU) members. A total of 144 school officials and 144 LGU members, representing 50% of their respective populations, were selected, while 285 parent-respondents were determined using Slovin's formula. Data were gathered through a researcher-made questionnaire-checklist and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools. Findings revealed that respondents were generally "often engaged" in shared governance practices in terms of participation in decision-making, communication and collaboration, and transparency and accountability. However, certain profile variables significantly influenced engagement levels. Among school officials, educational attainment, length of service, in-service training, and age showed significant differences. For parents, educational attainment, occupation, income, age, and civil status were significant in selected domains. Among LGU members, civil status influenced engagement in communication and collaboration. Conversely, variables such as sex and some demographic factors were not significant predictors. The study also identified that stakeholders "sometimes" encountered challenges, including limited understanding of shared governance, unclear roles, and scheduling conflicts affecting participation. The study concluded that while engagement is evident, there is a need to strengthen stakeholders' capacities and awareness. It is recommended that school administrators implement orientation programs, capacity-building activities, and establish effective communication channels. Flexible participation mechanisms and continuous monitoring are also encouraged to enhance stakeholder involvement. The proposed action plan is suggested for implementation, and further studies are recommended to explore additional variables affecting shared governance.

Keywords: Shared Governance, Stakeholder Engagement, Public Elementary Schools, Decision-Making, Communication and Collaboration, Transparency and Accountability

1. Introduction

Education plays a vital role in the social, economic, and cultural development of society. As educational systems continue to evolve, governance frameworks increasingly emphasize collaboration, participation, transparency, and accountability. One of the key approaches that embody these principles is shared governance, which involves multiple stakeholders—such as school officials, parents, local government units (LGUs), and the community—in decision-making processes. This participatory approach ensures that educational policies and programs reflect the diverse needs of stakeholders while promoting accountability and institutional effectiveness. Shared governance represents a shift from centralized leadership toward a more decentralized and participatory model. In the Philippine context, this principle is institutionalized under Republic Act No. 9155, also known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, which underscores that each unit within the education system holds distinct roles and responsibilities and is accountable for educational outcomes. Complementing this, DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2022 mandates the establishment of School Governance Councils (SGCs) to strengthen stakeholder participation and serve as platforms for shared decision-making and feedback mechanisms at the school level. Aligned with School-Based Management (SBM) and Rights-Based Education (RBE), shared governance fosters inclusive participation, enhances communication, and strengthens partnerships among stakeholders. Active engagement in governance processes promotes a sense of ownership, improves transparency, and contributes to better school outcomes and learner development.

Empirical studies support the significance of stakeholder engagement in education. Internationally, George and Amos (2025) found that parental involvement in school decision-making significantly improves students' academic performance through enhanced communication and participation. Similarly, Ergin et al. (2024) emphasized that strong parent-school collaboration leads to improved educational outcomes, highlighting the importance of effective communication. Eden et al. (2024) further noted that community and parental involvement foster holistic student development and social improvement. Meanwhile, Rachman et al. (2024) identified structured and technology-supported

