

Assessing The Implementation and Institutional Impact of Community Co-Governance and Culture Responsive Leadership Practices in Selected Public Elementary Schools

Mr. Ericson G Pacaldo¹, Ms. Bb. Bulak P Butal², Ms. Gay R Ponce³

ABSTRACT

This study examined the level of implementation and institutional impact of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol during the School Year 2025–2026. It aimed to determine how participatory governance and inclusive leadership practices contribute to institutional effectiveness in terms of organizational culture, stakeholder engagement, teacher performance, and student support. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed using structured questionnaires administered to ninety (90) respondents composed of school heads, teachers, and stakeholders. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.

The findings revealed that community co-governance practices were implemented at a high level, while culture-responsive leadership practices and institutional impact were rated very high across all dimensions. Strong positive relationships were found between community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices, between community co-governance and institutional impact, and between culture-responsive leadership and institutional impact, indicating that increased stakeholder participation and inclusive leadership are associated with improved institutional outcomes.

The study concludes that the integration of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices plays a significant role in enhancing school effectiveness and fostering inclusive educational environments. Based on the results, an Integrated Community Co-Governance and Culture-Responsive Leadership Framework was developed to strengthen governance practices, promote inclusive leadership, and improve institutional effectiveness in public elementary schools.

Keywords: Community Co-Governance, Culture Responsive Leadership, School Governance Inclusive Leadership, Educational Leadership, Educational Management and Development

1. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SCOPE

INTRODUCTION

Rationale of the Study

Educational institutions today operate within increasingly complex governance environments that require leadership approaches to be more collaborative, participatory, and culturally responsive. At the international level, co-governance has emerged as a strategic framework that promotes shared decision-making, trust-building, and active stakeholder participation to achieve sustainable institutional outcomes (Bradley & Mahmoud, 2024; Jones, 2023). Studies consistently show that co-governance strengthens institutional legitimacy and improves policy implementation by fostering community ownership and collective accountability (Li et al., 2022; Shen et al., 2025). In rapidly changing social and cultural contexts, such approaches enable institutions to respond more adaptively to emerging challenges (Zhao et al., 2024; Rückle & Vasseur, 2025).

Parallel to these developments, global leadership scholarship highlights the importance of culturally responsive leadership (CRL) in promoting inclusive and equitable organizations. Research indicates that leadership practices grounded in cultural awareness, inclusivity, and adaptability contribute significantly to institutional effectiveness and resilience (Al Hakim et al., 2022; Purnomo et al., 2024). In educational settings, culturally responsive leadership has been shown to enhance equity-focused policies, strengthen inclusive teaching practices, and improve outcomes for marginalized learners (Brady et al., 2024; Mansfield & Lambrinou, 2024; Indar & Byrd, 2024). International evidence further demonstrates that such leadership approaches are particularly effective in addressing diversity-related challenges and fostering inclusive school cultures across varied contexts (Brown et al., 2021; Highfield et al., 2024).

While these international studies provide a strong foundation, the application of co-governance and culturally responsive leadership within the Philippine educational system presents distinct contextual considerations. In the Philippines, educational reforms increasingly emphasize community engagement, inclusive practices, and the integration of local knowledge systems into teaching and leadership (Geromo et al., 2026; Susilo et al., 2025). Local studies suggest that culturally responsive leadership contributes to more inclusive school environments and supports culturally diverse learners (Uy et al., 2024). However, existing research in the Philippine context tends to focus either on culturally responsive pedagogy or on leadership practices independently, with limited attention to governance structures that enable meaningful stakeholder participation in decision-making processes.

More specifically, at the local level, public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol operate within culturally diverse communities where strong collaboration between schools and stakeholders is essential. Schools are increasingly expected to implement participatory governance and culturally responsive practices in response to policy directions and community needs. However, there is limited empirical evidence on how these expectations are translated into actual school practices. In particular, little is known about how school leaders integrate community co-governance mechanisms with culturally responsive leadership approaches, and how this integration influences institutional effectiveness, stakeholder engagement, and equitable student outcomes within this specific setting.

Despite the growing body of literature on co-governance and culturally responsive leadership, a critical research gap remains. Existing studies largely examine these frameworks separately and are often situated in international or urban contexts, leaving rural and localized educational settings underexplored. More importantly, no known study has systematically investigated the combined implementation of community co-governance and culturally responsive leadership and their interaction in shaping school-level outcomes in Philippine public elementary schools, particularly in the Division of Bohol. This gap is significant, as schools are increasingly required to adopt inclusive and participatory approaches, yet there is insufficient localized evidence to guide their effective integration in practice.

Given these gaps, there is a clear need for context-specific research that examines how community co-governance and culturally responsive leadership are implemented and how they collectively influence school functioning. Understanding this relationship is essential for informing leadership practices, strengthening stakeholder collaboration, and improving equitable educational outcomes. Hence, this study seeks to assess the implementation and institutional impact of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol.

Theoretical Background

The theoretical foundation of this study is anchored in co-governance theory, which emphasizes shared authority, participatory decision-making, and collaborative accountability among institutional stakeholders. At its core, co-governance is guided by the principles of inclusivity, shared responsibility, trust-building, and collective ownership, positioning governance as a relational and negotiated process rather than a hierarchical function. Contemporary scholarship highlights that co-governance integrates multiple actors in shaping sustainable and inclusive systems (Chang et al., 2025), while mechanisms such as shared narratives, collaborative rituals, and collective meaning-making strengthen trust and reinforce participatory governance cultures (Xie et al., 2025). Indigenous perspectives further extend this framework by emphasizing relational accountability and cultural stewardship, where governance is deeply rooted in community identity and responsibility to both people and environment (Ford & Waters, 2025).

