



STAKEHOLDERS' COLLABORATIVE EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL-COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

Rea B. Dacanayⁱ

Jiabong National High School,
Department of Education,
Samar Province, Philippines

Abstract:

This study explored the collaborative experiences of stakeholders in school–community partnerships in the Second Congressional District of Samar and developed a contextualized collaboration model for school heads. Anchored in Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory and supported by Systems Theory, Stakeholder Theory, School-Based Management, the Theory of Collaborative Advantage, and the Community of Practice Theory, the research employed a qualitative phenomenological design. Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with fifty-six (56) participants, including school heads, teachers, Supreme Secondary Learner Government (SSLG) presidents, School Parent-Teacher Association (SPTA) presidents, parents, alumni, and barangay officials. Findings revealed three essential themes that characterize stakeholder collaboration: (1) collaboration as shared responsibility, where stakeholders assume distinct yet complementary roles in supporting school programs and learner welfare; (2) collaboration sustained through active engagement, manifested through participation in meetings, communication, and inclusive decision-making processes; and (3) collaboration strengthened by accountability practices, emphasizing transparency, trust, responsiveness, and commitment to collective goals. These findings highlight that meaningful collaboration is not merely participation-based, but is deeply rooted in role clarity, relational involvement, and ethical responsibility among stakeholders. Based on these insights, the study developed the Proposed REA Collaboration Model, which integrates Responsibility, Engagement, and Accountability as interconnected dimensions that strengthen school–community partnerships and promote learner-centered outcomes. The study concludes that sustainable collaboration requires a shared sense of duty, continuous stakeholder involvement, and strong accountability mechanisms. It is recommended that school leaders institutionalize structured engagement practices, clarify stakeholder roles, and reinforce accountability systems to enhance partnership effectiveness and support holistic educational development.

ⁱ Correspondence: email rea.dacanay004@gmail.com

Keywords: stakeholder collaboration, school–community partnership, phenomenology, educational leadership, REA collaboration model

1. Introduction

Education thrives best when it is grounded in meaningful collaboration between schools and the communities they serve. The effectiveness of educational institutions is no longer measured solely by academic performance but by their ability to engage stakeholders in fostering holistic student development and social responsibility. The active participation of school leaders, teachers, parents, local government units (LGUs), and community members ensures that education becomes a shared societal enterprise rather than the exclusive responsibility of schools (Epstein, 2018; Fullan, 2016). Globally and locally, school–community partnerships are recognized as powerful mechanisms for improving educational access, promoting accountability, and strengthening collective ownership of learning outcomes.

The Department of Education (DepEd) in the Philippines has institutionalized stakeholder collaboration as a core principle of educational governance. National programs such as the School Governing Council (SGC), Adopt-a-School Program, School PTA Meetings and General Assemblies, Community Outreach Programs, School Programs and Celebrations, School Improvement Planning Workshops, and Brigada Eskwela operationalize this vision by promoting inclusive and community-driven participation in school improvement (DepEd, 2019; DepEd, 2023). Among these initiatives, Brigada Eskwela serves as a flagship program that mobilizes volunteers, including teachers, parents, alumni, local government units (LGUs), and private partners, to prepare schools for the opening of classes through shared labor, donations, and community service (DepEd, 2018; DepEd, 2023). In addition, the Partnerships and External Relations Office (PERO) at the national level facilitates and strengthens collaboration among schools, communities, and external partners to support the Department's goal of delivering quality and inclusive education (DepEd, 2023).

Despite these efforts, sustaining genuine and equitable collaboration among stakeholders remains a challenge. Studies reveal that many school–community partnerships in the Philippines tend to focus on isolated programs, short-term volunteerism, or compliance-oriented activities rather than continuous, meaningful engagement (Agbisit *et al.*, 2022; Pimentel & Llorin, 2021). Quantitative evaluations often measure participation rates and resources generated, but overlook the lived experiences, interpersonal dynamics, and collective meanings that underpin authentic collaboration (Bautista *et al.*, 2020). This gap highlights the need to explore stakeholder collaboration from a phenomenological lens, allowing the voices of administrators, teachers, parents, and community members to emerge in understanding how collaboration is truly experienced within the school setting.

Studies show that while quantitative data capture participation rates and resource mobilization outcomes, they often fail to portray the human dimension of collaboration,

specifically how administrators, teachers, parents, and community members perceive, negotiate, and sustain their roles in partnership. Existing studies tend to focus on specific actors or program outcomes, leaving a gap in capturing the holistic, shared essence of collaboration as experienced collectively by multiple stakeholders. Understanding this lived experience is critical, as it provides insight into the motivations, challenges, and meanings that underpin sustainable educational partnerships.

These governmental directives are implemented locally in the Samar Division. Section 246 of Division Memorandum No. 2025 requires the creation of Public Assistance Command Centers (PACC), the formation of Brigada Eskwela Task Forces, and the filing of accomplishment reports detailing resource development and stakeholder participation (DepEd Samar Division, 2025). Schools across the Second Congressional District of Samar, including Jiabong, Motiong, Paranas, Hinabangan, San Sebastian, Villareal, Pinabacdao, and Basey, actively involve barangay officials, parents, teachers, alumni, and LGUs in addressing school needs, improving facilities, and supporting learner welfare. However, several persistent issues hinder the sustainability of collaboration, including inconsistent stakeholder participation, limited documentation of partnership outcomes, and reliance on the initiative of school heads and community leaders to maintain engagement (DepEd Samar Division, 2025; Region VIII DepEd, 2024).

Anchored on these realities, this study sought to explore and describe the lived experiences of various stakeholders engaged in school–community partnerships within the Second Congressional District of Samar. Specifically, it aimed to uncover the underlying meanings, motivations, and challenges that define collaboration among school administrators, teachers, parents, and community members. Ultimately, the study aimed to develop a stakeholders' collaboration model for school heads, serving as a framework to guide the promotion of sustainable, inclusive, and meaningful school–community partnerships in the Philippine public-school context.

2. Materials and Methods

This study uses a qualitative research approach using a phenomenological research design to explore and describe the collaborative experiences of stakeholders in public secondary schools within the 2nd District of Samar Division. A total of 56 participants were selected from secondary schools in Samar, including eight school heads, eight teachers, and forty external stakeholders. The phenomenological approach, rooted in the works of Husserl (1931) and further developed by Moustakas (1994), was appropriate when the goal was to understand the meanings and essence of shared human experiences of collaboration. Moustakas' framework guided the in-depth exploration of stakeholders' lived experiences through processes such as bracketing, identification of significant statements, and development of textural descriptions (what the participants experienced) and structural descriptions (how they experienced it), which were synthesized to capture the essence of stakeholders' collaborative experiences. This framework ensured depth, authenticity, and faithfulness to the participants' perspectives.

On the other hand, Creswell and Poth's (2018) framework provided a practical and systematic guide in the conduct of qualitative research. Their approach supported the organization of the study, including data collection through semi-structured interviews, transcription of responses, coding procedures, thematic analysis, and interpretation of findings. Creswell and Poth also emphasized the importance of validation strategies such as member checking, triangulation, and maintaining rigor in qualitative inquiry. Their framework ensured that the research process was well-structured, coherent, and consistent with accepted standards in qualitative research. The integration of the two frameworks strengthened the methodological rigor of the study. While Moustakas provided a deep phenomenological lens on understanding lived experiences, Creswell and Poth offered a clear and organized process for analyzing and presenting the data. Together, these frameworks enabled the researcher to generate rich, meaningful, and credible findings that reflected the collaborative experiences of stakeholders. These insights served as the foundation for the development of a stakeholders' collaboration model aimed at enhancing school-community partnership.

The primary instrument used in this study was a semi-structured interview guide designed to explore the collaborative experiences of stakeholders in school-community partnership. The basis for selecting the interview guide as the research instrument lay in its ability to elicit rich, in-depth, and descriptive data directly from participants. As such, the researcher's role involved engaging participants in open dialogue, facilitating interviews, and interpreting their accounts while practicing reflexivity and bracketing to minimize bias. An in-depth interview guide was employed to collect personal narratives from respondents of the study who had collaborative experiences in school-community partnership. Follow-up questions were raised to clarify meanings and probed deeper into the essence of lived collaborative experiences of stakeholders in the school-community partnership within the Division of Samar.

To ensure the validity and reliability of the research instrument, the researcher employed content and expert validation procedures. Content validity was established through a systematic expert review of the interview guide by the research adviser for comments and suggestions. The adviser examined the content, structure, and consistency of the questions with the research problem and provided recommendations for improvement. After incorporating the suggested revisions, the instrument was then submitted to a panel of experts for further validation. The validators were chosen based on their expertise and qualifications in the field of educational management. The panel of experts consisted of professionals with advanced academic degrees such as Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Management and with extensive experience in qualitative research and school leadership. Their expertise ensured that the instrument was both theoretically grounded and contextually appropriate.

Table 1: Participants of the Study

No.	School	Stakeholders Participants							Total No. of Participants
		Principal	Teacher	SSLG President	SPTA President	Parent	Alumni President	Barangay Captain	
1	A	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
2	B	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
3	C	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
4	D	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
5	E	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
6	F	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
7	G	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
8	H	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Total		8	8	8	8	8	8	8	56

The data collection process was conducted in several stages to ensure rigor and ethical compliance. Prior to data collection, formal permission was obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent and School Heads of the selected public secondary schools in Samar. Upon approval, the researcher coordinated with the School Heads and School Governing Council (SGC) chairpersons to identify qualified participants who met the inclusion criteria and had direct and substantial experiences in school-community partnerships. Informed consent forms were obtained from all participants before the scheduled interview at mutually convenient times and venues to ensure participant comfort and willingness to share. Participants were provided with a detailed explanation of the study's purpose, procedures, potential risks and benefits, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Consent forms were available in both English and Filipino to ensure understanding.

Data collection was carried out in a timely manner following a structured timeline to maintain the flow and relevance of the research. Each interview session lasted approximately 25 minutes, allowing sufficient time for participants to express their insights in depth. Data collection commenced on February 2, 2026 and was completed on February 23, 2026, covering a total span of three weeks. This duration provided ample opportunity to conduct, transcribe, and review the consistency of the data gathered.

The appropriateness of the data-gathering method was based on its consistency with the study's qualification and phenomenological nature. The semi-structured interview guide enabled the participants to freely articulate their experiences, insights, and reflections on collaboration within the school-community partnership. Clarifying questions were used to elicit further explanation, clarification, and examples, ensuring that each response was comprehensive and meaningful. Field notes and recordings were used with participant permission to capture both verbal and non-verbal cues essential for later analysis.

To maintain manageability, the researcher employed an organized system for recording, labeling, and securely storing interview data. Each transcript was coded and anonymized to protect participant confidentiality.

The researcher used manual and digital tools to organize data systematically, ensuring ease in retrieval during the thematic analysis phase. Regular progress monitoring was conducted to keep the data collection process on schedule and within the planned duration. Overall, the data gathering procedure was designed to uphold the standards of credibility, ethical conduct and practical efficiency. This was to ensure that the information collected truly represented the essence of stakeholders' lived experience in school-community partnership.

3. Results and Discussions

The findings revealed three key phenomenological themes that define the collaborative experiences of stakeholders in school–community partnerships. These themes illustrated how collaboration was experienced as a shared responsibility, maintained through active stakeholder participation, and reinforced by accountability practices. Table 2 displays the themes and their related subthemes that guided the subsequent discussion.

Theme 1: Collaboration Was Experienced as Shared Responsibility

The stakeholders' narratives showed that collaboration in school–community partnerships was mainly experienced as a shared responsibility. Among teachers, SSLG presidents, principals, SPTA presidents, parents, alumni, and barangay captains, collaboration was seen not just as occasional participation but as an ongoing duty connected to each person's role, function, and commitment to the school and its students. Their accounts indicated that stakeholders viewed collaboration as something they were expected to handle, maintain, and contribute to, whether through leadership, representation, volunteering, coordination, guidance, or direct support.

The narratives revealed that shared responsibility was demonstrated in five interconnected ways: stakeholders took on distinct roles within the partnership, provided practical support for school programs and projects, shared accountability for learner welfare, complemented each other's functions in school–community initiatives, and viewed collaboration as a duty rather than optional involvement. These aspects demonstrated that collaboration was experienced as a collective effort where each stakeholder group contributed in different but connected ways to improve schools and support learners.

Table 2: Emergent Phenomenological Themes and
Subthemes on the Collaborative Experiences of Stakeholders

Emergent/ Phenomenological Themes	Subthemes
Theme 1. Collaboration was experienced as shared responsibility.	1. Stakeholders assumed distinct roles in the partnership. 2. Stakeholders contributed practical support to school programs and projects. 3. Stakeholders shared responsibility for learner welfare. 4. Stakeholders complemented one another's functions in school-community initiatives. 5. Stakeholders viewed collaboration as a duty rather than optional involvement.
Theme 2. Collaboration was sustained through active stakeholder engagement.	1. Stakeholders participated in meetings and consultative processes. 2. Stakeholders maintained communication through formal and informal channels. 3. Stakeholders were engaged through invitations, recognition, and inclusion. 4. Stakeholders contributed ideas and feedback in collaborative decision-making. 5. Stakeholder participation was sustained through relational connection and mutual involvement.
Theme 3. Collaboration was strengthened by accountability practices.	1. Stakeholders valued transparency in plans, decisions, and fund use. 2. Stakeholders addressed misunderstandings through clarification and dialogue. 3. Stakeholders responded to constraints through adjustment and follow-through. 4. Stakeholders linked accountability with trust and credibility in collaboration. 5. Stakeholders anchored accountability on actions that benefit learners and the school community.