communication as essential in strengthening teacher-parent collaboration. Additionally, Lucky (2025) underscored that transparency and accountability are critical components of effective school governance, influencing institutional trust and performance. Local studies present parallel findings. Amer (2025), Tanque and Brobo (2024), and Cauad (2025) consistently revealed that parental involvement significantly contributes to students' academic achievement, particularly through decision-making and communication. Balinas (2025) highlighted challenges in family-school communication, including limited responsiveness and technological barriers, which hinder effective collaboration. Fernandez (2025) demonstrated that transparency is strongly correlated with effective governance practices in schools, reinforcing the importance of accountability mechanisms. Despite these contributions, gaps remain in the literature. Most studies focus primarily on parental involvement and academic achievement, with limited attention given to the combined engagement of multiple stakeholders such as school officials, parents, and LGUs within the framework of shared governance. Additionally, there is a scarcity of localized studies examining the level of stakeholder engagement across key governance dimensions—participation in decision-making, communication and collaboration, and transparency and accountability—particularly in public elementary schools. Furthermore, few studies explore how demographic variables influence stakeholders' engagement or examine the challenges they encounter in participating in governance processes. Given these gaps, this study aims to assess the level of engagement in shared governance among school officials, parents, and LGU members in public elementary schools in the District of Baras, Division of Rizal. By examining stakeholder participation and identifying influencing factors and challenges, this research seeks to contribute to the improvement of governance practices and promote more inclusive and effective educational management.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study used the descriptive method of research, specifically the survey design in gathering the data needed.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in eight (8) public elementary schools in the District of Baras, Division of Rizal. These are Baras Elementary School, Evangelista Elementary School, Santiago Elementary School, Malalim Elementary School, Painaan Elementary School, Baras -Pinugay Phase 2 Elementary School, Paopawan Elementary and Baras-Pinugay Elementary School. These are the schools that practice shared governance with a collaborative decision-making model in which authority, responsibility, and accountability are distributed among administrators, school officials, parents, and community leaders around the community of the schools.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The study involved three groups of respondents drawn from selected public elementary schools in the District of Baras, Division of Rizal: school officials, parents, and Local Government Unit (LGU) officials. A total of 144 school officials and 144 LGU officials participated, representing 50% of their respective populations, while 285 parents were included as respondents based on the computed sample size using Slovin's formula from a population of 1,091. The respondents were distributed across eight schools: Baras Elementary School, Baras Pinugay Elementary School, Baras Pinugay Elementary Phase 2 School, Paopawan Elementary School, Paenaan Elementary School, Evangelista Elementary School, Malalim Elementary School, and Santiago Elementary School. The study described the respondents based on relevant demographic variables: for school officials—age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, position title, length of service, and in-service trainings attended; for parents—age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, occupation, and monthly family income; and for LGU officials—age, sex, civil status, number of children in the family, educational attainment, occupation, and monthly family income.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study employed a combination of sampling techniques to ensure adequate representation of the target population. For school officials and LGU officials, a proportional sampling approach was used by selecting 50% of the total population from each school. For parent-respondents, Slovin's formula was applied to determine an appropriate sample size, resulting in 285 participants. Subsequently, a random sampling technique was utilized in selecting respondents from each group to minimize bias and ensure equal chances of participation. The distribution of samples per school was proportionally allocated based on the population size of each group, thereby maintaining representativeness and enhancing the reliability of the study's findings.

2.5 Research Instrument

The study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire-checklist as the primary instrument for data collection. The instrument consisted of three parts: Part I gathered the demographic profile of the respondents, including variables such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, and other relevant characteristics specific to school officials, parents, and LGU officials. Part II measured the level of engagement in shared governance across three key dimensions—participation in decision-making, communication and collaboration, and transparency and accountability—comprising a total of 30 items.

rated using a five-point Likert scale ranging from “Never” to “Always.” Part III assessed the extent of challenges encountered by respondents in engaging in shared governance, also using a five-point scale from “Never Encountered” to “Always Encountered.” The instrument underwent content validation by a panel of experts, including the dean, thesis adviser, graduate school dean, professorial lecturers, a principal, and a master teacher, whose feedback and recommendations were incorporated to ensure the validity and appropriateness of the tool in measuring the study variables..

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher followed the Gantt Chart of Activities in the conduct of the study. The researcher came up with the conceptualization of the research title. It was followed by reading and scanning of several research in order to come up with the development of Chapters 1, 2, and 3 of the study. After the proposal defense, the questionnaire-checklist was content-validated by the experts. Afterwards, permission from concerned authorities was secured by the researcher from the Schools Division Superintendent. Then, guided by the approved statement of the problem, she proceeded to the crafting and validating of the questionnaire-checklist. Corrections were considered according to the suggestions of the validators. Then, she administered the questionnaire-checklist and retrieved them from the respondents using Google Survey forms. The researcher was also guided by the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The data were tallied, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to answer the specific problems of the study. Then, summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations followed. After the final oral defense, the manuscript was subjected to an anti-plagiarism test at the statistical center. She once again subjected the manuscript to editing to make it free from errors and had it undergone the routing for the panelists to check and countercheck every part of the thesis for final revision. Finally, hardbound copies were submitted to the Office of the Graduate Studies Program and other offices concerned..