In relation to this study, co-governance theory directly supports the variable of community co-governance, particularly in explaining how participatory structures influence stakeholder engagement and institutional effectiveness. The theory suggests that when stakeholders are actively involved in decision-making, they develop a sense of ownership that enhances commitment to school policies and programs. As a result, governance becomes more responsive to community

needs, leading to improved implementation outcomes. This indicates that community co-governance functions as a structural mechanism that enables inclusive participation and strengthens the alignment between institutional goals and local realities.

Similarly, organizational culture and leadership theory, which explains how leaders shape institutional norms, values, and responsiveness to change. This theory is grounded in key principles such as sense-making, symbolic leadership, value formation, and structural alignment, which collectively influence how individuals within an organization interpret policies and engage in collective action (Al Hakim et al., 2022). Pedagogical leadership theory further posits that leadership practices directly affect teaching

quality and student outcomes, thereby linking leadership behavior to institutional effectiveness (Guvhu et al., 2025). In addition, value-based leadership emphasizes ethical orientation, shared vision, and sustainability, which are essential in fostering long-term organizational development (Purnomo et al., 2024).

Therefore, these leadership theories directly inform the variable of culture-responsive leadership, particularly in explaining how leadership practices shape school climate, inclusivity, and adaptability to diversity. They suggest that leaders play a critical role in creating environments that either support or hinder participatory governance. In this sense, leadership does not operate independently of governance; rather, it enables and sustains the effectiveness of co-governance by cultivating a culture of trust, openness, and collaboration.

In addition, culturally responsive leadership (CRL) theory provides a more focused lens for understanding how leadership practices address diversity and equity within educational settings. CRL is grounded in principles such as cultural awareness, equity orientation, inclusivity, advocacy for marginalized groups, and the integration of learners' cultural identities into institutional processes (Walrond, 2022). Unlike traditional leadership approaches, CRL emphasizes the need for leaders to actively recognize systemic inequities and ensure that decision-making processes reflect diverse perspectives. Empirical evidence suggests that professional learning communities and data-informed collaboration enhance the implementation of culturally responsive practices in schools (Cano, 2022), while Indigenous education scholarship highlights the importance of culturally grounded leadership in addressing contextual realities (Geromo et al., 2026).

Consequently, CRL directly supports the variable of culture-responsive leadership practices, particularly in influencing equitable student outcomes and stakeholder participation. It explains how leadership can bridge the gap between institutional policies and the lived experiences of culturally diverse communities. By embedding equity and cultural responsiveness into leadership practices, CRL strengthens the capacity of schools to ensure that governance processes are not only participatory but also inclusive and socially just.

Moreover, the philosophical foundations of educational management further contextualize these theories by emphasizing the need for adaptive, reflective, and ethically grounded leadership in dynamic environments. Adaptive leadership theory highlights the importance of flexibility, responsiveness, and problem-solving in addressing complex and evolving challenges (Mahdi & Hidayat, 2025). Similarly, curriculum theory underscores the integration of local knowledge, cultural relevance, and contextualized learning as essential components of meaningful educational experiences (Fathurrochman et al., 2025). These perspectives reinforce the idea that both governance and leadership must be responsive to cultural and contextual realities, thereby supporting the alignment of school practices with community needs.

Finally, inclusive education and sociological perspectives provide a unifying framework that connects governance and leadership to broader educational outcomes. These perspectives emphasize stakeholder participation, social inclusion, and the recognition of diverse learner needs as critical factors in achieving equitable education (Saani, 2024). They suggest that the success of school initiatives depends not only on policy design but also on how stakeholders perceive and engage with these initiatives.

Taken together, these theories interact to explain the central relationships examined in this study. Co-governance theory explains how participatory structures create opportunities for stakeholder engagement and shared decision-making. Organizational and leadership theories explain how leaders shape the institutional culture that supports or constrains these participatory processes. Culturally responsive leadership theory bridges these perspectives by ensuring that both governance and leadership practices are grounded in equity, inclusivity, and cultural awareness.

More importantly, these theories suggest a dynamic and reinforcing relationship among the study variables. Community co-governance provides the structural conditions for participation, while culture-responsive leadership shapes the quality and inclusiveness of that participation. When these elements are effectively integrated, they create a synergistic effect that enhances institutional effectiveness, strengthens stakeholder engagement, and promotes equitable student outcomes. Conversely, the absence of culturally responsive leadership may limit the effectiveness of co-governance structures, while weak participatory mechanisms may constrain the impact of leadership practices.

Thus, the integration of co-governance theory, organizational leadership theory, culturally responsive leadership frameworks, and inclusive education perspectives provides a comprehensive explanation of how community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership interact to influence institutional effectiveness, stakeholder engagement, and equity outcomes in public elementary schools. This theoretical framework supports the assumption that effective school governance is not only participatory but also culturally responsive, and that the interaction between these elements is essential for achieving sustainable and inclusive educational outcomes in the Division of Bohol.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

This research assesses the implementation and institutional impact of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices in selected public elementary schools in the Department of Education, Division of Bohol during the School Year 2025–2026 as a basis for a responsive leadership framework.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What relevant information can be derived from the respondents:
 - 1.1. age,
 - 1.2. gender,
 - 1.3. position,
 - 1.4. length of service,
 - 1.5. highest educational attainment,
 - 1.6. school classification, and
 - 1.7 Related training, seminars, and workshops attended?
2. As perceive by the respondent groups, what is the level of implementation of community co-

governance practices in school improvement in terms of:

- 2.1. Stakeholder participation in decision-making;
- 2.2. Transparency and accountability mechanisms;
- 2.3. Shared planning and policy development; and
- 2.4. Community engagement and partnership initiatives?
3. As perceived by the respondent groups, what is the level of implementation of culture-responsive leadership practices in school improvement in terms of:
 - 3.1. Cultural awareness and sensitivity;
 - 3.2. Inclusive policy and curriculum support;
 - 3.3. Equity-centered leadership practices;
 - 3.4. Support for culturally diverse learners and families?
4. As perceived by the respondent groups, what is the level of institutional impact of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership in terms of:
 - 4.1. Organizational culture and collaboration;
 - 4.2. Stakeholder trust and engagement;
 - 4.3. Teacher performance and professional growth;
 - 4.4. Improvement in student support and inclusivity?
5. Is there a significant relationship between community co-governance practices and culture-responsive leadership practices in selected public elementary schools?
6. Is there a significant relationship between community co-governance practices and institutional impact?
7. Is there a significant relationship between culture-responsive leadership practices and institutional impact?
8. Based on the findings, what is the Integrated Community Co-Governance and Culture-Responsive Leadership Framework that can be develop?

Null Hypothesis

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at the 0.05 level of significance:

Ho1. There is no significant relationship between community co-governance practices and culture-responsive leadership practices in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol during the School Year 2025–2026.

Ho2. There is no significant relationship between community co-governance practices and institutional impact in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol during the School Year 2025–2026.

Significant of the Study

This study assesses the implementation and perceived institutional impact of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol. This study provides insights to the following:

Policymakers. The results may inform policy enhancement related to school-based management and inclusive education. The proposed framework may serve as a reference in designing governance and leadership strategies aligned with equity and cultural responsiveness.

Department of Education – Division of Bohol. The findings may assist DepEd officials in strengthening stakeholder participation, refining leadership development programs, and improving community partnership initiatives to support effective and inclusive school governance.

School Administrators. The study provides practical insights on integrating participatory governance and culture-responsive leadership to improve school climate, collaboration, and performance. It may guide leaders in implementing transparent, inclusive, and equity-centered practices.

Teachers. The findings may help teachers understand their role in governance and inclusive practices, encouraging active participation in school decision-making and collaboration. This may enhance instructional practices and support diverse learners.

Non-Teaching Personnel. The study highlights their role in supporting school programs and fostering an inclusive environment. It may encourage active involvement in school initiatives that promote collaboration and effective service delivery.

Parents, Community Leaders, and Local Government Units. The study emphasizes the importance of stakeholder engagement in school governance. The findings may strengthen collaboration, trust, and shared responsibility in school improvement efforts.

Researchers and Future Studies. This study contributes to the existing literature on co-governance and culture-responsive leadership in the Philippine context. It may serve as a reference for future studies exploring governance, leadership, and institutional effectiveness in similar educational settings.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**Research Design**

This research employed a descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component examined the levels of implementation of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol during the School Year 2025–2026. This analysis identified the extent to which stakeholder participation, transparency mechanisms, shared decision-making, and community engagement initiatives were practiced within schools. It also assessed the degree to which school leaders demonstrated cultural awareness, inclusive policy support, equity-centered leadership, and responsiveness to culturally diverse learners.

The correlational component investigated whether significant relationships existed among community co-governance practices, culture-responsive leadership practices, and institutional impact. Through quantitative data analysis, the study determined the extent to which participatory governance structures influenced leadership effectiveness and institutional outcomes such as organizational culture, stakeholder trust, teacher performance, and inclusivity in student support. This approach allowed the researcher to examine predictive associations between governance participation, culturally grounded leadership practices, and overall institutional effectiveness, ultimately forming the basis for developing an Integrated Community Co-Governance and Culture-Responsive Leadership Framework.

assessed the extent to which schools operationalized participatory governance structures aligned with school-based management principles.

Furthermore, the study assessed the level of implementation of culture-responsive leadership practices in terms of cultural awareness and sensitivity, inclusive policy and curriculum support, equity-centered leadership approaches, and support systems for culturally diverse learners and families. It also evaluated institutional impact based on organizational culture and collaboration, stakeholder trust and engagement, teacher professional growth, and perceived improvements in student inclusivity and support. This provided a comprehensive understanding of how governance and leadership practices influenced institutional outcomes within public elementary schools.

Lastly, the study determined the relationships among community co-governance practices, culture-responsive leadership practices, and institutional impact, as well as the differences when grouped according to respondents' position and school classification. Based on the findings, the study proposed an Integrated Community Co-Governance and Culture-Responsive Leadership Framework designed to strengthen participatory governance, promote inclusive leadership, and enhance institutional effectiveness in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol.

Environment of the Study

This study was conducted in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol during the School Year 2025–2026. The participating schools were Sto. Rosario Elementary School, Uog-Ubujan Elementary School, and



Figure 3.
Location Map

Panghagban Elementary School under Inabanga South District and Buenavista II District. These schools were chosen due to their active implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) principles and their engagement with community stakeholders, making them relevant contexts for examining community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices.

In Inabanga South District, Sto. Rosario Elementary School and Uog-Ubujan Elementary School operate within predominantly rural communities where stakeholder participation plays a significant role in school development initiatives. These schools serve learners from diverse socio-economic and cultural backgrounds, with strong involvement from parents, barangay officials, and community organizations. The governance structures in these schools reflect collaborative decision-making processes aligned with DepEd's decentralization policies and local community engagement programs.