Subtheme 1.1: Stakeholders Assumed Distinct Roles in the Partnership

This subtheme shows that stakeholders experienced collaboration by taking on clear and recognizable roles within the partnership. Their stories indicated that collaboration was not vague or general; instead, each stakeholder group understood its specific role in maintaining the school-community partnership. Therefore, collaboration was viewed as a role-based process where participation was shaped by one's position, responsibilities, and contributions to the school and its students.

Teacher and principal participants particularly described collaboration as role performance anchored in facilitation, planning, and leadership.

A teacher-participant stated,

"I oversee preparation and planning for the SPTA activities that include the fundraising of funds of the school projects." (TP1, L10–L11)

showing how teachers assumed organizing and preparatory responsibilities in school-community undertakings. In a parallel manner, a principal participant shared,

"...of course, the school head is the initiator of the programs and project of the school."
(SHP1, L10–L11)

emphasizing that school heads saw themselves as the ones who begin and drive collaborative efforts. These statements suggest that for teachers and principals, collaboration was experienced not merely as support work, but as a defined responsibility tied to their positions as facilitators and leaders of partnership activities.

Student and parent-sector stakeholders likewise described their participation in role-specific terms. An SSLG president said,

"We lead whenever there are activities being conducted." (SP1, L9–L10)

reflecting how student leaders experienced collaboration through leadership and visible participation in school affairs. Similarly, an SPTA president explained,

"Being the president of the General PTA, I am the one who conveys the parents' concerns to the school administration. (SPTAP1, L10–L12)"

These narratives show that collaboration was experienced by student and parent leaders through roles of representation, leadership, and communication, indicating that they were not passive attendees but active actors within the partnership.

Parents, alumni, and barangay officials also framed their collaborative experiences through the roles they assumed in relation to the school. A parent-participant remarked,

"As a parent, I always show support whenever the school needs." (PP1, L10–L10)

while an alumnus shared,

"As an alumnus, I support school community activities by volunteering my time, sharing my experience, and helping strengthen the link between the school and the community."
(AP1, L10–L12)

In the same vein, a barangay captain narrated,

"Before, when we were still allowed by COA, we donated one facility and then the wall fence." (BCP1, L9–L10)

These accounts indicate that collaboration was experienced across non-school actors assuming supportive, connecting, and community-based roles that complemented those of school-based stakeholders.

Willemse *et al.* (2018) explained that family-school partnerships depend on teachers' ability to assume roles that extend beyond classroom instruction, including coordination, relationship-building, and parental involvement. Their study emphasized that teachers play a crucial role in supporting the structures and interactions that facilitate collaboration. This aligns with the current finding that teachers see partnership not only as teaching but also as a responsibility that involves planning, organizing, and maintaining stakeholder participation. Additionally, Jung and Sheldon (2020) found that school leadership significantly influences the conditions for meaningful family and community involvement, especially when school heads actively promote participation and establish partnership frameworks. Similarly, Caetano, Freire, and Machado (2020) observed that student participation becomes meaningful when learners are given real opportunities to lead, speak, and act in school processes. These studies support the current finding that both principals and SSLG leaders experience collaboration through clearly defined roles related to leadership, facilitation, and representation. Furthermore, Murray, Domina, Renzulli, and Boylan (2019) pointed out that PTAs and other family-based organizations create channels for parent representation and school engagement, while Sepanik *et al.* (2021) stressed that community partnerships become effective when non-school stakeholders provide different kinds of support aligned with school needs. These studies back up the accounts of SPTA leaders, parents, alumni, and barangay officials, whose experiences highlight collaboration as role-based support, representation, and resource contribution. Collectively, the literature confirms that school-community partnerships are strengthened when stakeholders take on distinct but complementary roles within a shared collaborative structure.

Therefore, the participants' narratives reveal that collaboration was viewed as a partnership with clear, differentiated roles rather than just random participation. Stakeholders entered the partnership with specific responsibilities based on their relationship to the school, and these roles helped the partnership operate in an organized and ongoing way. In this context, taking on distinct roles became a key sign of shared responsibility in school-community collaboration.

Subtheme 1.2: Stakeholders Contributed Practical Support to School Programs and Projects

This subtheme demonstrates that stakeholders experienced collaboration through tangible and visible forms of support for school programs, projects, and activities. Their stories show that collaboration went beyond just attending meetings or verbally supporting; it was demonstrated through concrete actions like identifying school needs, suggesting projects, volunteering labor, starting activities, and providing material or logistical help. In this way, collaboration was seen as a practical effort where stakeholders turned their involvement into actions that directly aided school operations and growth.

Teacher and principal participants particularly described collaboration as practical support directed toward school improvement and problem-solving.

A teacher participant explained,

"We conceptualize project ideas by identifying the needs of the school and then develop project proposals that address those identified needs." (TP1, L18–L20),

showing that practical collaboration began with identifying school needs and translating them into proposed projects. The same participant added,

"We implemented a deep well project to provide a reliable water supply for the school's comfort rooms. Additionally, we carried out a solar lamp project to improve outdoor lighting and enhance safety and visibility within the school premises, especially during nighttime." (TP1, L21–L23),

indicating that support was expressed through actual improvement projects. Likewise, a principal participant narrated,

"For example, if there are dropouts, we have to call the attention of the parents first... "We can carry out this initiative through home visits." (SHP1, L17–L19)

suggesting that school heads also experienced collaboration as a practical intervention in response to learner and school concerns. These accounts reveal that collaboration was experienced as action-oriented support rather than symbolic participation.

Student leaders and parent-sector stakeholders likewise framed their participation in terms of practical contribution to school undertakings. An SSLG officer stated,

"Taking the initiative on what would be good for the school. (SP1, L39–L40),

reflecting that student participation was also understood as giving useful and improvement-oriented support. In the same way, an SPTA president shared,

"We are the ones who initiate the activities together with the parents. (SPTAP1, L34–L36),

while a parent participant said,

"I volunteer in every Community volunteerism conducted in school as a 4ps beneficiary." (PP1, L20–L20)

These statements indicate that practical support was expressed through initiative, direct labor, and organized involvement in school activities, making stakeholder collaboration visible in the everyday life of the school.

Non-school stakeholders also described collaboration as extending concrete support that responds to school needs. An alumnus explained,

"I contribute by volunteering, helping, and sharing ideas to improve school activities and projects." (AP1, L24–L25),

while a barangay captain shared,

"We only help voluntarily now during enrollment. That lasts for one week." (BCP1, L28–L29).

A further SPTA account in the chapter noted school safety and infrastructure support such as signage, pedestrian lanes, and solar lights, showing that practical support also included material and project-based assistance. Taken together, these narratives show that collaboration was lived as concrete contribution—through service, projects, and local support—that enabled school programs and activities to move forward. Sepanik *et al.* (2021) explained that school-community partnerships expand the social, material, and organizational resources available to schools, especially when stakeholders provide practical support that addresses school and learner needs. Their study suggests that collaboration becomes meaningful when outside actors do not just express goodwill but actively offer support that schools alone may not be able to provide. This supports the present finding that stakeholders experienced collaboration through visible and functional contributions such as projects, volunteer work, and direct assistance to school operations. Also, Sacro (2025) emphasized that PTA-school synergy is strengthened when parents and PTA leaders go beyond attendance and become active supporters of school programs, facilities, and improvement efforts. Likewise, Murray, Domina, Renzulli, and Boylan (2019) highlighted that parent-led organizations served as channels through which families contribute to school life in practical and organized ways. These studies reinforced the current finding that SPTA presidents and parents experienced collaboration through concrete support such as initiating activities, participating in labor, and contributing materials to school projects. The narratives demonstrated that stakeholders viewed collaboration as something made tangible through practical support for school programs and projects. Their contributions went beyond symbolic participation and were expressed through concrete actions that addressed school needs, enhanced programs, and improved school conditions. In this way, practical support became a key way of showing how shared responsibility was carried out in school-community partnerships.

Subtheme 1.3. Stakeholders Shared Responsibility for Learner Welfare

This subtheme highlights that stakeholders viewed collaboration as a shared commitment to learners' well-being. Their stories show that collaboration was most meaningful when focused on students' needs, participation, attendance, motivation, and overall development. In this way, collaboration was not just about supporting school programs and projects, but also about a collective responsibility to protect and foster learner growth through coordinated actions among school and community stakeholders.

School-based participants particularly described collaboration as an intentional response to learner needs. A teacher participant stated,

"Support and assist the parents and guide their learners. (TP1, L31–L31),

indicating that teachers experienced their role as extending beyond instruction into support for both parents and students. Similarly, a principal explained,

"There must be a collaborative effort from the school administrator and the community itself to solve these problems." (SHP1, L21–L22),

referring to the issue of dropouts and the need for home visits and support mechanisms. These accounts suggest that collaboration was experienced as a coordinated responsibility to respond to learner concerns through shared intervention and guidance.

Other stakeholders, likewise, framed their participation in relation to learner welfare. An SPTA president shared,

"Monitoring whether the learners attend school or not also helps the school." (SPTAP1, L45–L46)

A parent participant also expressed,

"Cooperate and participate for the good of the learners." (PP1, L75–L75),

directly linking parental involvement with learner benefit. These narratives show that both parent-sector stakeholders and school-home partners experienced collaboration as a form of accountability to students, particularly in relation to attendance, school participation, and educational support.

The broader set of participants also shows that learners remained the central point around which collaborative action was organized. A principal participant emphasized,

"Cooperation han stakeholders ngan school dapat to improve the school and the learners (cooperation of the stakeholders and the school is needed to improve the school and the learners)." (SHP4, L729–L730)

Another teacher added that community partnership had a direct impact on students, noting,

"The community benefits because their children, the learners, study better because of the good partnership between the school and the community. It has an impact on the learners."
(TP1, L91–L92)

Together, these statements indicate that stakeholders understood collaboration not as an end in itself, but as a shared responsibility whose ultimate value lies in what it does for learners.

Sepanik *et al.* (2021) noted that school-community partnerships enable schools to leverage broader social and institutional support to address students' academic, social, and well-being needs. Their work highlights that collaboration becomes especially meaningful when it targets barriers affecting learners and when support goes beyond the school's internal resources. This confirms the current finding that stakeholders view collaboration as shared responsibility for learner welfare, particularly when addressing attendance issues, learner needs, and school participation. Additionally, Chappel *et al.* (2021) also found that partnership practices are most effective when schools work collaboratively with families and communities to meet learner needs and overcome learning barriers. In this study, this is reflected in stakeholders' focus on home visits, attendance monitoring, parental cooperation, and coordinated efforts for students at risk of disengagement. Chappel *et al.* (2021) thus support the idea that collaboration persists when stakeholders view learner welfare as a shared concern rather than solely the school's responsibility. Likewise, Anazia (2025) emphasized that strong home-school partnerships are maintained through shared responsibility, communication, and collective commitment to learner support. Jutara and De Jesus (2024) also pointed out that school leaders boost parental and community involvement when they align collaboration with educational benefits for children. Similarly, Sepanik *et al.* (2021) argued that meaningful partnerships are rooted in actions that improve students' conditions for learning and participation. Overall, these studies support the current finding that accountability to learners is a key principle guiding stakeholder collaboration.

Therefore, the narratives indicate that stakeholders experienced collaboration as a shared responsibility for learner welfare. Their involvement was not only directed toward school activities and organizational support, but also toward ensuring that learners attend, participate, remain motivated, and benefit from a stronger school-community relationship. In this sense, collaboration was lived as a collective commitment to the educational well-being of students, making learner welfare a central expression of shared responsibility in the phenomenon.

Subtheme 1.4: Stakeholders Complemented One Another's Functions in School-Community Initiatives

This subtheme illustrates that stakeholders saw collaboration as a process where different actors played distinct but interconnected roles within school-community initiatives. Their narratives show that collaboration was possible not because everyone did the same thing, but because each person contributed a unique role that supported, expanded, or strengthened others' efforts. Therefore, collaboration was experienced as a coordinated and interdependent system of participation where roles complemented each other rather than being isolated.

The school-based stakeholders particularly described collaboration as requiring the coordinated performance of different functions. One SSLG officer stated,

"SSLG officers, representatives, teachers, and school heads. We discuss students who are not attending classes and those who are late. (SP1, L86-L89)

In the same way, a principal participant shared,

"Actually, as a leader, you have to gather all the resources you have to be successful... Consultative is the most important." (SHP1, L38-L40)

These statements show that collaboration was experienced as a shared undertaking in which school leaders, teachers, and student representatives worked through interconnected roles of leadership, consultation, and responsiveness to learner concerns.

Parent and community-sector stakeholders likewise emphasized complementary roles in making school initiatives possible. A General PTA president explained,

"We are the ones who coordinate with other agencies to help the school, such as providing vehicles for learners during competitions." (SPTAP1, L41-L44)

Similarly, a barangay captain said,

"It is a big help. Each stakeholder is able to provide, especially through cooperation, and the GPTA they establish in the school is a big thing for the children. (BCP4, L495-L498)

These statements suggest that stakeholders experienced collaboration as a process in which parent organizations, community leaders, and school actors provided different forms of support that were mutually reinforcing.