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

The data gathered in the study were analyzed and interpreted using appropriate statistical tools. Frequency, percentage, and rank distribution were employed to describe the profile of the three groups of respondents. To determine the level of engagement on shared governance in terms of participation in decision-making, communication and collaboration, and transparency and accountability, the weighted mean was utilized. Likewise, weighted mean was used to assess the extent of challenges encountered by the respondents. Furthermore, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to determine if there were significant differences in the level of engagement on shared governance when respondents were grouped according to their profile variables.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

This study strictly adhered to ethical standards in the conduct of research. Prior to data collection, permission was sought from the school authorities and concerned officials to ensure proper coordination and approval. The respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, and their participation was entirely voluntary. Informed consent was obtained, assuring them that they could withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences. Confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents were strictly maintained by not disclosing their identities and ensuring that all collected data were used solely for academic purposes. Additionally, the researcher ensured that no harm, discomfort, or bias would affect the participants throughout the process. All information gathered was treated with utmost respect and integrity, and results were presented honestly and objectively.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of the Three Groups of Respondents in Terms of the Selected Variables

As shown in the table 1.1., out the 144 school official-respondents, in terms of their age, 44.4% are from 30 – 39 years old while 3.5% are from 51 – 59 years old. Most of them are female at 72.9% while the male respondents got 27.1%. In terms of their civil status, 63.9% are married while 0.7% is a widow/er. Also, as to their educational attainment, 55.6% have baccalaureate degrees while 0.7% are with doctorate degree and master’s degree with doctorate units respectively. In addition, as to their position title, 66% are holders of Teacher I position while .7% are Teacher IV and Teacher VII. Likewise, in terms of length of service, most of them have been serving for 1–10 years (54.9%), while only 3.5% have served for 21 years or more. Most of the school official-respondents attended in-service trainings in the regional level at 31.3% while .7% in international level.

Table 1.1
*Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution of the School Official-Respondents
in Terms of the Selected Variables*

Profile	f	%	Rank
Age			
51 – 59 years old	5	3.5	4
40 – 49 years old	43	29.9	2
30 – 39 years old	64	44.4	1

21 – 29 years old	32	22.2	3
Total	144	100	
Sex			
Male	39	27.1	2
Female	105	72.9	1
Total	144	100	
Civil Status			
Single	51	35.4	2
Married	92	63.9	1
Widow/er	1	.7	3
Separated/Annulled	-	-	-
Total	144	100	
Educational Attainment			
Doctorate Degree	1	.7	4.5
Master's Degree with Doctorate units	1	.7	4.5
Master's degree	35	24.3	2
with MA units	27	18.8	3
Baccalaureate Degree	80	55.6	1
Total	144	100	
Position Title			
Teacher VII	1	.7	3.5
Teacher IV	1	.7	3.5
Teacher III	47	32.6	2
Teacher II	-	-	-
Teacher I	95	66.0	1
Total	144	100	
Length of Service			
21 years and more	5	3.5	4
11-20 years	51	35.5	2
1-10 years	79	54.9	1
Below 1 year	9	6.3	3
Total	144	100	
In-Service Trainings Attended			
International	1	.7	6
National	26	18.1	3
Regional	45	31.3	1
Division	43	29.9	2
District	8	5.6	5
School	21	14.6	4
Total	144	100	

As shown in the table 1.2 below, out of the 285 parent-respondents, in terms of their age, 35.1% of them are 41 - 50 years while 15.1% are 21 – 30 years old. Most of them are female respondents at 95.1% while the male respondents got 4.9%. In terms of their civil status, first in rank at 89.5% are married while .4% is a widow/er. Also, as to their educational attainment, most of them are high school graduate at 35.8% while last in rank at 1.1% are elementary graduates. In addition, as to their occupation, 43.5% are housewives while .4% is a househusbands. In terms of their monthly family income, 26.7% belong to the income bracket of Php 5,000–Php 9,999 while 5.3% have an income below Php 5,000.

Table 1.2
*Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution of the Parent-Respondents
in Terms of the Selected Variables*

Profile	f	%	Rank
Age			
51 years old and above	48	16.8	3
41 – 50 years old	100	35.1	1
31 – 40 years old	94	33.0	2
21 – 30 years old	43	15.1	4
20 years old	-	-	-