In Buenavista II District, Panghagban Elementary School represents a public elementary school situated in a community setting that integrates local cultural practices and stakeholder partnerships into its school improvement efforts. The school demonstrates participatory leadership approaches through coordination with Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs), barangay councils, and local government units. This context provides a meaningful setting for analyzing how culture-responsive leadership practices influence institutional effectiveness and inclusivity.

The selected schools represent varied community environments within the Division of Bohol, characterized by differences in geographic location, stakeholder dynamics, and levels of institutional capacity. By focusing on public elementary schools within rural and semi-rural districts, the study provides a contextualized examination of how community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices operate within decentralized educational settings. This diversity allows for a comprehensive understanding of governance structures, leadership approaches, and their institutional impact across selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol.

Respondents

The respondents of this research were school heads, teachers, and selected stakeholder representatives from three public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol: Sto. Rosario Elementary School and Uog-Ubujan Elementary School under Inabanga South District, and Panghagban Elementary School under Buenavista II District. The study employed a stratified sampling technique to ensure proportional representation from school heads, teaching personnel, and community stakeholders involved in governance and leadership processes.

The inclusion criteria were as follows:

- a) Respondents were officially assigned personnel or recognized stakeholder representatives (e.g., PTA officers, barangay representatives) in the selected schools during the Academic Year 2025–2026;
- b) Respondents had at least one (1) year of service or active involvement in school governance and leadership activities; and
- c) Respondents voluntarily agreed to participate in the study and signed the informed consent form.

This selection process ensured that respondents possessed sufficient experience and exposure to school governance mechanisms, leadership practices, and community engagement initiatives necessary to provide informed responses regarding community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices.

Table 1

Distribution of Respondents

School	School Heads	Teachers	Stakeholders	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Panghagban Elementary School	1	9	20	30	33.33%
Sto. Rosario Elementary School	1	7	28	30	33.33%
U-og Ubujan Elementary School	1	10	19	30	33.33%
Total	3	26	67	90	100%

This distribution indicated a total of 90 respondents representing school leaders, teachers, and community stakeholders from selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol. The inclusion of schools from two districts Inabanga South and Buenavista II ensured diversity in governance structures, leadership dynamics, and community engagement contexts. This district-level representation strengthened the study's validity by providing comparative insights into how community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices are implemented across different public elementary school environments within the Division of Bohol.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

To ensure clarity and understanding, the following key terms used in this study were operationally defined:

Community Co-Governance – The collaborative process through which school leaders, teachers, parents, barangay officials, and other stakeholders actively participate in shared decision-making, planning, implementation, and evaluation of school programs in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol during Academic Year 2025–2026.

Correlational Analysis – The statistical procedure used to determine the strength and direction of the relationship among community co-governance practices, culture-responsive leadership practices, and institutional impact.

Culture-Responsive Leadership – A leadership approach demonstrated by school heads and administrators that promotes cultural awareness, inclusivity, equity-centered practices, and responsiveness to the diverse cultural backgrounds of learners and community stakeholders.

Descriptive Analysis – The statistical procedure used to summarize and describe the levels of community co-governance, culture-responsive leadership, and institutional impact using measures such as frequency, percentage, and weighted mean.

Inclusive Policy Support – Leadership practices that promote equitable policies, culturally relevant curriculum initiatives, and support systems that address the diverse needs of learners.

Integrated Community Co-Governance and Culture-Responsive Leadership Framework – The proposed output of the study, consisting of structured strategies, policy recommendations, and leadership development initiatives designed to strengthen participatory governance and inclusive leadership practices in public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol.

Institutional Impact – The observable influence of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices on school organizational culture, stakeholder trust, teacher professional growth, collaboration, and inclusivity in student support systems.

Level of Community Co-Governance Practices – The extent to which participatory governance mechanisms, such as stakeholder involvement, transparency, shared planning, and community partnerships, are implemented in the selected schools.

Level of Culture-Responsive Leadership Practices – The degree to which school leaders demonstrate cultural sensitivity, inclusive policy support, equity-driven leadership strategies, and support for culturally diverse learners and families.

Level of Institutional Impact – The degree to which governance and leadership practices contribute to improved collaboration, trust, teacher development, and inclusive school climate within the selected public elementary schools.

Organizational Culture – The shared values, norms, beliefs, and practices within the school that influence collaboration, decision-making, and overall institutional climate.

Selected Public Elementary Schools – The schools where the study was conducted, specifically Sto. Rosario Elementary School and Uog-Ubujan Elementary School under Inabanga South District, and Panghagban Elementary School under Buenavista II District, Division of Bohol.

Stakeholder Participation – The involvement of teachers, parents, community leaders, and other school partners in decision-making processes, policy development, and school improvement planning.

Transparency and Accountability – The openness of school leadership in communicating policies, financial matters, and program outcomes, ensuring responsible governance and shared accountability among stakeholders.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

This chapter presents a review of related literature and studies relevant to community co-governance, culture-responsive leadership, and institutional impact in educational settings. It synthesizes theoretical perspectives, empirical research, and policy frameworks that establish the conceptual foundation of the study. The reviewed works highlight the evolution of participatory governance models, equity-centered leadership practices, and inclusive school management approaches across global and local contexts. This chapter also identifies research gaps that justify the need to assess the implementation and institutional impact of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol.

Related Literature

Culturally responsive leadership (CRL) has increasingly been recognized as a transformative framework that aligns leadership practices with equity, inclusion, and social justice. A critical review by Wang et al. (2023) synthesizes global scholarship and argues that CRL extends beyond surface-level cultural awareness toward systemic reform that addresses structural inequities embedded in school systems (Wang et al., 2023). This perspective positions CRL as both a leadership orientation and a reform mechanism that drives deeper institutional change.