Alumni and other external stakeholders also reflected the same pattern of complementarity. An alumnus shared,

"As an alumnus, I contribute by sharing my knowledge and experience, mentoring students and connecting the school with possible partners or opportunities." (AP6, L688–L689)

Another alumnus added,

"As an alumnus, I actively contribute to our school community partnership activities by mentoring students, participating in career workshops, and supporting local school initiatives." (AP6, L670–L672)

These accounts indicate that collaboration was experienced as a network of different but connected forms of support—school stakeholders handled internal coordination and program implementation, while alumni and community actors extended expertise, mentoring, and outside linkages. In this sense, collaboration was sustained because stakeholders did not duplicate one another's work; rather, they complemented each other's functions in ways that broadened the school's capacity to respond to needs. Galdames-Calderón *et al.* (2023) emphasized that distributed and collaborative leadership enhances school effectiveness when leadership functions are shared rather than concentrated in a single individual. Their work suggests that school-community partnerships become stronger when different participants are allowed to contribute in ways that match their roles, skills, and relational access. This supports the current finding that collaboration was experienced through complementary role performance, especially among principals, teachers, student leaders, and parent representatives who performed different but interdependent functions in school-community initiatives.

Also, Murray, Domina, Renzulli, and Boylan (2019) similarly highlighted that family and parent organizations create channels through which school actors and community members can contribute in coordinated efforts, rather than in isolated actions. In the same vein, Sepanik *et al.* (2021) noted that school-community partnerships become effective when outside stakeholders provide resources, services, and connections that schools cannot deliver alone. These studies reinforce the current finding that community actors, parent groups, and alumni serve not as peripheral supporters but as complementary partners who expand the reach of school initiatives.

Likewise, Flores (2024) and Wahono *et al.* (2025) further argued that genuine student and stakeholder participation gains significance when different actors are given real opportunities to contribute from their own positions within the system. This means that collaboration is not maintained by uniform participation but by recognizing that stakeholders contribute differently toward a shared goal. In relation to the present study, the accounts of SSLG leaders, alumni, and barangay officials confirm that partnerships strengthened when each stakeholder's role was acknowledged as part of a larger, interconnected system. Subsequently, the narratives indicate that stakeholders perceived collaboration as a structure of complementary participation. Their roles differed in form

and scope, yet these differences did not divide the partnership; instead, they made collaboration more functional and adaptable. In this way, school-community initiatives were experienced as collective efforts sustained through the interdependence of distinct but mutually reinforcing stakeholder functions.

Subtheme 1.5: Stakeholders Viewed Collaboration as a Duty Rather than Optional Involvement

This subtheme reveals that stakeholders viewed collaboration as something to be consistently carried out, maintained, and fulfilled, rather than as optional or occasional participation. Their stories show that collaboration was connected to a sense of duty rooted in their roles, concern for learners, and commitment to the school and community. In this way, collaboration was seen not just as a willingness to participate when convenient, but as a responsibility that required cooperation, presence, and follow-through.

School-based stakeholders particularly described collaboration as an obligation that must be sustained if school-community partnership is to remain effective. A principal participant stated,

"For example, if we have an agreement, if everyone has agreed, we have to sustain that so that we can make progress." (SHP1, L48–L49)

showing that collaboration was understood as something that carries continuing responsibility once commitments have been made. In another account, a principal emphasized,

"Technically, giving technical assistance to the teachers, this must be the duty of the principal." (SHP5, L748–L749)

indicating that collaboration was tied to leadership duty and not merely to discretionary action. These statements suggest that school leaders viewed partnership as a moral and professional obligation anchored in consistency, commitment, and follow-through.

Parents and alumni likewise framed collaboration as something they were expected to do for the school and the learners. A parent participant shared,

"As a parent, I always show support whenever the school needs." (PP1, L10–L10)

reflecting that parental involvement was experienced as a continuing obligation rather than occasional assistance. Similarly, an alumnus stated,

"As an alumnus, I support school community activities by volunteering my time, sharing my experience, and helping strengthen the link between the school and the community."
(AP1, L10–L12)

These narratives show that even non-school actors experienced collaboration as something they ought to uphold because of their relationship to the school and their sense of responsibility to contribute to its well-being.

The sense of duty also emerged in the expectation that stakeholders should cooperate and attend when called upon. One principal participant stressed,

"if there is a call, one really has to cooperate and attend because it is for the school and for their children as well." (SHP4, L724–L726)

In the same vein, a parent participant succinctly stated,

"Cooperate and participate for the good of the learners." (PP1, L75–L75)

These statements reveal that collaboration was experienced as a norm of expected participation, where attendance, cooperation, and involvement were viewed as obligations tied to the common good rather than purely personal choice. Anazia (2025) emphasized that a strong home-school partnership is built on shared responsibility, effective communication, and a collective sense of duty toward children's welfare and school goals. This supports the current finding that stakeholders did not see collaboration as optional support, but as an obligation rooted in their commitment to the school and its students. In this study, this sense of duty was evident in how principals, parents, and alumni described collaboration as something to be maintained because it benefits both the school and the children. Similarly, Jutara and De Jesus (2024) also found that school-community partnerships grow stronger when school leaders and families see their participation as an ongoing responsibility rather than a one-time response to school requests. Their work suggests that lasting partnership depends on internalizing collaboration as part of one's role in supporting education. This aligns with the participants' stories, which framed cooperation, attendance, and support as expected forms of involvement rather than acts of goodwill.

Likewise, Murray, Domina, Renzulli, and Boylan (2019) highlighted that parent and community participation becomes more meaningful when it is rooted in a strong sense of commitment to school life, while Sepanik *et al.* (2021) underscored that lasting partnerships are maintained when stakeholders consistently act on their responsibilities to learners and the school community. Together, these studies support the current finding that stakeholders view collaboration as a duty—one reinforced by commitment, ongoing participation, and a shared sense of obligation toward common educational goals. Therefore, the participants' stories show that collaboration was seen not just as a voluntary act of participating in school activities, but as a duty that needed to be fulfilled.

Stakeholders considered cooperation, attendance, support, and follow-through as part of what they owe to the school, the learners, and the broader community. In this way, collaboration was experienced as a duty-bound involvement, making responsibility not only a role or action but also an ongoing ethical commitment within the school-community partnership.

Theme 2: Collaboration Was Sustained Through Active Stakeholder Engagement

The stakeholders' narratives revealed that collaboration in school-community partnerships was maintained through active stakeholder engagement. Among teachers, SSLG presidents, principals, SPTA presidents, parents, alumni, and barangay captains, collaboration was not viewed as a one-time or passive act of support but as an ongoing process involving participation, consultation, communication, inclusion, and mutual involvement. Their accounts demonstrated that collaboration remained meaningful when stakeholders were not only present in name but actively involved, that is, being included in meetings, informed through communication channels, invited into decision-making spaces, and recognized as partners in school initiatives. In this way, engagement served as a sustaining force, keeping the partnership alive, visible, and participatory across various stakeholder groups.

The narratives suggest that active stakeholder engagement was expressed through five interconnected ways: stakeholders participated in meetings and consultative processes, maintained communication via formal and informal channels, were engaged through invitations, recognition, and inclusion, provided ideas and feedback in collaborative decision-making, and sustained participation through relational connections and mutual involvement.

Subtheme 2.1: Stakeholders Participated in Meetings and Consultative Processes

This subtheme highlights that stakeholders saw collaboration as happening through meetings and consultative processes. Their stories show that collaboration became clear and meaningful when stakeholders gathered in formal spaces where plans were presented, suggestions were shared, concerns were raised, and participation was organized. In this way, meetings were not just routine administrative tasks, but lived spaces of coordination, consultation, and collective involvement in school-community partnerships.

Teacher and principal participants particularly described meetings as central spaces for planning and coordination. A teacher participant narrated,

"First, we have assembly meetings; the PTA plans are presented to the parents, and then they suggest what is good." (TP1, L26–L28)

showing that meetings were experienced as venues where plans were openly shared and improved through stakeholder input. In a related account, a principal participant stated,

"We discuss proposals in meetings and gather suggestions before finalizing decisions." (SHP7, L1073–L1075)

indicating that meetings were also experienced as spaces where decisions were not simply imposed, but developed through consultation. These statements suggest that meetings sustained collaboration by making planning and decision-making participatory rather than unilateral.

Student and parent-sector stakeholders likewise framed collaboration as taking shape in meetings and consultations. An SSLG officer stated,

"We conduct meetings" (SP1, L57–L57), while an SPTA president shared, *"Through meetings ngan consultation"* (through meetings and consultation). (SPTAP4, L589–L591)

A parent participant also simply described the process of collaborative decision-making as

"Through meetings." (PP1, L47–L49)

These concise but direct statements show that, for these participants, meetings served as the most recognizable structure through which they entered the collaborative process, stayed informed, and participated in school-community matters. The same pattern is evident among alumni and community stakeholders. An alumnus explained,

"Decisions are made collaboratively through meetings where stakeholders share ideas, discuss options, and reach agreements that consider everyone's input and the school's goals." (AP1, L61–L63)

Similarly, a barangay captain shared,

"When there are meetings, stakeholders like me are included." (BCP1, L40–L41)

These narratives suggest that meetings were experienced not only as internal school mechanisms but also as inclusive spaces that allowed external stakeholders to be part of collaboration. In this way, meetings and consultative gatherings sustained partnership by bringing together diverse actors around common school concerns. Willemse *et al.* (2018) emphasized that family-school partnership depends on structures that make parent participation possible, and they identified organized opportunities for interaction as essential to collaborative engagement between schools and families. Their discussion of partnership in teacher education suggests that meetings and other structured encounters remain central because they create spaces where stakeholders can exchange views, clarify expectations, and coordinate responsibilities. This supports the

present finding that meetings were experienced by participants as essential venues for collaborative planning and participation. Moreover, Graham-Clay (2024) argued that communication with parents is most effective when schools provide intentional and varied opportunities for two-way exchange, including formal meetings that allow families to ask questions, receive information, and participate more meaningfully in their children's education. In a similar way, Chappel and Ratliffe (2021) found that structured school-home communication practices, including meetings and collaborative discussions, help schools build stronger and more participatory family-school relationships. These studies reinforce the accounts of teachers, parents, and SPTA leaders who described meetings as critical spaces for coordination and consultation.

Also, Jung and Sheldon (2020) also found that leadership for partnerships shapes the quality of family engagement when schools intentionally create formal opportunities for involvement, consultation, and shared discussion. In relation to student participation, Egan *et al.* (2025) showed that student voice becomes more meaningful when schools provide organized spaces in which students can participate in discussion and decision processes. Taken together, these studies affirm that meetings and consultative processes are not merely procedural requirements; they are relational and organizational mechanisms through which stakeholder engagement is sustained across different groups.

Therefore, the participants' narratives show that meetings and consultative processes were central to sustaining collaboration in school-community partnership. Through these spaces, stakeholders were able to gather, hear plans, raise concerns, offer suggestions, and take part in decisions that affected the school and its learners. In this sense, meetings emerged as one of the most concrete and widely shared expressions of active stakeholder engagement in the phenomenon.

Subtheme 2.2: Stakeholders Maintained Communication Through Formal and Informal Channels

This subtheme illustrates that stakeholders perceived collaboration as being sustained through both formal and informal communication channels. Their stories show that collaboration depended not on just one type of interaction but was maintained through a mix of meetings, letters, invitations, group chats, Messenger, social media, and face-to-face meetings. In this way, communication was seen not only as transmitting information but as an ongoing process that kept stakeholders informed, connected, and responsive to school-community concerns.

Teacher and parent participants particularly described collaboration as sustained through a blend of structured and accessible communication. A teacher participant stated,

"We have quarterly meetings, and we also communicate through group chat regarding the latest updates, problems, issues, and concerns involving parents and students" (TP1, L37–L38)

Similarly, a parent participant explained,

"They communicate through letters. Sending to us letters of invitation if there's an activity in school" (PP1, L29–L30)

These statements suggest that collaboration was maintained through both formal school-issued communication and more immediate digital communication, allowing parents and teachers to remain informed and involved in school matters. Student leaders and parent-sector representatives likewise emphasized the importance of communication platforms that allowed faster coordination and direct connection. An SSLG officer shared,

"Through social media. We make announcements there, and if they have concerns, they can also raise them there. Then these are solved with the collaboration of the school" (SP1, L73–L75)

In the same way, an SPTA president remarked,

"Social media, especially Messenger, is a big help because it provides direct connection." (SPTAP1, L89–L90)

These accounts show that stakeholders experienced digital communication as a practical and responsive channel for maintaining connection, raising concerns, and sustaining involvement between formal meetings. The broader set of participants also indicates that face-to-face and formal communication remained important even with the presence of digital tools.

A principal participant noted,

"Face-to-face meetings and group chats are most effective for clear communication" (SHP7, L1066–L1068)

while a barangay captain stated,

"It is still through open communication... If there is an important meeting that needs our presence, we are included." (BCP1, L49–L52)

An alumnus also expressed the need for stronger communication systems, saying,

"I would like to improve communication by establishing regular updates and clearer channels so everyone stays informed and tasks are better coordinated" (AP1, L104–L105)

Taken together, these narratives suggest that collaboration was sustained through a communication ecology in which formal meetings, direct interaction, and informal digital channels worked together to keep the partnership active and responsive. A study by Graham-Clay (2024) explained that home-school communication is essential for parent involvement and student success. It also shows that schools now have various communication options to work with families. Her discussion highlights that communication is most effective when it is positive, invitational, and uses multiple channels suitable for the school and families' contexts. This supports the current finding that stakeholders maintain collaboration not through a single communication method but through a combination of letters, meetings, group chats, social media, and direct conversations. Additionally, Chappel and Ratliffe (2021) found that strong family-school relationships grow when schools create structured and consistent communication opportunities that allow families to ask questions, get updates, and stay involved in school activities. Similarly, Levy (2024) noted that home-school communication increasingly occurs across multiple channels, with different forms of interaction contributing in various ways to relationship-building and coordination between schools and families. These studies reinforce the accounts of parents, teachers, and SPTA leaders who describe both formal and informal communication as vital for maintaining stakeholder engagement.