Total	285	100	
Sex			
Male	14	4.9	2
Female	271	95.1	1
Total	285	100.0	
Civil Status			
Single	29	10.2	2
Married	255	89.5	1
Widow/er	1	.4	3
Total	285	100.0	
Educational Attainment			
Master's degree	32	11.2	4
with MA units	13	4.6	5
Bachelor's Degree	94	33.0	2
Vocational/TESDA	41	14.4	3
High School Graduate	102	35.8	1
Elementary Graduate	3	1.1	6
Total	285	100.0	
Occupation			
Government Employee	25	8.8	4
Private Employee	57	20.0	3
Self-Employed	78	27.4	2
Housewife	124	43.5	1
Househusband	1	.4	5
Total	285	100.0	
Monthly Family Income			
Php 30,000 and above	62	21.8	2
Php 25,000 – Php 29,999	40	14.0	4
Php 20,000 – Php 24,999	18	6.3	6
Php 15,000 – Php 19,999	52	18.2	3
Php 10,000 – Php 14,999	22	7.7	5
Php 5,000 – Php 9,999	76	26.7	1
Below Php 5,000	15	5.3	7
Total	285	100.0	

The table 1.3 below shows that out of the 144 Local Government Unit-respondents, in terms of their age, 56.9% are 41-50 years old while 4.2% are 21-30 years old. Most of them are male respondents at 73.6% while female respondents got 26.4%. In terms of their civil status, 81.9% of them are married while 4.9 % are single. As to the number of children in the family, 36.8% have only 1 child in the family while 4.9% are with 5 and above children. In addition, as to their educational attainment, 50.7% are high school graduates while 12.5% are elementary graduates. Likewise, in terms of their occupation, 29.9% are community leaders and have other occupations while last in rank at 18.1% are Barangay Health workers. Most of them have monthly income of Php 5,000 – Php 9,999 at 61.8% while 2.8% are from Php 15,000 – Php 19,999.

Table 1.3
Frequency, Percentage and Rank Distribution of the Local Government Unit -Respondents
in Terms of the Selected Variables

Profile	f	%	Rank
Age			
51 years old and above	9	6.3	3
41 - 50 years old	82	56.9	1
31 – 40 years old	47	32.6	2
21 – 30 years old	6	4.2	4
Total	144	100.0	
Sex			
Male	106	73.6	1
Female	38	26.4	2
Total	144	100.0	
Civil Status			
Single	7	4.9	3
Married	118	81.9	1

Widow/er	19	13.2	2
Total	144	100.0	
Number of Children in the Family			
5 and above	7	4.9	5
4	26	18.1	3
3	35	24.3	2
2	23	16.0	4
1	53	36.8	1
Total	144	100.0	
Educational Attainment			
Vocational/TESDA	53	36.8	2
High School Graduate	73	50.7	1
Elementary Graduate	18	12.5	3
Total	144	100.0	
Occupation			
Barangay Official	4	2.8	5
Community Leader	43	29.9	1.5
Barangay Health Worker	26	18.1	4
Barangay Tanod	28	19.4	3
Others	43	29.9	1.5
Total	144	100.0	
Monthly Family Income			
Php 15,000 – Php 19,999	4	2.8	4
Php 10,000 – Php 14,999	26	18.1	2
Php 5,000 – Php 9,999	89	61.8	1
Below Php 5,000	21	14.6	3
Total	114	100.0	

3.2 Level of Engagement on Shared Governance in Public Elementary Schools as Perceived by the Three Groups of Respondents with Respect to the Different Aspects

The table presents the summary of the level of engagement on shared governance in public elementary schools as perceived by the three groups of respondents: school officials, parents, and Local Government Unit (LGU) representatives. Results revealed that all groups were generally “Often (Much Engaged)”, with school officials obtaining the highest overall mean of 4.43, followed by parents at 4.25, and LGU respondents at 4.02. Among school officials, communication and collaboration ranked first (4.52, Always/Very Much Engaged), followed by participation in decision-making (4.51, Always/Very Much Engaged), while transparency and accountability ranked last (4.25, Often/Much Engaged). Similarly, parents rated communication and collaboration highest (4.32), followed by participation in decision-making (4.23), and transparency and accountability (4.20), all interpreted as Often (Much Engaged). LGU respondents also ranked communication and collaboration first (4.14), followed by participation in decision-making (4.03), and transparency and accountability (3.89), all interpreted as Often (Much Engaged). These findings indicate that while shared governance is actively practiced, school officials demonstrate stronger and more consistent engagement compared to parents and LGUs. The results further suggest that communication and collaboration serve as strengths in governance practices, while transparency and accountability remain areas for improvement. Strengthening these aspects through clearer communication channels, defined stakeholder roles, and increased access to information may enhance participation, build trust, and promote more effective and inclusive school governance. These findings support the study of Amponsah (2025), which emphasized that meaningful stakeholder engagement, trust-building, and inclusive participation are essential components of effective shared governance.