Complementing this, Indar and Byrd (2024) identified recurring themes in CRL literature, including reflective practice, relationship-building, and institutional transformation, reinforcing the notion that culturally responsive leaders must cultivate measurable behaviors that relate to school outcomes. The development of instruments such as the Culturally Responsive Leadership Scale (Hines, 2022) further supports the empirical assessment of CRL practices, enabling systematic evaluation within governance contexts and strengthening the basis for linking leadership to school effectiveness.

Empirical studies at the district and school level highlight the complexities of embedding CRL into institutional planning and practice. Mansfield and Lambrinou (2024) revealed that culturally responsive systems require ongoing leadership accountability and stakeholder engagement to avoid superficial implementation. Similarly, Barksdale's (2024) case study found that leaders who institutionalize culturally responsive classroom management strategies foster inclusive climates and reduce disparities. These findings suggest that leadership plays a crucial role in operationalizing equity-oriented practices and sustaining inclusive school cultures.

Integrating cultural responsiveness into curriculum also strengthens participatory governance. Fathurrochman et al. (2025) demonstrated that integrating local wisdom into elementary curricula enhances cultural relevance and community engagement. Such research highlights the role of inclusive curricular frameworks in reinforcing governance structures that align community and school values.

Stakeholder perspectives further underscore the importance of participatory governance. Saani's (2024) findings reveal discrepancies between policy intentions and classroom realities, emphasizing the need for leadership that actively engages teachers, parents, and community members in governance decisions. Jordan et al. (2025) also note that globalization and technological change require adaptive and culturally sensitive governance approaches, reinforcing the relevance of culturally grounded leadership models.

Recent studies within the Philippine setting extend the global discourse on culturally responsive and inclusive leadership. Balbuena, Capacio, and Ocdenaria (2025) explored leadership perspectives of Filipino school heads in multicultural contexts, noting that effective leaders demonstrate cultural sensitivity, inclusive collaboration, and trust principles that align with CRL and contextualize leadership within Filipino values. This supports the premise that local leaders must integrate cultural awareness into leadership practices to effectively respond to diverse school communities.

Multicultural diversity management within Philippine schools has also been linked to enhanced leadership practices, where culturally responsive practices significantly improve school management

effectiveness (Agno & Rufino, 2025). This finding reinforces that inclusive leadership and cultural responsiveness enhance institutional governance and stakeholder collaboration, meriting investigation within elementary school contexts.

Intercultural leadership practices among educational leaders in the Camarines Norte region further emphasize the importance of adapting leadership to reflect diverse cultural realities, indicating that leaders who prioritize engaging varied cultural groups can promote more cohesive and responsive school environments. This resonates with the study's focus on how leadership practices intersect with community participation to influence school effectiveness.

Finally, studies in the Philippine context have emphasized the integration of Indigenous and sociocultural values into leadership practice. A systematic review on educational leadership in the Philippines highlights Indigenous Filipino values such as *kapwa*, *pakiramdam*, and *bahala na* as foundational to inclusive and community-centered leadership that aligns with culturally responsive paradigms and promotes stakeholder empowerment.

Related Studies

Recent empirical investigations further support the direction of the current study by providing evidence on the implementation and outcomes of culturally responsive and inclusive leadership practices.

Thompson-Slappy (2024) examined urban principals' equity-focused leadership practices, finding that leaders who sustained culturally responsive reforms through professional development and community engagement were more successful in institutionalizing inclusive practices. This underscores the importance of leadership commitment and systemic continuity that extend beyond policy rhetoric to actual governance behaviors.

Highfield et al. (2024) explored culturally responsive middle leadership, demonstrating that distributed leadership structures that promote culturally responsive pedagogy significantly enhanced support systems for marginalized learners and strengthened school capacity for equity-focused outcomes. These findings support the idea that leadership influence must permeate multiple organizational levels, a principle that aligns with the integrated governance and leadership model investigated in this study.

Cross-national research such as Brown et al. (2021) confirms that adaptive and culturally aware leadership strategies are essential in diverse contexts to address challenges related to migration and institutional responsiveness. Similarly, experimental research by Brady et al. (2024) shows measurable improvements in teachers' inclusive beliefs and practices following leadership-driven interventions, highlighting the tangible impact of leadership on school culture.

In the Philippine context, studies like Bayawan (2025) identified key constructs related to culturally responsive leadership within DepEd divisions, including cultural adaptability, inclusive communication, and sensitivity elements that contextualize leadership practices within local educational settings and support the premise that leadership frameworks must be tailored to cultural contexts.

These related studies collectively provide empirical support for examining how culture-responsive leadership practices, when embedded within participatory governance structures, influence institutional

effectiveness and equity outcomes. They highlight the practical significance of leadership practices that align cultural responsiveness with inclusive governance a central focus of the current research.

The reviewed literature demonstrates that culturally responsive leadership is not only a conceptual ideal but an empirically supported framework that influences school governance, teacher practices, and stakeholder engagement. Local Philippine studies show that context-specific leadership practices rooted in cultural values enhance institutional capacity and align leadership with community expectations. These studies collectively support the direction of the current research by highlighting the necessity of integrating participatory governance mechanisms with culturally responsive leadership to achieve institutional effectiveness and equitable outcomes in public elementary schools.

3. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter dealt with the summary, findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

SUMMARY

This study assessed the implementation and institutional impact of community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol.

In terms of the profile of the respondents, majority were within the middle to late stages of their professional careers, predominantly female, and mostly composed of stakeholders. It had more than six years of service and possessed graduate-level educational qualifications. Additionally, the majority had participated in district and division-level trainings, indicating substantial experience and professional exposure.