Research also indicates that communication platforms function differently, each serving unique collaborative purposes. A recent qualitative study on diverse family-school communication channels reported that parents value multiple options, while schools often use different channels for specific functions, such as formal notices, quick updates, or relationship-building. Likewise, Egan *et al.* (2025) emphasized that student engagement and voice are strengthened in schools that foster open, inclusive, and responsive communication cultures. Together, these studies support the current finding that active stakeholder engagement is sustained when communication remains flexible, multi-channeled, and responsive to the relational and practical needs of different stakeholder groups. The participants' stories show that collaboration was maintained through a dynamic mix of formal and informal communication channels. Meetings, letters, social media, Messenger, group chats, and direct interpersonal exchanges all helped keep stakeholders informed, connected, and involved in school-community partnerships. In this way, communication served as a mechanism to sustain engagement, enabling collaboration to continue beyond isolated events and into the daily life of the partnership.

Subtheme 2.3: Stakeholders Were Engaged Through Invitations, Recognition, and Inclusion

This subtheme highlights that stakeholders saw collaboration as being ongoing when they were invited, recognized, and included in school-community processes. Their narratives show that engagement grew stronger when they felt seen, acknowledged, and intentionally involved in activities, meetings, and decision-making. In this way,

collaboration was maintained not just through participation, but through the experience of being regarded as legitimate and valued partners in the partnership.

School-based and student participants particularly described engagement as being deepened through recognition and acknowledgment.

An SSLG officer shared,

"They give recognition. They provide messages and recognize us." (SP1, L58–L60),

indicating that recognition affirmed the value of student leaders' participation. In a similar way, the broader set of participants from the principals' narratives showed that school leaders also viewed recognition as a way of strengthening stakeholder support, particularly when contributors were publicly acknowledged and made to feel appreciated within school activities. These accounts suggest that recognition functioned as a sustaining condition of engagement because it validated stakeholder efforts and reinforced their willingness to continue participating.

Parent-sector stakeholders likewise emphasized the importance of invitation and inclusion in sustaining engagement.

A parent participant stated,

"I received a letter for the activities in school." (PP1, L31–L33),

reflecting that invitations served as concrete signals that parents were expected and welcomed in school activities.

Similarly, an SPTA president explained,

"They really involve the GPTA, they invite us, and there is also recognition for us." (SPTAP1, L63–L64)

Another SPTA account in the trail likewise highlighted recognition and invitations to important activities as part of what sustained stakeholder involvement. These statements show that engagement was experienced as stronger when stakeholders were explicitly brought into school processes and made to feel that their presence mattered.

External stakeholders also described inclusion and acknowledgment as central to meaningful collaboration. An alumnus stated,

"I feel most valued when my input is acknowledged, my efforts are recognized, and I am included in decisions with clear and transparent communication." (AP1, L40–L41)

showing that engagement was tied not only to presence in activities but also to being heard and treated as part of decision-making. In the same way, a barangay captain shared,

"When there are meetings, stakeholders like me are included." (BCP1, L40–L41)

These narratives indicate that invitations, recognition, and inclusion functioned as relational practices that signaled respect and partnership, allowing non-school actors to experience themselves as genuine collaborators rather than peripheral supporters. Flores and Ahn (2024) highlighted that stakeholder engagement, especially student involvement, becomes more meaningful when leaders intentionally validate overlooked voices and create spaces where contributors feel recognized and appreciated. Their research on principals legitimizing student voice indicates that recognition is not just symbolic but a leadership practice that affirms participation and promotes ongoing involvement. This aligns with the current finding that SSLG participants perceived their engagement as stronger when their efforts were acknowledged and their participation was publicly affirmed.

Murray, Domina, Renzulli, and Boylan (2019) further demonstrated that parent-teacher organizations establish institutional channels through which families are not only present but also recognized as civic participants in school life. Their research indicates that engagement becomes more effective when schools and parent organizations develop opportunities for participation that acknowledge the importance of stakeholder presence and contribution. Along with Flores and Ahn (2024), these studies confirm that invitations, recognition, and inclusion serve as key mechanisms of collaboration because they help stakeholders feel visible, valued, and legitimately part of the partnership. Thus, active stakeholder engagement persisted when people were intentionally invited, openly acknowledged, and genuinely included in school-community processes. These practices did more than boost attendance; they enhanced stakeholders' sense of belonging, legitimacy, and relational connection to the school. In this way, invitations, recognition, and inclusion proved to be vital mechanisms through which collaboration was continually reinforced and maintained.

Subtheme 2.4: Stakeholders Contributed Ideas and Feedback in Collaborative Decision-Making

This subtheme illustrates that stakeholders saw collaboration as sustained when they could share ideas, suggestions, and feedback during decision-making. Their stories show that engagement went beyond just attending or sharing information; instead, collaboration was meaningful when stakeholders had chances to speak, suggest, recommend, and influence plans and priorities. In this way, collaboration was experienced as participatory when stakeholder input was invited, listened to, and considered in shaping school actions.

Teacher and student participants particularly described collaboration as involving the active exchange of ideas during meetings. A teacher participant explained,

"The PTA plans are presented to the parents, and then they suggest what is good." (TP1, L26–L27),

showing that parents were not only informed but were also expected to give input. In a similar way, an SSLG officer stated,

"During meetings, if we have ideas, we confidently raise our hands and share the ideas."
(SP1, L29–L30)

reflecting that students also experienced engagement through the opportunity to express suggestions in school discussions. These statements suggest that collaboration was sustained when participants felt that they had space to contribute ideas that could shape school plans and improvements.

Parent-sector and community stakeholders also described collaboration as participatory when their ideas were heard in consultation and planning. An SPTA president shared,

"Through meetings and consultation." (SPTAP1, L101–L103),

indicating that decision-making was experienced as consultative rather than one-sided. Likewise, a barangay captain noted,

"Suggestions are asked, especially from officers or the PTA, and these are sometimes followed." (BCP1, L68–L71)

These narratives show that stakeholders experienced collaboration as stronger when school decisions were shaped through consultation and when community input had a visible place in planning processes.

The same pattern appears in the accounts of alumni and other stakeholders who described engagement as meaningful when suggestions translated into action. An alumnus explained,

"I helped coordinate and implement this idea, which increased sales and the event's success." (AP1, L69–L71),

referring to a community suggestion that significantly improved a school activity.

A principal account in the trail also reflected this pattern, noting that proposals were discussed and suggestions gathered before decisions were finalized. Taken together, these statements indicate that collaboration was sustained not only by speaking, but by the experience of having one's feedback considered and, at times, acted upon. Willemse *et al.* (2018) highlighted that a meaningful family-school partnership requires more than just one-way communication, as families need chances to participate in discussions and contribute to educational processes. Their research indicates that collaboration improves when schools intentionally create space for stakeholder perspectives rather than limiting participation to compliance or mere attendance. This

aligns with the current finding that teachers and parents felt more engaged when school plans were open to suggestions and consultation.

Likewise, Egan *et al.* (2025) found that student participation in school decision-making becomes meaningful when schools create inclusive conditions where students can express their views, be listened to, and influence decisions. Similarly, Conner (2022) argued that student voice is strengthened when schools go beyond symbolic listening and provide real opportunities for students' ideas to matter in school processes. These studies support the current finding that SSLG participants experienced engagement not just through attendance at meetings but through the opportunity to share ideas and feedback in collaborative decision-making. Therefore, collaboration was maintained when stakeholders could share ideas and give feedback in school decision-making. Their involvement became more meaningful when they were not just informed of decisions but also able to suggest, consult, discuss, and influence plans and priorities. In this way, collaborative decision-making became a key way of demonstrating active stakeholder engagement in school–community partnerships.

Subtheme 2.5: Stakeholder Participation was Sustained Through Relational Connection and Mutual Involvement

This subtheme demonstrates that stakeholders felt collaboration was sustained through relational connections and mutual involvement. Their stories show that engagement wasn't just maintained by structures but also by the quality of relationships built through communication, shared presence, encouragement, appreciation, and everyday interactions. In this way, collaboration was experienced not only as participation in formal activities but also as an ongoing relational process where stakeholders stayed connected to each other and to the shared work of the school-community partnership. Teacher and parent participants particularly described collaboration as deepened through everyday relational contact. In the broader set of participants, one teacher participant noted that

“While formal meetings are necessary for the records, informal group chats and face-to-face chats at the school gate are where the real trust is built” (Teacher participant, L736),

suggesting that sustained engagement was not confined to official gatherings but was reinforced in ordinary school-based interaction. In a similar way, a parent participant stated,

“Through communication and pangungumusta” (Through communication and checking in). (PP1, L37–L39),

indicating that relational gestures such as checking in also helped maintain openness and connection among stakeholders. These accounts suggest that collaboration

was sustained when communication was experienced as relational and personal rather than merely procedural.

Student and parent-sector stakeholders also emphasized encouragement, support, and recognition as relational factors that sustained participation. An SSLG officer shared,

"I am encouraged through the other members too, especially since my fellow members are also my friends." (SP1, L64–L66)

Similarly, an SPTA president narrated that participation was sometimes maintained through group chat discussions where opinions, suggestions, and observations were shared when motivation began to fade. These statements show that participation endured when stakeholders felt supported by others, suggesting that engagement was strengthened by mutual involvement and the social bonds formed within the partnership.

The same relational pattern is evident among alumni and community stakeholders. An alumnus stated,

"Positive outcomes include... stronger community engagement, improved programs, and a sense of teamwork and shared accomplishment among all stakeholders." (AP1, L74–L76),

highlighting that collaboration generated not only successful activities but also a sense of collective achievement. In a related way, a barangay captain shared,

"Our relationship with them is good. We feel appreciated." (BCP1, L74–L75)

These statements indicate that collaboration was sustained when stakeholders experienced positive treatment, teamwork, appreciation, and a sense of belonging in the partnership. Hinkle (2022) emphasized that trust, mutual respect, and active listening are essential for effective school communication and relationship-building. This supports the current finding that stakeholder participation remained consistent not just through organizational procedures but through relational experiences that helped stakeholders feel connected, respected, and heard. In the present study, this connection was clear in the focus on checking in, group chats, face-to-face interactions, and mutual encouragement as key factors in sustaining collaboration.

Additionally, Flores and Ahn (2024) argued that participation becomes more lasting when contributors feel they are not just included structurally but are recognized relationally as valued members of the educational community. Similarly, Murray *et al.* (2019) proposed that school partnerships are stronger when stakeholder involvement fosters shared identity and collective belonging instead of isolated acts of support. Together, these studies support the current finding that relational connection and mutual involvement are key conditions for sustaining active stakeholder engagement in school-community partnerships. The participants' narratives reveal that collaboration was

maintained through relational bonds and mutual engagement. Stakeholders stayed involved not just because they attended meetings or received updates, but because they felt encouraged, worked together as a team, appreciated each other, and built meaningful personal connections within the partnership. In this way, collaboration persisted as a process rooted in relationships, where mutual involvement strengthened stakeholders' dedication to the shared goals of the school and community.

Theme 3: Collaboration was Strengthened by Accountability Practices

The stakeholders' narratives showed that collaboration in school–community partnerships was boosted by accountability practices. Among teachers, SSLG presidents, principals, SPTA presidents, parents, alumni, and barangay captains, participation alone did not sustain collaboration; it was also strengthened by transparency, responsiveness, clarification, and follow-through. Their accounts indicated that stakeholders stayed committed to the partnership when school issues were communicated openly, concerns were addressed, explanations were given, and actions were followed through in ways that built trust and a sense of responsibility. In this way, accountability became a key factor that strengthened collaboration rather than just an administrative formality.

The narratives indicate that accountability practices were demonstrated in five interconnected ways: stakeholders valued transparency in plans, decisions, and fund use; addressed misunderstandings through clarification and dialogue; responded to constraints through adjustment and follow-through; linked accountability with trust and credibility in collaboration; and rooted accountability in actions that benefit learners and the school community.

Subtheme 3.1: Stakeholders Valued Transparency in Plans, Decisions, and Fund Use

This subtheme shows that stakeholders experienced collaboration as stronger when school matters were handled with transparency. Their narratives indicate that collaboration was reinforced when plans, decisions, activities, and financial matters were openly shared and clearly explained to those involved. In this sense, transparency was not merely a technical matter of reporting, but a relational practice that made stakeholders feel informed, included, and assured that school–community efforts were being managed responsibly.

Teacher and principal participants particularly associated accountability with openness in reporting and communication. A teacher participant explained,

"Transparency. For example, during assembly meetings we always have it. Our treasurer reports where the funds went, and there is an open forum for whatever clarifications the parents have." (TP1, L51–L53)

In a similar way, a principal stated,

"Through open communication. Then any tangible projects? Or... Transparent. Transparent. Because once you're transparent, of course, the committee itself will come to support, right?" (SHP1, L76–L78)

These statements suggest that stakeholders experienced transparency as a way of making school decisions and fund use visible, thereby encouraging confidence and support.