Table 2

Level of Engagement on Shared Governance in Public Elementary Schools as Perceived by the Three Groups of Respondents with Respect to the Different Aspects

Aspects	School Officials			Parents			Local Government Unit		
	W $\bar{X}$	VI	R	W $\bar{X}$	VI	R	W $\bar{X}$	VI	R
Participation in Decision Making	4.51	Always (Very Much Engaged)	2	4.23	Often (Much Engaged)	2	4.03	Often (Much Engaged)	2
Communication and Collaboration	4.52	Always (Very Much Engaged)	1	4.32	Often (Much Engaged)	1	4.14	Often (Much Engaged)	1
Transparency and Accountability	4.25	Often (Much Engaged)	3	4.20	Often (Much Engaged)	3	3.89	Often (Much Engaged)	3
Composite W$\bar{X}$	4.43	Often (Much Engaged)		4.25	Often (Much Engaged)		4.02	Often (Much Engaged)	

3.3 Significant Difference on the Level of Engagement on Shared Governance of the Three Groups of Respondents with Respect to the Different Aspects in Terms of Their Profile

The table 3.1 below shows the result of the test for the significant difference on the level of engagement on shared governance as perceived by school official-respondents with respect to the different aspects in terms of their sex, civil status, and age in terms of transparency and accountability, the obtained p-values higher than .05 level of significance, thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. Meanwhile, when they are grouped according to their educational attainment, length of service, position title, and in-service trainings attended with respect to all aspects, the obtained p-values are lower than .05 level of significance, thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Findings reveal that there is no significant difference on the level of engagement on shared governance as perceived by school official- respondents with respect to participation in decision making, communication and collaboration, and transparency and accountability in terms of their sex and civil status. However, significant difference exists when they are grouped according to their educational attainment, length of service, position title, and in-service trainings attended with respect to participation in decision making, communication and collaboration, and transparency and accountability. The findings imply that school officials' sex and civil status do not influence their level of engagement in shared governance, meaning that male and female officials, whether single or married, participate similarly in decision making, communication, collaboration, and transparency activities. However, differences in educational attainment, length of service, in-service trainings attended, and age do affect engagement in participation in decision making and communication and collaboration. This further implies that school officials with higher educational attainment, more years of service, older age, or more in-service trainings may have greater knowledge, experience, and confidence, which enables them to participate more actively in decision-making and collaborate more effectively with others. This is in relation with Donquillo (2024) which examined school heads' shared governance practices and management styles, finding that the effectiveness of leadership impacts the implementation of school-based continuity plans.

Table 3.1

Result of the F-test in the Significant Difference on the Level of Engagement on Shared Governance as Perceived by School Official-Respondents with Respect to the Different Aspects in Terms of their Profile

Variables/ Aspects	F-comp	p-values	Ho	VI
Age				
Participation in Decision Making	5.403	.002	Rejected	Significant
Communication and Collaboration	5.574	.001	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	1.343	.263	Accepted	Not Significant
Sex				
Participation in Decision Making	1.680	.190	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	1.350	.262	Accepted	Not Significant
Transparency and Accountability	1.734	.180	Accepted	Not Significant
Civil Status				
Participation in Decision Making	.452	.637	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	.432	.650	Accepted	Not Significant
Transparency and Accountability	1.338	.266	Accepted	Not Significant
Educational Attainment				

Participation in Decision Making	5.045	.001	Rejected	Significant
Communication and Collaboration	5.955	.000	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	9.943	.000	Rejected	Significant
Length of Service				
Participation in Decision Making	16.675	.000	Rejected	Significant
Communication and Collaboration	13.497	.000	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	12.861	.000	Rejected	Significant
Position Title				
Participation in Decision Making	7.603	.000	Rejected	Significant
Communication and Collaboration	7.767	.000	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	14.426	.000	Rejected	Significant
In-Service Trainings Attended				
Participation in Decision Making	9.824	.000	Rejected	Significant
Communication and Collaboration	5.976	.000	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	6.152	.000	Rejected	Significant