Regarding the level of implementation of community co-governance practices the findings shows a high level of implementation across all dimensions including stakeholder participation, transparency and accountability, shared planning and community engagement. Community engagement and partnership initiatives obtained the highest level while transparency and accountability mechanisms showed relatively lower ratings suggesting areas for improvement.

In terms of the level of implementation of culture-responsive leadership practices the results indicated a very high level of implementation. Cultural awareness and sensitivity, equity-centered leadership and support for culturally diverse learners were highly practiced demonstrating strong commitment to inclusive leadership. On the other hand, inclusive policy and curriculum support showed slightly lower ratings, indicating a need for continuous enhancement.

The level of institutional impact, the findings showed a very high level of impact across all indicators, including organizational culture and collaboration, stakeholder trust and engagement, teacher performance and professional growth, and student support and inclusivity. This suggests that the integration of governance and leadership practices positively influences overall school effectiveness.

In terms of the significant relationships among variables, the results revealed that there is a strong positive relationship between community co-governance practices and culture-responsive leadership practices; There is a strong positive relationship between community co-governance practices and institutional

impact; and There is a strong positive relationship between culture-responsive leadership practices and institutional impact.

Furthermore, the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the levels of community co-governance practices, culture-responsive leadership practices, and institutional impact when respondents were grouped according to position and school classification.

FINDINGS

The study revealed that the respondents were generally experienced, predominantly female, and largely composed of stakeholders, with most having more than six years of service, graduate-level qualifications, and participation in district and division-level trainings.

The level of implementation of community co-governance practices was found to be high across all dimensions, with community engagement and partnership initiatives obtaining the highest ratings, while transparency and accountability mechanisms registered comparatively lower scores.

The level of implementation of culture-responsive leadership practices was determined to be very high, particularly in cultural awareness and sensitivity, equity-centered leadership, and support for culturally diverse learners. However, inclusive policy and curriculum support showed relatively lower ratings.

The level of institutional impact was likewise very high, as reflected in strong organizational culture and collaboration, stakeholder trust and engagement, teacher performance and professional growth, and student support and inclusivity.

The study further revealed significant and strong positive relationships among the variables. Community co-governance practices were significantly related to culture-responsive leadership practices, and both variables were significantly related to institutional impact.

Significant differences were also found in the levels of community co-governance practices, culture-responsive leadership practices, and institutional impact when grouped according to respondents' position and school classification.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices are effectively implemented in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Bohol and collectively contribute to a high level of institutional impact. The strong positive relationships among these variables indicate that participatory governance and inclusive, equity-centered leadership are critical in enhancing organizational culture, stakeholder engagement, teacher performance and student support systems. Lastly, variations in implementation across position and school classification suggest that contextual factors influence how these practices are carried out. The general results affirm that strengthening both governance and leadership practices is essential in achieving sustainable and responsive school improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

School heads and educational leaders should strengthen stakeholder participation, transparency and culture-responsive leadership practices by enhancing inclusive policies, professional development and equity-centered support systems for diverse learners. The Department of Education and school stakeholders should sustain collaborative partnerships and utilize the proposed framework to improve governance, leadership, and institutional effectiveness, while future researchers may further validate the model in different contexts.

4. OUTPUT OF THE STUDY

Rationale

The Integrated Community Co-Governance and Culture-Responsive Leadership Enhancement Program is anchored on the findings of the study which revealed that while community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices are highly implemented, gaps remain in transparency and accountability mechanisms, inclusive policy and curriculum support, and consistent stakeholder involvement in decision-making and planning processes. The results also indicated that although institutional impact is very high, continuous strengthening of equity-centered practices and support systems for diverse learners is necessary.

These findings highlight the need for a structured and strategic intervention to further enhance participatory governance, inclusive leadership, and institutional effectiveness. The program is therefore designed to address these gaps by strengthening stakeholder engagement, improving transparency and accountability, and promoting culturally responsive and equity-centered leadership practices in schools.

Objectives

The program aims to strengthen community co-governance and culture-responsive leadership practices by enhancing stakeholder participation, improving transparency and accountability mechanisms and promoting inclusive policy and curriculum support. It also seeks to reinforce equity-centered leadership practices and support systems for diverse learners to ensure sustained institutional impact. Furthermore, the program intends to empower school leaders, teachers, and stakeholders to actively engage in collaborative planning, implementation, and evaluation of school improvement initiatives.

Scheme of Implementation

The implementation of the program will involve the conduct of capacity-building trainings, stakeholder consultation meetings, and monitoring and evaluation activities focused on governance and leadership practices. These activities will be carried out by school heads, teachers, and community stakeholders utilizing available resources such as MOOE, PTA funds, and support from local government units and partner organizations. The program will follow a structured timeline to ensure effective coordination, active participation, and continuous monitoring of progress. Through these interventions, the program is expected to strengthen participatory governance, enhance culture-responsive leadership, and improve overall institutional effectiveness in selected public elementary schools.