Parent-sector stakeholders likewise framed collaboration as stronger when transparency was present, and weaker when it was not. An SPTA president shared,

"...When it comes to transparency, I have not yet attended a meeting where transparency was clearly presented by the school." (SPTAP1, L65–L71),

indicating that the absence of transparency was felt as a gap in the partnership. In contrast, an alumnus stated,

"I feel most valued when my input is acknowledged, my efforts are recognized, and I am included in decisions with clear and transparent communication." (AP1, L40–L41)

These accounts show that transparency was not experienced as a neutral administrative procedure, but as something that directly affected stakeholders' sense of value, participation, and trust in the collaboration.

The same pattern is visible in the broader stakeholder trail, where transparency was linked to inclusion and stakeholder confidence. In the SSLG account reflected in the chapter trail, transparency was described as part of monthly communication and member accountability, while a parent participant explicitly expressed the desire for

"Allowing more parents to involve of meetings specially transparency." (PP1, L78–L78)

These narratives indicate that stakeholders valued transparency not only for knowing how resources were used, but also for ensuring that collaboration remained open and participatory. In this sense, transparency strengthened collaboration because it gave stakeholders a clearer basis for trust, involvement, and continued support. Jung and Sheldon (2020) found that school leadership for partnerships influences family engagement when leaders establish practices characterized by openness, partnership-focused communication, and visible support for stakeholder involvement. Their work suggests that trust in school-community partnerships is reinforced when leadership practices are transparent, and stakeholders feel confident that school processes are managed responsibly. This aligns with the present finding that principals and teachers view transparency as essential to building collaborative trust. Additionally, Anazia *et al.* (2025) argued that effective home-school partnerships are built on shared responsibility, strong communication, and collaboration, while Jutara and De Jesus (2024) emphasized

that school leadership influences parental involvement partly through the quality of communication and the openness of school processes. These studies support the current finding that transparency is not just a side aspect of collaboration; rather, it is a crucial factor that makes stakeholder engagement credible, sustainable, and deserving of ongoing support.

Thus, collaboration was enhanced when stakeholders saw transparency in plans, decisions, and fund use. Openness in communication and reporting made stakeholders feel informed, respected, and included, while the lack of transparency weakened confidence in the partnership. In this way, transparency became a key accountability practice that helped collaboration gain legitimacy, support, and relational strength.

Subtheme 3.2: Stakeholders Addressed Misunderstandings Through Clarification and Dialogue

This subtheme illustrates that stakeholders saw collaboration grow stronger when misunderstandings were resolved through clarification and dialogue. Their stories show that collaboration wasn't always free from confusion, differing interpretations, or disagreements; however, these issues didn't necessarily weaken the partnership when openly discussed and clarified. In this way, accountability was seen as the willingness to explain, listen, and resolve issues through communication instead of avoiding them.

Teacher and parent participants particularly described misunderstandings as situations that required direct explanation and face-to-face discussion. A teacher participant recounted,

"So, I explained that the amount raised came only from the gala because we did not have voluntary contributions." (TP1, L67–L68),

showing how misunderstanding about fund use was handled through explanation. In a similar way, a parent participant stated,

"This was solved when a face-to-face meeting was held." (PP1, L45–L46),

referring to disagreement from parents who had not regularly attended meetings.

These accounts suggest that clarification and direct dialogue were experienced as necessary to restore shared understanding and maintain stakeholder cooperation.

The same pattern appears in the narratives of alumni and school leaders, where clarification was used to settle confusion and restore coordination. An alumnus explained,

"I helped clarify the details through a meeting and follow-up messages, ensuring everyone understood their roles and responsibilities, which resolved the issue" (AP1, L48–L50).

In the broader set of participant accounts, a principal participant likewise described collaboration as being strained when there was “No proper communication. And information dissemination” and emphasized that misunderstanding arose when matters were not clearly explained. These narratives indicate that accountability was experienced through the effort to prevent confusion, explain expectations, and provide follow-up communication when needed.

Community stakeholders also connected collaboration with the practice of open dialogue in addressing tensions and differing views. A barangay captain shared,

“It is still through open communication... If there is an important meeting that needs our presence, we are included.” (BCP1, L49–L52)

Another alumnus reflected this same process in conflict management, stating,

“Conflicts are managed through open dialogue, listening to all perspectives, finding common ground, and agreeing on solutions that benefit both the school and the community.” (AP1, L91–L93)

These accounts show that stakeholders experienced dialogue not simply as talking, but as a collaborative act of listening, clarifying, and working toward common ground when misunderstandings emerged. A study by Chappel and Ratliffe (2021) found that positive school-home partnerships are supported when schools use personalized, face-to-face, and informal communication to address concerns and keep strong relationships. Their study reported that stakeholders saw personalized and face-to-face exchanges as especially effective in maintaining positive partnership practices, which supports the current finding that misunderstandings are more effectively resolved when clarified through direct discussion. Furthermore, Graham-Clay (2024) similarly highlighted that home-school communication is most effective when it fosters opportunities for two-way exchange, clarification, and mutual understanding rather than just one-way information flow. In a related vein, Hinkle *et al.* (2022) emphasized that successful communication with families and other stakeholders requires clarity, responsiveness to audience needs, and communication practices that minimize confusion and promote shared understanding. Collectively, these studies support the accounts from teachers, parents, and alumni who describe clarification and dialogue as essential for resolving misunderstandings and maintaining collaboration.

Anazia *et al.* (2025) argued that effective home-school partnership is based on shared responsibility, clear communication, and collaboration, all of which rely on stakeholders' ability to handle tensions and differing expectations constructively. Their study provides a framework where communication and collaboration are key to maintaining partnerships despite challenges. This supports the current finding that accountability in collaboration was improved when stakeholders engaged in explanation, dialogue, and seeking common ground, rather than letting misunderstandings go

unresolved. Therefore, collaboration was strengthened when misunderstandings were addressed through clarification and dialogue. By explaining issues, listening to concerns, and using meetings and follow-up communication to resolve confusion, stakeholders were able to restore understanding and maintain the partnership. In this sense, clarification and dialogue became key accountability practices that protected collaboration from breakdown and reinforced shared commitment among stakeholders.

Subtheme 3.3: Stakeholders Responded to Constraints Through Adjustment and Follow-Through

This subtheme shows that stakeholders felt collaboration was strengthened when they responded to challenges through adjustments and follow-through. Their stories suggest that school–community partnerships were not always smooth, as participation could decline due to schedule conflicts, low motivation, uneven attendance, and communication gaps. However, these challenges did not necessarily cause disengagement. Instead, stakeholders described efforts to modify plans, develop alternatives, offer support, and follow through on commitments. In this way, accountability was experienced as the capacity to maintain collaboration despite practical and relational obstacles.

Teacher and principal participants particularly described accountability as requiring action when participation began to weaken. A teacher participant explained,

"We give them responsibility so they will know what they are supposed to do." (TP1, L47–L48),

suggesting that delegation was used to sustain involvement when parents became reluctant to participate. Likewise, a principal stated,

"Through encouragement. encouragement and giving them a support system." (SHP1, L95–L96).

indicating that school leaders experienced accountability as providing support and motivation in response to fading participation. These statements show that stakeholders did not simply note constraints; they responded to them by adjusting responsibilities and offering support mechanisms that could renew involvement.

Parent-sector stakeholders also described accountability as involving practical adjustments to sustain communication and participation. An SPTA president shared,

"We create a group chat and that is where we discuss what we want to say." (SPTAP1, L77–L80),

showing that when direct participation weakened, stakeholders used alternative communication spaces to continue interaction. In the The broader set of participant , a

principal also described the need to strategically schedule meetings, explaining that participation was sustained by timing activities when stakeholders were free to attend. These accounts suggest that accountability was experienced as flexibility and follow-through, especially when ordinary arrangements were not enough to keep collaboration active.

The same pattern is reflected in the narratives of alumni and other stakeholders who saw stronger coordination as dependent on continued adjustment.

An alumnus stated,

"I would like to improve communication by establishing regular updates and clearer channels so everyone stays informed and tasks are better coordinated." (AP1, L104–L105)

This shows that accountability was linked to making communication more regular and coordinated, particularly when existing arrangements created confusion or weakened participation. Taken together, these narratives indicate that stakeholders experienced collaboration as stronger when they responded to limitations not with withdrawal, but with adjustments that enabled the partnership to continue functioning. Chappel and Ratliffe (2021) discovered that positive family-school partnerships are maintained when schools use responsive practices that adapt to families' schedules, communication preferences, and participation patterns. Their study indicates that partnerships are strengthened when schools do not assume uniform participation but instead tailor communication and engagement strategies to stakeholder circumstances. This confirms the current finding that accountability was experienced through practical adjustments such as delegation, support systems, alternative channels, and strategic scheduling. Similarly, Jung and Sheldon (2020) also emphasized that leadership in partnerships involves creating conditions that enable and make family and stakeholder involvement more possible and meaningful. Their findings show that school leaders strengthen collaboration by intentionally addressing barriers instead of expecting participation to happen automatically. In the current study, this is reflected in the participants' focus on encouragement, support systems, and adjustments in communication and meeting arrangements to maintain stakeholder involvement.

The participants' narratives show that collaboration grew stronger when stakeholders responded to challenges through adjustment and follow-through. Instead of letting schedule conflicts, waning motivation, or communication issues derail the partnership, they described ways to maintain coordination through flexibility, support, and continuous action. In this way, being responsive to challenges became an important accountability practice that helped collaboration persist despite difficulties.

Subtheme 3.4: Stakeholders Linked Accountability with Trust and Credibility in Collaboration

This subtheme shows that stakeholders felt collaboration was stronger when accountability built trust and credibility within the partnership. Their stories suggest that

accountability was not just about compliance or reporting but also about a relational quality that made stakeholders trust each other's intentions, actions, and commitments. In this way, collaboration became more credible and lasting when stakeholders saw that school leaders and partners were honest, open, respectful, and reliable in addressing school-community concerns.

School-based stakeholders particularly described trust as closely tied to openness and responsible conduct. A principal participant stated,

"Because once you're transparent, of course, the committee itself will come to support." (SHP1, L77–L78),

suggesting that accountability practices such as transparency made stakeholders more willing to trust and support school initiatives. In a related way, an SSLG officer remarked,

"You should not do anything harmful that could ruin their trust." (SP1, L70–L71),

indicating that trust was understood as something that had to be protected through responsible behavior. These accounts show that accountability was experienced as a foundation of trust because it signaled integrity and reliability in collaborative relationships.

Parent-sector stakeholders likewise connected accountability with credibility and confidence in the partnership. An SPTA president explained,

"They really involve the GPTA, they invite us, and there is also recognition for us" (SPTAP1, L63–L64),

showing that inclusion and acknowledgment contributed to the credibility of the school's partnership practices. At the same time, the same participant's concern about limited transparency suggests that credibility weakens when openness is lacking. These narratives indicate that stakeholders linked accountability with the extent to which the school's actions matched its claims of inclusion and partnership.

The same relational dimension appears in the accounts of community stakeholders. A barangay captain shared,

"Maupay amon бага pakikitungo man ha amon. Na appreciate namon." (Our relationship with them is good. We feel appreciated.) (BCP1, L74–L75),

while an alumnus stated that feeling valued depended on being included in decisions through

"...clear and transparent communication." (AP1, L40–L41).

These statements suggest that trust and credibility were not built by formal structures alone, but by how accountability practices were experienced in actual relationships—through good treatment, appreciation, inclusion, and openness. In this way, collaboration was strengthened when stakeholders believed that the partnership was genuine, fair, and worthy of continued support.

Anazia *et al.* (2025) further argued that shared responsibility and effective communication in home-school partnerships depend on the development of mutual trust, which in turn is supported by accountable and credible interactions among stakeholders. Their findings reinforce the current study's view that accountability enhances collaboration not just because it organizes actions, but because it assures stakeholders that the partnership is genuine, respectful, and worth maintaining.

Additionally, Hinkle (2022) highlighted that trust is a key element of effective communication with families, educators, and stakeholders, and that credibility is established when communication is honest, responsive, and respectful of stakeholders' needs and perspectives. This aligns with the current finding that accountability is experienced not just in procedural ways but also relationally, as a quality that enhances collaboration's trustworthiness and reliability.

Moreover, Jung and Sheldon (2020) similarly found that school leadership for partnerships influences stakeholder engagement when families and communities see school processes as credible, transparent, and supportive. Their work indicates that trust in collaboration grows when leadership actions consistently show openness and a partnership focus. In this study, this is reflected in participants' emphasis on transparency, good treatment, recognition, and responsible conduct as conditions for stronger collaboration.

Therefore, the participants' stories demonstrate that collaboration improved when accountability-built trust and credibility among stakeholders. Openness, responsible behavior, inclusion, recognition, and respectful treatment all helped create a sense that the partnership was trustworthy and genuine. In this way, accountability became a relational force that strengthened confidence in collaboration and increased stakeholders' willingness to stay involved.