The table 3.2 below presents the results of the F-test on the significant differences in the level of engagement on shared governance as perceived by parent-respondents across selected profile variables. The findings indicate that sex does not significantly influence parents' engagement in all three aspects—participation in decision-making, communication and collaboration, and transparency and accountability—as all p-values exceeded the 0.05 level of significance. Similarly, age does not significantly affect participation in decision-making, but it shows a significant influence on communication and collaboration ($p = .035$) and transparency and accountability ($p = .028$). In terms of civil status, significant differences were found in participation in decision-making ($p = .032$) and communication and collaboration ($p = .002$), while no significant difference was observed in transparency and accountability. Moreover, educational attainment, occupation, and monthly family income consistently showed significant differences across all three aspects, with p-values less than 0.05, indicating that these variables are strong determinants of parents' engagement in shared governance. These results imply that while parental involvement is not influenced by sex, it is shaped by socio-economic and educational factors, which affect parents' confidence, awareness, and capacity to participate in school governance. The findings suggest the need for schools to adopt inclusive strategies, such as capacity-building activities and accessible communication mechanisms, to encourage active participation among parents from diverse backgrounds. These results support the study of Cuaud (2025), which emphasized that parental involvement in decision-making and communication significantly contributes to students' academic development and overall school effectiveness.

Table 3.2

Result of the F-test in the Significant Difference on the Level of Engagement on Shared Governance as Perceived by Parent-Respondents with Respect to the Different Aspects in Terms of their Profile

Variables/ Aspects	F-comp	p-values	Ho	VI
Age				
Participation in Decision Making	1.237	.297	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	2.903	.035	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	3.064	.028	Rejected	Significant
Sex				
Participation in Decision Making	.651	.421	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	.007	.933	Accepted	Not Significant
Transparency and Accountability	3.656	.057	Accepted	Not Significant
Civil Status				
Participation in Decision Making	3.496	.032	Rejected	Significant
Communication and Collaboration	6.280	.002	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	1.602	.203	Accepted	Not Significant
Educational Attainment				
Participation in Decision Making	24.148	.000	Rejected	Significant
Communication and Collaboration	14.778	.000	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	8.374	.000	Rejected	Significant
Occupation				

Participation in Decision Making	19.262	.000	Rejected	Significant
Communication and Collaboration	5.989	.000	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	6.908	.000	Rejected	Significant
Monthly Family Income				
Participation in Decision Making	11.721	.000	Rejected	Significant
Communication and Collaboration	4.732	.000	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	4.910	.000	Rejected	Significant

The table 3.3. below presents the results of the F-test on the significant differences in the level of engagement on shared governance as perceived by Local Government Unit (LGU) respondents when grouped according to selected profile variables. The findings reveal that age, sex, number of children in the family, educational attainment, occupation, and monthly family income do not significantly influence the level of engagement across all three aspects—participation in decision-making, communication and collaboration, and transparency and accountability—as all computed p-values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. However, a significant difference was observed in civil status with respect to communication and collaboration ($p = .043$), indicating that civil status affects how LGU respondents engage in collaborative processes. This suggests that while LGU participation in shared governance is generally consistent regardless of most demographic factors, variations in civil status may influence interpersonal dynamics, communication styles, and collaborative engagement. The results imply that LGU representatives, regardless of background, maintain a stable level of involvement in school governance, but tailored strategies may be necessary to enhance communication and collaboration among individuals with differing personal circumstances. Providing inclusive and flexible engagement mechanisms may further strengthen partnerships between schools and LGUs, improve coordination, and support effective implementation of school programs. These findings align with Consolacion et al. (2025), which emphasized the importance of collaborative governance and active LGU participation in strengthening School-Based Management (SBM) practices.