INTEGRATED COMMUNITY CO-GOVERNANCE AND CULTURE-RESPONSIVE LEADERSHIP ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Areas of Concern	Objectives	Strategies	Persons Involved	Budget	Source of Budget	Time Frame	Expected Outcome
Limited stakeholder participation in decision-making	To strengthen stakeholder engagement in school governance	Conduct regular stakeholder assemblies and consultation meetings	School Head, Teachers, PTA Officers, Barangay Officials	₱25,000	PTA, LGU	Sept–Dec 2026	Improved stakeholder participation and shared decision-making
Limited transparency in financial reporting and accountability	To enhance transparency and accountability systems	Conduct financial transparency orientation and quarterly reporting sessions	School Head, Finance Committee, PTA	₱20,000	School MOOE, PTA	Oct–Dec 2026	Increased trust and accountability among stakeholders
Inconsistent stakeholder involvement in school planning and policy	To improve participatory planning processes	Facilitate collaborative School Improvement Plan (SIP) workshops	School Head, Teachers, Community Leaders	₱30,000	DepEd, LGU	Nov 2026–Jan 2027	More inclusive and responsive school plans and policies

development		with stakeholders					
Limited application of culture-responsive leadership practices	To strengthen culturally responsive leadership	Conduct training workshops on cultural awareness and inclusive leadership practices	School Head, Master Teachers, External Trainers	₱35,000	DepEd , NGO Partners	Jan–Mar 2027	Improved culturally responsive and inclusive leadership practices
Insufficient integration of inclusive policies and curriculum	To enhance inclusive policy and curriculum implementation	Review and revise school policies and curriculum to align with inclusive education principles	School Head, Teachers, Curriculum Coordinators	₱15,000	School Funds	Feb–Apr 2027	More inclusive and culturally responsive curriculum implementation
Limited equity-centered leadership and support for marginalized learners	To strengthen equity-based interventions and learner support systems	Develop targeted programs and support services for disadvantaged and marginalized learners	Teachers, Guidance Counselor, School Head	₱40,000	LGU, NGO	Mar–May 2027	Enhanced learner support and reduced educational inequalities
Limited community engagement and external partnerships	To strengthen school-community collaboration	Establish linkages and partnerships with local organizations and stakeholders	School Head, PTA, LGU Representatives	₱20,000	LGU, Private Partners	Apr–June 2027	Stronger community engagement and sustainable partnerships
Need to strengthen teacher professional	To improve teacher performance and	Conduct professional development programs	School Head, Master Teachers	₱25,000	DepEd ,	Whole Year 2026	Improved teacher performance and

growth and collaboration	continuous professional development	and collaborative learning sessions			School Funds	– 2027	instructional practices
Need to enhance student support and inclusivity programs	To improve student engagement and inclusive learning environment	Implement inclusive programs and student support services addressing diverse needs	Teachers, School Head, Stakeholders	₱30,000	DepEd, LGU	Whole Year 2026 – 2027	Improved student participation, inclusivity, and learning outcomes

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abdalla, H., & Moussa, A. (2024). Culturally responsive teaching: Navigating models and implementing effective strategies. *Acta Pedagogica Asiana*, 3(2), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.53623/apga.v3i2.432>
2. Al Hakim, Y. R., Sigita, D. S., & Irfan, M. (2022). Leadership influence in shaping responsive organizational culture in the face of ongoing change. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 207–212. <https://jos3journals.id/index.php/jos3/article/view/144>
3. Barksdale, C. L. (2024). Campus leaders' support of culturally responsive classroom management strategies: Single exploratory case study (Doctor of Education dissertation, Abilene Christian University). Digital Commons @ ACU. <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd/738/>
4. Bradley, S., & Mahmoud, I. H. (2024). Strategies for co-creation and co-governance in urban contexts: Building trust in local communities with limited social structures. *Urban Science*, 8(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci8010009>
5. Brady, L. M., Wang, C., Griffiths, C., Yang, J., Markus, H. R., & Fryberg, S. A. (2024). A leadership-level culture cycle intervention changes teachers' culturally inclusive beliefs and practices. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 121(25), e2322872121. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2322872121>
6. Brown, M., Altrichter, H., Sánchez, L., et al. (2021). Challenges and opportunities for culturally responsive leadership in schools: Evidence from four European countries. *Education*, 20(5). <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103211040909>
7. Cano, L. J. (2022). Improving leadership and teaching: An action research study's implementation of coaching and data processes within the PLC framework for highly effective culturally responsive English learner practices (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University). TTU DSpace.
8. Chang, D., Chen, X., Bai, Y., & Dong, Z. (2025). Soundscape co-governance for a healthy megacity. *npj Urban Sustainability*, 5, Article 30. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42949-025-00030-0>
9. Chunoo, V. S., & Devies, B. (2024). Culturally relevant leadership learning in action: Applying CRLI to curriculum development and program design. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 2023(180), 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yl.20582>