Subtheme 3.5: Stakeholders Anchored Accountability on Actions that Benefit Learners and the School Community

This subtheme reveals that stakeholders see accountability as fundamentally linked to actions that benefit learners and the wider school community. Their stories show that accountability isn't just about reporting, explaining, or compliance. Instead, it feels meaningful when decisions, support, and follow-through result in real gains for students, improve school operations, and enhance the community's welfare. In this way, accountability is valued because it connects to outcomes that matter to learners and the collective good of the school-community partnership.

School-based and parent-sector stakeholders especially framed accountability in learner-centered terms. A parent participant stated,

"Cooperate and participate for the good of the learners." (PP1, L75–L75),

directly linking participation and accountability to student benefit. In a similar way, a principal participant explained,

"There must be a collaborative effort from the school administrator and the community itself to solve these problems." (SHP1, L21–L23),

referring to learner absenteeism and dropout concerns. These statements suggest that stakeholders experienced accountability as a shared obligation to respond to student needs through collaborative action rather than through isolated school effort alone.

The same learner-centered orientation appears in the accounts of SPTA and community stakeholders. An SPTA president shared,

"We are the ones who coordinate with other agencies to help the school, such as when learners need transportation for contests." (SPTAP1, L41–L44)

This shows that accountability was experienced as extending practical assistance that enables learner participation and opportunity. Likewise, a principal emphasized,

"One really has to cooperate and attend because it is for the school and for their children as well." (SHP4, L724–L726)

These accounts indicate that accountability was judged not only by whether stakeholders fulfilled obligations, but by whether those obligations actually served learners and the school community.

Non-school stakeholders also described accountability in terms of wider community and school benefit. An alumnus explained,

"The partnership benefits the community by promoting awareness, learning, and active involvement in local projects." (AP1, L83–L84),

suggesting that collaboration was experienced as accountable when it generated value beyond the school gates. In a related way, the same alumnus and other external stakeholders emphasized contribution, linkage, and support as worthwhile when they strengthened both student opportunities and community participation. These narratives show that accountability was anchored on a broader view of benefit in which learner welfare and community development were intertwined outcomes of collaboration. Sepanik and Brown (2021) explained that school-community partnerships matter because

they help schools access outside supports that improve students' learning conditions, social well-being, and opportunities to thrive. Their brief frames partnership as meaningful when collaboration results in tangible benefits for students and enhances the broader conditions that support learning. This aligns with the current finding that stakeholder's base accountability on outcomes that serve learners and the school community, rather than solely on procedural completion. Similarly, Jutara and De Jesus (2024) also concluded that school leadership influences parental involvement by creating conditions that make participation meaningful and aligned with educational goals. Their review indicates that accountability in partnerships is strengthened when stakeholder participation is linked to the well-being of students and efforts to improve the school. Along with Sepanik and Brown (2021) and Anazia *et al.* (2025), these studies supported the current finding that accountability was most impactful when it results in actions and outcomes that benefit students and the broader community.

Thus, the participants' narratives demonstrated that accountability is based on actions that benefit learners and the school community. Stakeholders did not see accountability as just a narrow issue of rules or reporting. Instead, they viewed it as a practical and ethical commitment to ensure that collaboration results in meaningful support, increased participation, and real benefits for students, schools, and communities. In this way, accountability reinforced collaboration by keeping the partnership focused on a shared and valuable goal.

4. Integrative Summary of Shared Meanings across Stakeholder Groups

To provide an integrative view of the phenomenon, Table 3 presents the emergent phenomenological themes together with the shared meanings drawn across stakeholder groups. The table consolidates the common meanings that surfaced from the narratives of teachers, Supreme Secondary Learner Government presidents, principals, School Parent-Teacher Association presidents, parents, alumni, and barangay captains. Through this synthesis, the collaborative experiences of stakeholders are presented as converging meanings that collectively define the lived structure of school-community partnership.

To provide a fuller view of how the themes were derived across stakeholder groups, a comprehensive cross-stakeholder thematic matrix is presented in the annex. This matrix contains the emergent phenomenological themes, corresponding subthemes, shared meanings across stakeholder groups, and selected significant shared statements that served as the basis for the thematic synthesis.

Table 3: Emergent Phenomenological Themes
and Shared Meanings Across Stakeholder Groups

Emergent or Phenomenological Themes	Shared Meanings Across Stakeholder Groups
Responsibility	Across stakeholder groups, collaboration was experienced as the assumption of complementary roles and responsibilities in support of the school and its learners. Stakeholders described themselves as initiators, facilitators, representatives, volunteers, supporters, organizers, and contributors who offered time, ideas, skills, guidance, linkages, and practical assistance for school programs, projects, and learner needs. Their accounts suggest that collaboration was understood as a shared duty carried out according to their respective capacities and positions in the school–community partnership.
Engagement	Across stakeholder groups, collaboration was experienced as active and relational participation in meetings, consultations, communication processes, school activities, and shared decision spaces. Stakeholders associated meaningful collaboration with being invited, heard, consulted, included, recognized, and kept informed through both formal and informal channels. Their narratives show that engagement was sustained through meetings, group chats, open discussion, recognition, follow-up, and the continuing involvement of multiple stakeholders in planning and implementing school–community initiatives.
Accountability	Across stakeholder groups, collaboration was experienced as requiring transparency, responsiveness, clarification, and follow-through in order to sustain trust and collective action. Stakeholders described accountable collaboration as one in which plans, decisions, and fund use were explained openly; misunderstandings were addressed through dialogue and meetings; concerns were clarified; and actions were adjusted in response to stakeholder input, participation gaps, and local conditions. Their accounts indicate that accountability was expressed through openness, responsiveness, and commitment to what best serves learners and the school community.

The themes and shared meanings presented serve as the foundation for the overall descriptions of the phenomenon's texture and structure, as well as for explaining its core meaning.

4.1 Composite Textural Description

The stakeholders experienced school–community partnership as a shared effort rooted in responsibility, maintained through active engagement, and reinforced by accountability. In the stories of teachers, SSLG presidents, principals, SPTA presidents, parents, alumni, and barangay captains, collaboration was felt as a genuine responsibility where each stakeholder took on a role in supporting the school and its learners. They saw themselves as planners, facilitators, leaders, representatives, volunteers, supporters, and connectors who contributed based on their abilities and roles. Their stories showed that collaboration was not seen as something incidental or secondary to school life but as an ongoing duty expressed through tangible actions, fulfilling roles, and dedication to the well-being of learners and the school community. The stakeholders also viewed collaboration as a

participatory and relational process that relied on active engagement. Their stories consistently highlighted meetings, consultations, communication exchanges, invitations, recognition, and inclusion as the spaces and practices that kept collaboration alive. They described collaboration as meaningful when they could gather, listen, speak, suggest, respond, and stay involved in school-community activities and decisions. Beyond formal structures, they also experienced engagement through personal connections, mutual support, and daily interactions, which made the partnership feel more human, reciprocal, and lasting. In this way, collaboration was experienced not only through organized participation, but also through relational involvement that strengthened their sense of belonging and shared purpose. At the same time, the stakeholders saw collaboration as becoming stronger when accountability was part of their shared work. They described transparency, open communication, clarifying misunderstandings, responding to constraints, and following through as practices that built credibility and trustworthiness in the partnership. Their experiences showed that accountability was not just about fund reporting or formal compliance; it was also shown in how school and community members explained decisions, addressed concerns, adapted to challenges, and stayed committed to actions that helped learners and the wider community. For the stakeholders, collaboration felt more meaningful when it involved openness, responsibility, and a clear commitment to the common good. Overall, these experiences depict school–community partnership as a shared effort marked by shared responsibility, active participation, and accountable collaboration dedicated to students and community life.

4.2 Composite Structural Description

The stakeholders experienced collaboration within a structure shaped by their roles, relationships, and responsibilities in the school–community partnership. Their experiences were based on the fact that each stakeholder entered the partnership from a specific position: teachers as coordinators and facilitators, principals as initiators and school leaders, SSLG presidents as student representatives, SPTA presidents as parent-sector mediators, parents as direct supporters of their children's education, alumni as external partners and mentors, and barangay captains as community authorities and local supporters. Because of these different positions, collaboration was experienced as a structured interaction among interdependent actors whose roles were unique yet connected. In this way, the phenomenon was shaped by a system of shared but distinct responsibilities that guided how collaboration developed across school and community settings. Stakeholders also experienced collaboration through both formal and informal interaction methods that allowed participation and ongoing engagement. Meetings, assemblies, consultations, invitations, letters, group chats, social media, school visits, and face-to-face conversations provided tangible contexts where collaboration took place. These methods enabled stakeholders to share information, voice concerns, provide suggestions, negotiate decisions, and coordinate actions. Additionally, the experience of collaboration was shaped not only by organized systems but also by interpersonal

dynamics such as recognition, encouragement, inclusion, appreciation, and mutual support. Therefore, the phenomenon was shaped by both institutional structures that created spaces for participation and relational conditions that made stakeholders feel connected, valued, and motivated to stay involved.

Furthermore, the stakeholders experienced collaboration within conditions of both support and constraint. Their accounts showed that collaboration occurred amid realities such as limited resources, schedule conflicts, uneven participation, fading motivation, misunderstandings, and communication gaps. Yet these same conditions also highlighted the importance of accountability practices, as stakeholders described transparency, clarification, responsiveness, and follow-through as key to maintaining and strengthening collaboration despite obstacles. In this sense, the phenomenon was shaped by a tension between challenges that could weaken partnership and practices that allowed the partnership to endure. Collaboration was therefore seen as a dynamic process made up of role expectations, participation structures, relational connections, and accountability practices, all functioning within the broader goal of promoting learner welfare and strengthening the school community.

4.3 Essence of the Phenomenon

The essence of the phenomenon shows that school–community partnership was experienced by stakeholders as a collaborative effort shaped by responsibility, engagement, and accountability. First, stakeholders saw collaboration as a responsibility, where each individual took on a meaningful role in supporting the school and its students through leadership, representation, participation, service, and practical contributions. Second, they viewed collaboration as engagement, maintained through meetings, consultations, communication, inclusion, recognition, and relational involvement that kept stakeholders actively connected to each other and to the shared work of the partnership. Third, they perceived collaboration as a form of accountability, reinforced by transparency, clarity, responsiveness, and follow-through, which made the partnership more trustworthy, credible, and focused on the common good. Therefore, these experiences demonstrated that the phenomenon of school–community partnership was not just about working together in a general way. Instead, it was experienced as a shared commitment in which responsibility gave stakeholders a sense of duty and purpose, engagement provided active and relational participation, and accountability built trust, direction, and sustainability within the partnership. In this way, the core of the phenomenon lay in the collective experience of collaboration as a responsible, engaged, and accountable partnership focused on learners' well-being and the strengthening of the school community.

5. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, three conclusions were drawn. The stakeholders viewed school–community partnership as a shared responsibility. Collaboration was

seen as a role-based and responsibility-driven effort where teachers, school heads, SSLG officers, SPTA officers, parents, alumni, and barangay officials each had distinct yet interconnected roles. Their involvement was demonstrated through leadership, representation, hands-on support, student guidance, and community aid, showing that collaboration thrived when stakeholders understood their roles as part of a collective responsibility for the school and its students. Likewise, stakeholders experienced a school–community partnership as ongoing through active engagement. Collaboration remained meaningful when stakeholders attended meetings and consultations, communicated via formal and informal channels, were invited and acknowledged, contributed ideas during decision-making, and stayed connected through mutual involvement. This indicated that collaboration persisted not only because participation structures were in place, but because stakeholders were actively involved, relationally connected, and regarded as legitimate partners in the process. On the other hand, stakeholders viewed school–community partnerships as stronger when accountability practices were in place. Collaboration improved when transparency, clarity, responsiveness, and follow-up were part of school-community interactions. Stakeholders linked accountability to trust, credibility, and actions that benefit learners and the broader school community. Therefore, accountability was seen not just as compliance or reporting, but as a relational and ethical practice that built confidence in the partnership and maintained collective commitment.

5.1 Recommendations

Based on the study's conclusions, the following recommendations are provided.

- 1) School heads and other education leaders may strengthen school–community partnership by establishing clearer stakeholder role expectations and more structured participation mechanisms that recognize the distinct yet complementary responsibilities of teachers, student leaders, parents, alumni, and community officials. Strengthening responsibility among stakeholders may help promote more organized, consistent, and duty-bound collaboration in support of the school and its learners.
- 2) Schools may sustain stakeholder engagement by institutionalizing regular consultative meetings, strengthening formal and informal communication channels, and creating more inclusive opportunities for participation in planning, consultation, and collaborative decision-making. Greater attention to invitations, recognition, inclusion, and relational connection may further enhance meaningful and continuing stakeholder involvement in school–community partnership.
- 3) School leaders and stakeholder organizations may reinforce accountability practices by promoting greater transparency in plans, decisions, programs, and fund use, while also ensuring that concerns and misunderstandings are addressed through timely clarification, dialogue, responsiveness, and follow-through. Strengthening accountability may help build trust, credibility, and shared confidence in collaborative efforts among school and community stakeholders.

- 4) Schools and educational leaders may consider using the Proposed REA Collaboration Model as a guide in designing, implementing, and strengthening school–community partnership initiatives. By applying the dimensions of Responsibility, Engagement, and Accountability in partnership programs and stakeholder involvement strategies, schools may develop more learner-centered, community-responsive, and sustainable collaborative practices that improve relationships, support school development, and promote learner and community benefit.