Table 3.3

Result of the F-test in the Significant Difference on the Level of Engagement on Shared Governance as Perceived by Local Government Unit -Respondents with Respect to the Different Aspects in Terms of their Profile

Variables/ Aspects	F-comp	p-values	Ho	VI
Age				
Participation in Decision Making	.397	.755	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	2.078	.106	Accepted	Not Significant
Transparency and Accountability	1.155	.329	Accepted	Not Significant
Sex				
Participation in Decision Making	.099	.753	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	.058	.809	Accepted	Not Significant
Transparency and Accountability	.779	.379	Accepted	Not Significant
Civil Status				
Participation in Decision Making	1.138	.323	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	3.223	.043	Rejected	Significant
Transparency and Accountability	1.689	.188	Accepted	Not Significant
Number of Children in the Family				
Participation in Decision Making	.073	.990	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	.252	.908	Accepted	Not Significant
Transparency and Accountability	.195	.941	Accepted	Not Significant
Educational Attainment				
Participation in Decision Making	.195	.823	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	.490	.614	Accepted	Not Significant
Transparency and Accountability	.498	.609	Accepted	Not Significant
Occupation				
Participation in Decision Making	.491	.743	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	.579	.678	Accepted	Not Significant
Transparency and Accountability	.570	.685	Accepted	Not Significant
Monthly Family Income				

Participation in Decision Making	.288	.885	Accepted	Not Significant
Communication and Collaboration	.474	.754	Accepted	Not Significant
Transparency and Accountability	.263	.901	Accepted	Not Significant

3.4 Extent of the Challenges Encountered by the Three Groups of Respondents in the Engagement on Shared Governance

The table presents the extent of challenges encountered in engagement on shared governance as perceived by the three groups of respondents. The overall weighted means of 3.10 for school officials, 2.96 for parents, and 2.98 for Local Government Unit (LGU) respondents are all interpreted as “Sometimes Encountered,” indicating a moderate level of challenges across groups. Among school officials, the most frequently encountered challenge is the lack of understanding of shared governance and how it works (WM = 3.56, Often Encountered), while the least encountered is lack of self-confidence in contributing to decision-making (WM = 2.95, Sometimes Encountered). For parents, the top challenge is lack of awareness of roles and responsibilities in decision-making (WM = 3.19), while the least is the perceived lack of visible impact of their participation (WM = 2.78), both interpreted as Sometimes Encountered. Similarly, LGU respondents identified lack of awareness of roles and responsibilities as their primary challenge (WM = 3.31), while lack of visible impact ranked lowest (WM = 2.83). These findings suggest that although stakeholders are generally engaged, gaps in knowledge, clarity of roles, and understanding of governance processes hinder more effective participation. The results imply that schools should strengthen orientation programs, provide continuous capacity-building activities, and establish clear communication channels to enhance stakeholders’ understanding and confidence. Addressing these challenges can foster stronger collaboration, improve stakeholder participation, and promote more effective shared governance. These findings are consistent with Balinas (2025), who emphasized that communication barriers and lack of clarity in roles can limit effective collaboration among school stakeholders.

Table 4
*Extent of Challenges Encountered in Engagement of Shared Governance
by the Three Groups of Respondents*

Challenges encountered in engagement on shared governance L...	School Officials			Parents			Local Government Unit		
	W $\bar{X}$	VI	R	W $\bar{X}$	VI	R	W $\bar{X}$	VI	R
1. have lack of understanding on what shared governance is or how it works.	3.56	Often Encountered	1	3.02	Sometimes Encountered	3	3.06	Sometimes Encountered	3
2. am not aware of my roles and responsibilities in decision-making.	3.19	Sometimes Encountered	2	3.19	Sometimes Encountered	1	3.31	Sometimes Encountered	1
3. have lack of visible impact that reduces motivation to engage in decision-making.	3.09	Sometimes Encountered	4	2.78	Sometimes Encountered	10	2.83	Sometimes Encountered	10
4. feel that I am inadequately informed about the activities, projects and opportunities for involvement.	3.12	Sometimes Encountered	3	2.90	Sometimes Encountered	8	2.90	Sometimes Encountered	8
5. have lack of trust that my input do not actually used.	2.99	Sometimes Encountered	8	2.81	Sometimes Encountered	9	2.86	Sometimes Encountered	9
6. feel that I am unheard and unaware of different challenges in school.	3.06	Sometimes Encountered	5	3.01	Sometimes Encountered	5	2.97	Sometimes Encountered	5
7. cannot attend regular meetings or any important activities due to prior commitment.	2.97	Sometimes Encountered	9	3.02	Sometimes Encountered	3	3.09	Sometimes Encountered	2
8. feel that I am lacking self-confidence to contribute in decision-making.	2.95	Sometimes Encountered	10	2.94	Sometimes Encountered	6	2.92	Sometimes Encountered	6
9. have conflict schedules for me to attend regular meetings hard to do.	3.03	Sometimes Encountered	6.5	3.02	Sometimes Encountered	3	2.99	Sometimes Encountered	4