10. Dey, A. (2022, June). Culturally responsive leadership: A framework to merge Eastern and Western educational philosophies in an era of increasing globalization.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374553353_Culturally_Responsive_Leadership_A_Framework_to_Merge_Eastern_and_Western_Educational_Philosophies_in_an_Era_of_Increasing_Globalization
11. Di Tommaso, L., Daldanise, G., & Cerreta, M. (2024). A co-governance process for the adaptive reuse of cultural heritage: The experience of St. Michael Cloister in Anacapri. In Computational Science and Its Applications – ICCSA 2024 Workshops (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 14824, pp. 236–252).
12. Fathurrochman, I., Asnawan, Monita, D., & Hasan, M. F. (2025). Integration of local wisdom in elementary school local content curriculum: A study in rural areas of Indonesia. The Curriculum Journal. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.70029>
13. Ford, J., & Waters, S. (2025). Samqwan—Water: Revitalizing our relationship through Indigenous co-governance. PLOS Water, 4(2), e0000346. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pwat.0000346>
14. Genao, S. (2021). Doing it for culturally responsive school leadership: Utilizing reflexivity from preparation to practice. Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 16(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/19427751211002226>
15. Geromo, J. T., Trinidad, A. E., Gomez, B. S., & Gelicania, P. L. (2026). Indigenous education in Davao del Sur: An analysis of implementation, practices, challenges, and opportunities. Journal of Indigenous Practices, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.821>
16. Grooms, A. A., White, T., Peters, A. L., Childs, J., Farrell, C., & Martinez, E., Jr. (2024). Equity as a crucial component of leadership preparation and practice. The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 97(1), 8–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2023.2286373>
17. Guvhu, R., Zishiri, T., Tsokota, T., & Kusakara, R. (2025). The influence of pedagogical leadership on employee performance in a Zimbabwean university context. In Proceedings of the Botho University International Research Conference (BUIRC 2025). Atlantis Press.
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-906-3_8
18. Highfield, C., Webber, M., & Woods, R. (2024). Culturally responsive middle leadership for equitable student outcomes. Education Sciences
19. Highfield, C., Webber, M., & Woods, R. (2024). Teacher and middle leader perceptions of culturally responsive middle leadership practices and their ability to meet the needs of Māori students in New Zealand secondary schools. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 59, 503–518.
20. Hines, M. T. (2022). The development of culturally responsive leadership scale. Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 26(5), 1–10.
21. Indar, T., & Byrd, M. (2024). Leading with cultural responsive: A systematic review of the literature. Qualitative Inquiry in Education Theory & Practice, 2(2), 166–196. <https://doi.org/10.59455/qietp.24>
22. Indar, T., & Byrd, M. (2024). Leading with cultural responsive: A systematic review of the literature. Qualitative Inquiry in Education Theory & Practice, 2(2), 166–196. <https://doi.org/10.59455/qietp.24>
23. Jones, C. (2023). Co-governance and the case for shared decision making. Policy Quarterly, 19(2).
<https://doi.org/10.26686/pq.v19i2.8231>

24. Jordan, A., Dockens, A. L., Pierson, N. A., & Ren, X. (2025). Editorial: AI's impact on higher education: Transforming research, teaching, and learning. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, 1682901. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1682901>
25. Kachali, R. N., & Loos, J. (2025). Unveiling disparities between planned and perceived equity arrangements in protected area co-governance: Evidence from the North Luangwa Ecosystem in Zambia. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 169, 104068. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2025.104068>
26. Li, S., Liu, Z., & Ye, C. (2022). Community renewal under multi-stakeholder co-governance: A case study of Shanghai's inner city. *Sustainability*, 14(9), 5491. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095491>
27. Lin, Z. (2025). From co-design to co-governance: The role of service design in supporting social governance in China. *The Design Journal*, 28(5), 1104–1114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925.2025.2540379>
28. Mahdi, M., & Hidayat, N. (2025). The philosophy of educational management: Finding a new direction for school leadership in the era of disruption. *Algebra: Jurnal Pendidikan Sosial dan Sains*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.58432/vvw3hs63>
29. Mansfield, K. C., & Lambrinou, M. (2024). Culturally responsive leadership: A critical analysis of one school district's five-year plan. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1385788. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1385788>
30. Matovu, B., Lee, M.-A., Mammel, M., Lukumbagire, I., Lutalo, B., Mwangi, A. R., Mwabvu, B., Mim, T. A., Bbira, Y., Lubega, Y., & Muhoozi, Y. (2024). Mobilizing evidence-based knowledge for sustainable wetlands co-management and co-governance amidst increasing anthropogenic and environmental stressors: Key lessons from Mityana District, Uganda. *Environmental Challenges*, 17, 101014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envc.2024.101014>
31. Purnomo, Y. J., Siminto, & Ausat, A. M. A. (2024). The role of value-based leadership in shaping an organizational culture that supports sustainable change. *ADMAN: Journal of Contemporary Administration and Management*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.61100/adman.v2i1.165>
32. Rückle, K., & Vasseur, L. (2025). Exploring the community and ecosystem co-governance approach in the UNESCO Niagara Escarpment Biosphere Reserve. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 119, 103816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2025.103816>
33. Saani, A.-J. (2024). Sociology of education: Exploration of stakeholders experiences of inclusive education in schools. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 12(3), 351–372. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1453833>
34. Shen, Y., Tan, R., & Zhang, S. (2025). Co-creation, co-construction, and co-governance in community renewal: A case study of civic participation and sustainable mechanisms. *Land*, 14(8), 1577. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land14081577>
35. Susilo, S., Darmawan, I. G. N., Sungginwati, D., Arifin, S., Nisyah, K., & Mudiawati, R. C. (2025). The understanding of culturally responsive pedagogy among high school students and teachers in East Kalimantan. *Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.46843/jiecr.v6i2.2187>
36. Thompson-Slappy, S. (2024). Urban principals' leadership practices needed to implement culturally responsive curricula and instruction (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). ScholarWorks @ Walden University. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=17518&context=dissertations>

37. Walrond, H. (2022). Culturally relevant leadership and emancipatory leadership: Linking Black education and social justice struggles going forward. *Voices in Urban Education (VUE)*.
<https://doi.org/10.33682/6ede-yp8e>
38. Wang, F., Khodarahmi, N., & Nguyen, H.-T. H. (2023). Culturally responsive leadership: A critical review of literature. In *Handbook of global leadership and followership* (pp. 567–583). Springer.
39. Xie, W., Chu, Z., & Li, L. (2025). How rituals can contribute to co-governance: Evidence from the reconstruction of water pipes of old housing estates in Shanghai. *Systems*, 13(10), 860.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/systems13100860>
40. Zhao, N., He, S., Wang, S., & [additional authors]. (2024). Conflict-mediation, consensus-building, and co-production: Three models of co-governance in China's neighborhood regeneration. *Transactions in Planning and Urban Research*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/27541223241293407>