Creative Commons License Statement

This research work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>. To view the complete legal code, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode.en>. Under the terms of this license, members of the community may copy, distribute, and transmit the article, provided that proper, prominent, and unambiguous attribution is given to the authors, and the material is not used for commercial purposes or modified in any way. Reuse is only allowed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

About the Author(s)

Rea B. Dacanay is a Teacher III at the Jiabong National High School in the province of Samar, Philippines and holds a Ph.D. major in Educational Management at Graduate Studies, Samar State University in the Philippines. Her academic research interest focus on community engagement based on transparency and accountability in the classrooms among students and secondary school teachers in Samar province.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0766-65>.

References

- Abu-Alghayth, K. M. (2024). Understanding teachers' lived experiences of instructional collaboration in inclusive and mainstream settings: A transcendental phenomenological approach. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 72(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2024.2317484>
- Acaylar, R. R. (2025). Lived Experiences of Secondary Public-School Heads in Managing Schools Under the DepEd Management Framework. *Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields*, 1(8), 546-559. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17031961>

- Agbisit, J. M., Ambas, C. A., & Ambas, J. R. (2022). Challenges and opportunities in school-community partnership of public elementary schools in the Division of Laguna. *International Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 7(1), 1–15.
- Aguas, P. P. (2020). Key Stakeholders' Lived Experiences While Implementing an Aligned Curriculum: A Phenomenological Study. *The Qualitative Report*, 25(10), 3459-3485. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol25/iss10/2>
- Al-Thani, G., Ari, I., Koç, M., & Öztürk, M. (2024). Comparative analysis of stakeholder integration in education policymaking. *Societies*, 14(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc14070104>
- Amuni, B. S., Karimi, S. S., & Patrick, F. M. (2025). Influence of stakeholder involvement in monitoring and evaluation on the performance of donor-funded projects in informal settlements in Kisumu Central Sub-County, Kenya. *International Research Journal of Economics and Management Studies* 4(7):185-192. <https://doi.org/10.56472/25835238/IRJEMS-V4I7P123>
- Anabo, I. (2024). Stakeholder engagement in school-based management: A path toward quality education. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(3), 850–865.
- Anazia, I. U. (2025). Home-school partnerships: Values and expectations of rural teachers and parents. *Educational Review*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2025.2492143>
- Anazia, I., Skinner, B., & Woods, C. (2025). Home-school partnerships: Values and expectations of rural teachers and parents. *Educational Research*, 67(2), 170–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2025.2492143>
- Anderson-Butcher, D., Bates, S., Lawson, H. A., Childs, T. M., & Iachini, A. L. (2022). The community collaboration model for school improvement: A scoping review. *Education Sciences*, 12(12), 918. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12120918>
- Arguelles, M. L., & De Torres, R. (2024). Stakeholder engagement practices in rural and remote schools: Insights from Filipino school leaders. *Issues in Educational Research*, 34(1), 1–18. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392499586_Stakeholder_engagement_practices_in_rural_and_remote_schools_Insights_from_Filipino_school_leaders
- Arrieta, G. S. (2021). School-based management (SBM) levels of practice and school performance: Basis for a technical assistance plan. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 10(13), 1–13.
- Aziz, M. N. A., & Ahmad, J. (2020). The role of school leaders in fostering school-community partnerships. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(11), 1146–1157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v10-i11/8172>
- Barce, L. D. (2025). Parental involvement in schools: Barriers, challenges, and strategies. *British Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 7(3), 461–469. <https://doi.org/10.34104/bjah.02504610469>

- Barton, A., Ershadi, M., & Winthrop, R. (2021). *Understanding the connection between family-school engagement and education system transformation: A review of concepts and evidence*. Brookings Institution.
- Bautista, R. E., Villanueva, S. L., & Santos, J. C. (2020). Stakeholder participation and educational outcomes in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 3(1), 22–34.
- Beatty, A. (2019). *A Phenomenological Study of Co-Teaching's Collaborative Decision-Making Process in Taiwanese Elementary School* [Unpublished M.A. thesis]. St. Cloud State University.
- Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller. Retrieved from https://tomek.org/files/general_system_theory_foundations_development_applications.pdf
- Brinia, V., & Papantoniou, A. (2022). The impact of communication on the effectiveness of educational organizations. *Education Sciences*, 12(3), 170. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12030170>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv26071r6>
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610440967>
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2021). *Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for School Reform*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cabardo, J. R. O. (2016). Extent of Participation of Schools' Stakeholders to School-initiated Activities: A Convergent Parallel Approach. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 8(1), 8.
- Cabriga, A. A. C., & Ching, D. A. (2024). Collaboration and Partnership among Stakeholders towards Management of Public Elementary Schools. *TWIST Journal*, 19(3), 562-572. Retrieved from <https://twistjournal.net/twist/article/view/426>
- Caetano, A. P., Freire, I. P., & Machado, E. B. (2020). Student voice and participation in intercultural education. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 9(1), 57–73. <https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2020.1.458>
- Cagampang, B. P. (2023). Stakeholders' Experiences on the Establishment and Sustainability of the Balay Paglaum. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies*, 3(8), 1109-1122. <https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers.v3i8.601>
- Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (1988). *The self-managing school*. Falmer Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203977330>
- Cantet, N., Delavallade, C., Griffith, A., Liu, Z., & Thornton, R. (2023). The effects of increasing community participation on school management outcomes: Evidence from India. World Bank / Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL) Working Paper. Retrieved from <https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/research->

- [paper/WP11726 The-Effects-of-Increasing-Community-Participation-on-School-Management-Outcomes-in-India Thornton-et-al Aug2023.pdf](#)
- Castillo, E. T. and Cay, M. K. M. (2024) SBM practices and utilization of special education. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies* 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.53378/ijemds.353115>
- Chappel, J., & Ratliffe, K. (2021). Factors impacting positive school-home communication: A multiple case study of family-school partnership practices in eight elementary schools in Hawai'i. *School Community Journal*, 31(2), 9–30. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2023-11620-001>
- Chatenoud, C., & Odier-Guedj, D. (2022). Fostering family-school-community partnership with parents of students with developmental disabilities: Participatory action research with the 3D Sunshine Model. *School Community Journal*, 32(1), 327–356. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1347533.pdf>
- Conner, J. (2022). Who's afraid of student voice? *Democracy & Education*, 30(2). Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27185783>
- Conner, J., Sippy, Z., & Brennen, A. (2023). Student members of the school board exercising student voice in education policy. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 7(1), 1–23. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Silence&ff1=dtSince 2016&pg=12&id=EJ1396435>
- Cook, P. J., Dodge, K. A., Dishion, T. (2020). Scaling up effective programs for at-risk adolescents. *Prevention Science*, 21(1), 1-10
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. Retrieved from <https://collegepublishing.sagepub.com/products/designing-and-conducting-mixed-methods-research-3-241842>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design.html?id=gX1ZDwAAQBAJ&redir_esc=y
- Daca, M and Pacadaljen, L. (2021) Implementation of SIP in Samar and Catbalogan City Division. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353879536 Implementation of School Improvement Plan in Samar and Catbalogan City Divisions>
- Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2020). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED614324>
- Department of Education – Region VIII. (2024). *Regional memorandum on Brigada Eskwela implementation and monitoring in Eastern Visayas*. Tacloban City: DepEd Region VIII.
- Department of Education – Samar Division. (2025). *Division Memorandum No. 246, s. 2025: Guidelines on the conduct of Brigada Eskwela and stakeholder engagement*. Catbalogan City: DepEd Samar Division.

- Department of Education (DepEd) Region VIII. (2023, October 11). *Regional Memorandum No. 1117, s. 2023: Report on Resources Generated as of September 7, 2023*. Tacloban City, Philippines.
- Department of Education (DepEd) Region VIII. (2025, February 4). *Regional Memorandum No. 112, s. 2025: Contextualized Guidelines for Establishing Partnerships within DepEd Region VIII*. Tacloban City, Philippines.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2012). *DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012: Implementing Guidelines on the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) Framework, Assessment Process and Tool (APAT)*.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2018). *DepEd Memorandum No. 053, s. 2018: Brigada Eskwela implementing guidelines*.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2019). *DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019: Policy guidelines on the K to 12 basic education program*.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2023). *Partnerships and External Relations Office (PERO): Strengthening stakeholder engagement in education*.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2023a). *Partnerships and linkages framework*. Retrieved from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/programs-and-projects/partnerships>
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2023b, August 7). *DepEd emphasizes bayanihan spirit in simpler Brigada Eskwela 2023 launch*. Retrieved from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/08/07/deped-emphasizes-bayanihan-spirit-in-simpler-brigada-eskwela-2023-launch>
- Department of Education [DepEd]. (2023). *School-based management monitoring and evaluation system*. DepEd Regional Office VIII.
- Department of Education Region VIII. (2024). *Regional Memorandum on Brigada Eskwela implementation and monitoring in Eastern Visayas*. Department of Education, Palo, Leyte.
- Department of Education Schools Division of Samar. (2025). *Division Memorandum No. 246, s. 2025: Conduct of Brigada Eskwela 2025*. Department of Education, Catbalogan City, Samar.
- Department of Education. (2023). *2023 Brigada Eskwela implementing guidelines*. DepEd Memorandum No. 032, s. 2023. Department of Education, Pasig City.
- DePetrus, T., & Eames, C. (2017). A Collaborative Community Education Model: Developing Effective School-Community Partnerships. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 33(3), 171–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2017.26>
- Didham, R. J., & Ofei-Manu, P. (2020). Facilitating Collaborative Partnerships in Education Policy Research: A Case of Multi-Stakeholder, Co-Investigation for Monitoring and Evaluation of Education for Sustainable Development. *Sustainability*, 12(7), 2787. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072787>
- Dimalibot, R. M., & Garcines, R. B. (2023). Unveiling the Brigada Eskwela Coordinators' Journey: A Phenomenological Exploration. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies*, 3(5), 633-643. <https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers.v3i5.433>

- Drezner, N. D., & Pizmony-Levy, O. (2021). I belong, therefore, I give? The impact of sense of belonging on graduate student alumni engagement. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 50(4), 753–777. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764020977687>
- Egan, S., O'Brien, B., & O'Hara, J. (2025). Exploring school leaders' perceptions of student voice and student participation in decision-making. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101847>
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Westview Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494673>
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your guide to connecting educators and families*. Corwin Press. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ed454322>
- Ergin, D. Y., Dogan, C., & Cayak, S. (2024). Parent-school collaboration based on the frequency of visits to their child's school. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 10(2), 81–88. <https://doi.org/10.20448/edu.v10i2.5609>
- Esnara, M. (2024). Collaborative school-community partnering situation in a central school: basis for the creation of a partnership initiative. *Pantao*, 4(2), 794-802. <https://doi.org/10.69651/pijhss0402118>
- Estrada, J. (2023). A phenomenological study of collaboration between parents and teachers of students with special needs. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED662017.pdf>
- Flores, O. J., & Ahn, J. (2024). “Kids have taught me. I listen to them”: Principals legitimizing student voice in their leadership. *AERA Open*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584241232596>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Strategic_Management.html?id=4PUJAQAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/The_New_Meaning_of_Educational_Change.html?id=OlhdCwAAQBAJ&redir_esc=y
- Galang, C. Q. (2020). Community Partnership in Secondary Schools: a Sequential Analysis of Issues, Problems and Outstanding Practices. *European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability*, 1(1), 13-18. Retrieved from <https://scholarzest.com/index.php/ejrd/article/view/10>
- Galdames-Calderón, M. (2023). Distributed leadership: School principals' practices to promote teachers' professional development for school improvement. *Education Sciences*, 13(7), 715. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070715>
- Graham-Clay, S. (2024). Communicating with parents 2.0: Strategies for teachers. *School Community Journal*, 34(1), 9–60. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2024-81171-001>

- Gupta, A., Nanda, A., Sawhney, S., & Gupta, A. (2025). Examining the impact of alumni mentoring on student satisfaction and engagement in higher technical education. *Journal of Engineering Education Transformations*, 38(2), 412–419. <https://doi.org/10.16920/jeet/2025/v38is2/25050>
- Hardian, D. E., Abdullah, R., Hasanudin, I., & Syaifi, A. (2025). A Phenomenological Study of Collaborative Leadership in Schools: Advancing Educational Quality Through Stakeholder Synergy at SD Lukman Al Hakim Batu Kajang, East Kalimantan, Indonesia. *JlIP - Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 8(9), 10859-10865. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v8i9.9321>
- Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Annual Synthesis, National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED474521>
- Hinkle, A. R., Goldstone, L., Ressa, V. A., & Lazarus, S. S. (2022). Communicating with families, educators, and policymakers. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, 35, 112–124. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1370355>
- Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*. George Allen & Unwin. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203120330>
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2005). *Managing to collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage*. Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.routledge.com/Managing-to-Collaborate-The-Theory-and-Practice-of-Collaborative-Advantage/Huxham-Vangen/p/book/9780415339209>
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2024). *Family and community engagement framework*. Illinois State Board of Education.
- Irfan, A., Abd Jabar, C. S., & Al Fariz, A. B. (2025). Building organizational culture: The role of supportive leadership of school principals. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences (IJonSES)*, 7(4), 360–375. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonSES.5791>
- Jaboya, F. (2018). *Participation of Stakeholders in the implementation of the Enhancement - SBM*. Doctoral Dissertation, Philippine Women's University.
- Jekielek, S. M., Moore, K. A., Hair, E. C., & Scarupa, H. J. (2002). *Mentoring: A promising strategy for youth development*. Child Trends. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234682682_Mentoring_A_Promising_Strategy_for_Youth_Development_Child_Trends_Research_Brief
- Jung, S. B., & Sheldon, S. (2020). Connecting dimensions of school leadership for partnerships with school and teacher practices of family engagement. *School Community Journal*, 30(1), 9–32. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1257579>
- Jutara, J. T., & De Jesus, L. F. (2024). The impact of school leadership on parental involvement: A systematic review of literature. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research and Innovation*, 2(4), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.17613/fsfxp-9tw74>