10. have insufficient trainings on my roles, responsibilities and governance processes leads to poor understanding and ineffective participation.	3.03	Sometimes Encountered	6.5	2.92	Sometimes Encountered	7	2.91	Sometimes Encountered	7
Overall W $\bar{X}$	3.10	Sometimes Encountered		2.96	Sometimes Encountered		2.98	Sometimes Encountered	

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study concludes that not all demographic variables significantly influence the level of engagement in shared governance among stakeholders in public elementary schools. Specifically, school officials' sex and civil status, parents' sex, and Local Government Unit (LGU) respondents' age, sex, number of children, educational attainment, occupation, and monthly family income were found not to be predictors of engagement in terms of participation in decision-making, communication and collaboration, and transparency and accountability. However, certain variables were identified as significant predictors of engagement. For school officials, educational attainment, length of service, in-service trainings attended, and age influenced their level of participation and collaboration. Among parents, educational attainment, occupation, monthly family income, age, and civil status significantly affected their engagement in specific governance aspects. Likewise, civil status was found to influence LGU respondents' engagement in communication and collaboration. These findings indicate that while shared governance is generally practiced across stakeholder groups, engagement levels vary depending on experience, capacity, and socio-economic factors.

In light of these findings, the study recommends that school administrators strengthen stakeholder engagement through targeted interventions. These include conducting orientation sessions and capacity-building programs to enhance understanding of shared governance, establishing clear and accessible communication channels, and providing flexible participation mechanisms to accommodate stakeholders' varying schedules. Mentorship programs may also be developed to support less experienced members, while parents and LGU representatives should be encouraged to actively contribute through structured feedback mechanisms. Furthermore, continuous monitoring and evaluation of engagement practices are essential to identify areas for improvement and sustain collaborative efforts. The implementation of the proposed action plan is strongly recommended, and future studies may explore additional variables to further enrich understanding of shared governance in educational settings.

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 respondents for their contributions

REFERENCES

- Amer, M. A. (2025). Parental involvement and academic performance in public schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Development*, 11(2), 101–115.
- Amponsah, S. (2025). Stakeholder engagement and inclusive governance in educational institutions. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, 12(1), 45–60.
- Balinas, R. (2025). Communication barriers between parents and teachers in collaborative governance. *International Journal of Education and Development*, 9(2), 44–58.
- Balinas, R. (2025). Communication barriers in school–family partnerships: Implications for collaborative governance. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, 8(3), 77–89.
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2016). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Cauad, J. (2025). Parental engagement and student achievement: Evidence from basic education. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 15(1), 23–40.
- Consolacion, A. M., Reyes, P. L., & Dela Cruz, R. (2025). Collaborative governance and School-Based Management practices in the Philippines. *Asia-Pacific Education Review*, 26(2), 211–228.
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Department of Education. (2022). DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2022: Guidelines on School Governance Councils.

- DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2022. Guidelines on the establishment of School Governance Councils (SGC). Department of Education, Philippines.
- Dizon, M. T. (2024). Stakeholder participation in school governance and its impact on institutional effectiveness. *Journal of Philippine Education*, 18(2), 55–70.
- Eden, L., Herrera, S., & Kim, J. (2024). Community and parental involvement in education: A global perspective. *Educational Research International*, 2024, 1–12.
- Ergin, D., Yildiz, M., & Aydin, H. (2024). School–parent collaboration and student outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(1), 95–110.
- Fernandez, L. M. (2025). Transparency and accountability in school governance: A correlational study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 63(1), 88–102.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- George, K., & Amos, P. (2025). The role of parental involvement in improving student achievement. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 14(1), 33–47.
- Lucky, E. O. (2025). Transparency and accountability in governance: Implications for educational institutions. *Global Journal of Educational Research*, 12(2), 120–134.
- Rachman, A., Setiawan, B., & Putri, D. (2024). Digital communication and teacher-parent collaboration in schools. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 21(4), 210–225.
- Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). *Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- Slovin, E. (1960). *Sampling theory and practice*. (Unpublished manuscript).
- Tanque, R. J., & Brobo, L. (2024). Parental involvement and academic performance of learners. *Philippine Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(2), 65–79.