- Kaplan, A. E. (2024). *CASE insights on alumni engagement: 2023 key findings*. Council for Advancement and Support of Education. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED674499>
- Kumi, E. (2019). Analysing the relationship between domestic resource mobilisation and civic space: A scoping study. INTRAC. Retrieved from <https://www.intrac.org/app/uploads/2019/06/Scoping-study-Analysing-the-relationship-between-domestic-resource-mobilisation-and-civic-space.pdf>
- Kurian, P. S., & Nair, S. S. K. (2023). Alumni mentoring: An approach to build community of learners. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 156. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202315608003>
- Kwarteng, P., Asiamah, F., Twumasi, A. O., Nkansah, J. O., Issaka, J., & Afetorgbor, S. K. (2022). Parental involvement in the academic performance of students in Ghana: Socio-economic status. *Open Journal of Educational Research*, 2(3), 114–125. <https://doi.org/10.31586/ojer.2022.305>
- Larche, P. (2025). Strategic planning in educational management: A pathway to school success. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 29(1), 1–3. Retrieved from <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/strategic-planning-in-educational-management-a-pathway-to-school-success-17509.html>
- Larsson, C. F., Marshall, B., & Ritchie, B. (2022). The alumni project: Fostering student-alumni engagement in the curriculum. *Journal of Education for Business*, 97(4), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2021.1932704>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355>
- Lee, S. (2024). Public perceptions of cross-sector collaboration in governance. *Public Management Review* 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2273316>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2019). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 39(5), 575–592. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430701800060>
- Lemana II, H. E., Cabaya, M. G. C., Catalan, H. M., Fronda, B. D., Gocotano, O. E., Juan, M. R., Milan, J. B., Miranda, J. F., Omas-As, E. T., Susbilla, C. V., & Espartero, H. M. (2024). A new face of ethical leadership: Voices of future educational leaders. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 17(7), 726–739. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10795533>
- Lerning Policy Institute (2017). *How Community Schools Improve Outcomes - Evidence and Key Strategies*. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/community.schooloutcomes->
- Levy, R. (2024). Home-school communication: What we have learned from the pandemic. *Education* 3–13, 52(1), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2023.2186972>
- Lommen, K. (2018). *A Phenomenological Study on Collaborative Leadership from Assistant Principals' Perspective in High Schools* (Publication No. 13422608) [Doctoral dissertation, Creighton University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

- Retrieved from <https://cdr.creighton.edu/items/57de8d12-0aea-4d38-abb0-6cfc4a9a8df3>
- Lopez, A. C., & Bauyot, M. M. (2025). Stakeholders' Involvement in School-based Programs: A Case Study. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research and Innovation*, 3(1), 600-608. Retrieved from <https://philarchive.org/rec/LOPSII-3>
- Macalinao, R. R. (2024). An Exploratory Analysis of Support, Engagement, and Commitment (SEC) of School Administrators to Teacher Research Programs. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies*, 4(7), 1146-1153. <https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers.v4i7.1332>
- Meriç, E., & Öz, H. (2025). School transparency as a predictor of organizational trust. *BMC Psychology*, 13, 1383. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03776-9>
- Milosavljević Đukić, T. B., Bogavac, D. S., Stojadinović, A. M., & Rajčević, P. Đ. (2022). Parental involvement in education and collaboration with school. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*, 10(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.23947/2334-8496-2022-10-1-01-14>
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from <https://methods.sagepub.com/book/mono/phenomenological-research-methods/toc>
- Muñoz, K. A. M. *et al.* (2025). Strategic plan development: A methodological proposal for higher education institutions. *Sapiens in Higher Education* 2(6):1-21. <https://doi.org/10.71068/xqrdns61>
- Murray, B., Domina, T., Renzulli, L., & Boylan, R. (2019). Civil society goes to school: Parent-teacher associations and the equality of educational opportunity. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 5(3), 41-63. <https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2019.5.3.03>
- Murray, B., Domina, T., Renzulli, L., & Boylan, R. (2019). Civil society goes to school: Parent-teacher associations and the equality of educational opportunity. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 5(3), 41-63. <https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2019.5.3.03>
- Muscoe, H. B. (2022). *Understanding parent-school communication and involvement of children receiving Title 1 services* [Master's thesis, Northern Michigan University]. NMU Commons. Retrieved from <https://commons.nmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1759&context=theses>
- National PTA. (2022). *National standards for family-school partnerships*. Retrieved from <https://www.pta.org/home/run-your-pta/family-school-partnerships>
- Ngobeni, S. (2024). Establishing sustainable school-community partnerships in under-resourced contexts. *School Leadership & Management* 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2024.2369987>
- Ngobeni, S. T. (2025). Establishing and maintaining school-community partnerships: A challenge for school management teams. *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 28(4):903-928. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2117414>

- Ntombela, S. E. (2021). *An In-Depth Exploration of Parents, Teachers and Stakeholders' Collaboration Experiences Towards Learners' Academic Success: A Multiple Case Study* [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa]. UNISA Institutional Repository.
- O'Toole, L., Kiely, J., & McGillicuddy, D. (2019). *Parental involvement, engagement and partnership in their children's education during the primary school years*. National Parents Council. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355483792_Parental_involvement_engagement_and_partnership_in_their_children's_learning_during_the_primary_school_years_Part_2_A_Case_Studies_2_B_Oral_Language_Workshops_Background_005
- Okoro, E. A., & Eze, C. (2020). Communication Strategies and Participatory Decision-Making in Community-Managed Schools: A Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration and Leadership*, 12(3), 45-59.
- Orta, D., & Gutiérrez, V. (2022). *Improving school-family communication and engagement: Lessons from remote schooling during the pandemic*. University of Chicago Consortium on School Research. Retrieved from <https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2022-04/Improving%20School-Family%20Communication-Apr%202022-Consortium.pdf>
- Ozorak, B. M. (2022). *Trust and Reciprocity in Community-Campus Relationships: A Phenomenological Study of Community Partners' Perspectives* [Doctoral dissertation, Point Park University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/openview/43f6475c53aaba0a76555dcdb9b2d168/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Paccaud, A., Keller, R., Luder, R., Pastore, G., & Kunz, A. (2021). Satisfaction with the collaboration between families and schools – The parent's view. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.646878>
- Paradero, G. M., & Rizon, S. C. (2024). Fostering School-Community Collaboration in Island Schools in the Philippines: School Heads' Challenges and Strategies. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 13(5), 101-114. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2024.1167>
- Paraiso, J. T. (2022). Stakeholders' involvement in school-based management. *GEO Academic Journal* 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2026.7.169>
- Peddle, B. (2016). *The Realities of Stakeholders' Evaluation Experiences in a Low-Resourced Nonprofit Organization: A Phenomenological Study* [Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Peng, Y., Alias, B. S., & Mansor, A. N. (2024). Application of stakeholder theory in education management: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(6), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.6.1>

- Pimentel, J. P., & Llorin, R. T. (2021). Level of school-community partnership and its relationship to school performance among public elementary schools in the Philippines. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 3(2), 45–56.
- Quinones, J. I. D., & Abanto, R. G. (2024). Extent of implementation of school-based management (SBM) in selected secondary schools in Camarines Norte: Basis for policy recommendation. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 11(9). <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2024.1109063>
- Quintanilla, M. A. (2024). *A Phenomenological Study of High School Teacher Collaboration's Influence on Teaching and Learning* [Doctoral dissertation, American College of Education]. ACE Scholar Works. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.ace.edu/items/54c42c92-3e05-4fc1-a318-4253eee89753>
- Ramos, C. D., & Lee, S. J. (2021). Barriers to Effective School-Community Partnerships in Underserved Areas. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(2), 112-130.
- Reed, M. S., Vella, S., Challies, E., de Vente, J., Frewer, L., Hohenwallner-Ries, D., Huber, T., Neumann, R. K., Oughton, E., del Ceno, J. S., & van Delden, H. (2023). A theory of participation: What makes stakeholder and public engagement in environmental management work? *Environmental Science & Policy*, 141, 12–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12541>
- Renbarger, R., Rodler, L., Espina, G., Thompson, A., Detgen, A., Sobers, M., Fernandez, F., Sackman, R., Williams, P., & Newsome, E. (2025). Roadblocks to Effective District, Family, and Community Collaboration: A Phenomenology Study of Potential Challenges and Solutions. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 24(2), 384–400. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2024.2317298>
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>
- Sacro, J. C. B. (2025). Exploring the synergy between the PTA and school performance. *Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields*, 1(8), 142–154. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16822466>
- Sahlin, S. (2020). Making sense of external partnerships: Principals' experiences of school–university collaborations. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(1), 77-92. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPCCC-05-2019-0012>
- Salom, M. D. G., & Panganiban, R. S. (2018). Teachers as Builders: Professional Development and Community Participation of Public School Teachers in Metro Manila, Philippines. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 7(3), 81–93. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2018.3013>
- Sanders, M. G. (2017). *Building school-community partnerships: Collaboration for student success*. Corwin Press. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452224831>
- Santos, J. V., Ramos, L. M., & Mallari, M. O. (2024). Assessment of facility management performance: A basis for digitalizing reporting systems in educational institutions. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(2), 14–21. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0651>

- Sanzo, Karen L.; Wilson, Jacob McKinley, III *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, v11 n2 p1-20 Dec 2016
- Scheerens, J. (2016). *Educational effectiveness and ineffectiveness: A critical review of the knowledge base*. Springer. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-94-017-7459-8>
- Scheerens, J., & Bosker, R. J. (1997). *The foundations of educational effectiveness*. Pergamon. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000172375>
- Sepanik, S., & Brown, K. T., Jr. (2021). *School-community partnerships*. MDRC. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED616007>
- Serge, E. J., Alla, J. P., Belibi, P. D. B., Mbadcam, K. J., & Fathima, N. N. (2019). Clay/polymer nanocomposites as filler materials for leather. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117837>
- Sevoflugo, G. S., & Theodotou, E. (2024). The school–university partnership process: research on the views and experiences of the school–university partnership stakeholders. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2024.2396358>
- Sison, M. N., & Fuentes, H. C. (2025). Stakeholders' Engagement and School Performance: Basis for a Proposed School-Community Partnership Program. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(2), 608-620. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.02.16>
- Slater L. (2016). Collaboration: A Framework for School Improvement, *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning* 8(5). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228469990_Collaboration_A_Framework_for_School_Improvement_8_5
- Slavin, R. E. (1990). Achievement effects of ability grouping in secondary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 60(3), 471-499. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1170761>
- Sousa, I., & Ferreira, E. (2024). Students' participation in democratic school management: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.11576/jsse-6333>
- Stroetinga, M., Leeman, Y., & Veugelers, W. (2021). Primary school teachers' practices of collaborating with parents on upbringing. *School Community Journal*, 31(1), 81–100. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353382581_Primary_School_Teachers'_Practices_of_Collaborating_With_Parents_on_Upbringing
- Susbilla, J. G. (2024). Participative planning and community ownership: Navigating stakeholder engagement in public schools. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(2), 512–524.
- Tomajin, J. S. (2022). Portrait of the best practices of public-school heads in establishing school-community partnerships. *Asia Pacific Journal of Advanced Education and Technology*, 1(2), 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.54476/apjaet/30108>

- Tomlin, M. J. (2022). *Supporting Teachers through the Collaborative Process: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis Examining Teacher Perceptions on Principal Best Practices that Support Their Collaboration in Professional Learning Communities* [Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. Retrieved from <https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:4f17qh37g>
- Wahono, B., Purmanna, A., Azis, A. A., & Ependi, U. (2025). Strengthens the student collaboration and decision-making skills through integrated STEM education: A research and development study. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 22(1), 104–127. Retrieved from <https://www.icaseonline.net/journal/index.php/sei/article/view/754>
- Wahono, B., Purmanna, A., Ramadhani, R., & Manalu, M. S. (2025). Strengthens the student collaboration and decision-making skills through integrated STEM education: A research and development study. *Science Education International*, 36(1), 86–93. <https://doi.org/10.33828/sei.v36.i1.9>
- Willemse, T. M., Thompson, I., Vanderlinde, R., & Mutton, T. (2018). Family-school partnerships: A challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 44(3), 252–257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1465545>
- Willemse, T. M., Thompson, I., Vanderlinde, R., & Mutton, T. (2018). Family-school partnerships: A challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 44(3), 252–257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1465545>
- Wu, H., & Shen, J. (2022). The association between principal leadership and student achievement: A multivariate meta-meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100423>
- Yuntasilo, P. Y., & Sutheejariyawattana, P. (2023). Teachers with participation to enhance students' leadership skills. *World Journal of Education*, 13(4), 34. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v13n4p34>
- Zulauf-McCurdy, C. A., Loomis, C. A., Williamson, A. C., & Swick, K. J. (2024). A systematic review of interventions to promote parent-teacher relationships in early care and education: Exploring the social process between parents. *SAGE Open*, 14(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241288114>.