

BEED Stakeholders' Awareness and Acceptance of DOrSU's Vision, Mission, and Program Educational Objectives

12
13
14
15

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the level of awareness and acceptance of Davao Oriental State University's (DOrSU) Vision, Mission, and Program Educational Objectives (VMPEO) among stakeholders of the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) program. The research respondents comprised 299 stakeholders—including students, faculty, non-teaching staff, alumni, parents, and industry representatives. Utilizing a quantitative descriptive-correlational design, data were collected through a validated 30-item survey questionnaire distributed in printed and online formats. The study employed frequency, mean, independent sample t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlation as statistical tools for analysis. Findings revealed stakeholders exhibited high levels of awareness and complete acceptance of DOrSU's VMPEO. However, significant differences emerged when stakeholders were grouped by category, age, and educational attainment, with parents demonstrating notably lower levels of awareness and acceptance. Additionally, a significant positive relationship was observed between awareness and acceptance, indicating increased awareness was associated with increased stakeholder acceptance.

16
17
18

Keywords: stakeholder awareness, stakeholder acceptance, VMPEO, BEED, DOrSU

19
20

1. INTRODUCTION

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

The vision, mission, and Program Educational Objectives (PEOs) were fundamental strategic tools that defined the direction, purpose, and long-term goals of higher education institutions. These elements were essential for aligning institutional objectives with societal needs and national priorities (Senge, 2015). At Davao Oriental State University (DOrSU), the vision and mission articulated its goals of fostering quality education, promoting research, and engaging in meaningful community partnerships. Similarly, the university's Program Educational Objectives (PEOs) established pathways for its graduates to acquire the necessary skills, knowledge, and values required for personal and professional success while contributing to national and local development goals (Brewster et al., 2017).

The importance of the VMPEO (vision, mission, and program educational objectives) provided institutional clarity and strategic guidance, ensuring all programs and operations were aligned with overarching institutional objectives. These guiding statements were central to strategic decision-making, governance, leadership, and the successful implementation of the institution's academic and professional goals. Despite the strategic significance of

35 DOrSU's vision, mission, and Program Educational Objectives (PEOs), there was evidence
36 suggesting a gap in awareness and acceptance among key institutional stakeholders—
37 specifically, BEED students and faculty members. Challenges such as strategic
38 communication gaps, ineffective dissemination, and limited stakeholder engagement
39 hindered understanding and alignment with DOrSU's goals.
40

41 **2. OBJECTIVES**

42
43 The researchers aim to ascertain the awareness and acceptance of Davao Oriental
44 State University's Vision, Mission, and Graduate Outcomes among BEED stakeholders. As
45 such, the objectives of this study are the following:
46

- 47 1. Determine the demographic and contextual profile among BEED stakeholders.
- 48 2. Assess the level of awareness of DOrSU's vision, mission, and Program Educational
49 Objectives (PEO) among BEED stakeholders
- 50 3. Evaluate the level of acceptance of DORSU's vision, mission, and Program
51 Educational Objectives (PEO) among BEED stakeholders.
- 52 4. Examine the significant differences in the levels of awareness of DOrSU's vision,
53 mission, and PEO across BEED stakeholders when grouped according to:
54 a. stakeholder category;
55 b. age;
56 c. sex; and
57 d. educational attainment.
- 58 5. Determine the significant difference in the levels of acceptance of DOrSU's vision,
59 mission, and PEOs across BEED stakeholders when grouped according to:
60 a. stakeholder category;
61 b. age;
62 c. sex; and
63 d. educational attainment.
- 64 6. Investigate the relationship between the level of awareness and the level of
65 acceptance of DOrSU's vision, mission, and Program Educational Objectives (PEO)
66 among BEED stakeholders.
67

68 **3. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

69 **Research Design**

70
71
72 The study employed a quantitative approach utilizing a descriptive-comparative
73 correlational survey research design. This design effectively described the relationship
74 among multiple variables without establishing direct causality, aligning with the objectives to
75 quantify the awareness and acceptance of the university's Vision, Mission, and Graduate
76 Outcomes among stakeholders of the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) program.
77 The use of this design allowed for an exploration of how various factors co-occurred,
78 providing a comprehensive understanding of stakeholder perceptions.
79

80 **Research Instrument**

81
82 Data were collected using a researcher-made 30-item survey questionnaire. The
83 instrument underwent validation through factor analysis (KMO = 0.744; Bartlett's Test of
84 Sphericity, $\chi^2 = 987.835$, $p < 0.001$) and demonstrated high reliability (Cronbach's Alpha =
85 0.909). Respondents rated their responses using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from
86 "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."
87

88 **Respondents of the Study**

89

90 A total of 299 BEED stakeholders participated in the study. The sample included 97
 91 students (32.4%), 67 parents (22.4%), 11 alumni (3.7%), 101 industry partners (33.8%), 12
 92 faculty members (4.0%), and 11 non-teaching staff (3.7%). A purposive sampling technique
 93 was used, and complete enumeration was applied for non-teaching staff.

94

95 **Data Gathering**

96

97 The data gathering procedure began with the researcher securing ethical clearance
 98 from the University Research Ethics Board to ensure compliance with institutional and
 99 ethical standards. The research team then identified key stakeholders, including faculty
 100 members, non-teaching staff, students, parents, alumni, and industry partners.

101 Formal permission was sought from the Registrar’s Office to access a verified list of
 102 BEED stakeholders for the 2024–2025 academic year. Researchers identified parents
 103 through student communication. Alumni and industry partners were identified using
 104 purposive sampling, coordinated with the Alumni Office and faculty members.

105 Participants received information about the study and gave written informed
 106 consent. Printed surveys were distributed on campus for faculty, staff, and students, and
 107 delivered to local stakeholders. For alumni outside the area, surveys were administered
 108 online via Google Forms through alumni office coordination.

109

110 **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

111

112 The analysis of the stakeholders’ responses revealed important insights into the
 113 levels of awareness and acceptance of DOrSU’s Vision, Mission, and Program Educational
 114 Objectives (VMPEO) across stakeholder categories and demographic profiles.

115

116 **Levels of Awareness and Acceptance**

117 Stakeholders showed high awareness and strong acceptance of the VMPEO.
 118 Faculty and students had the highest mean ratings, while parents consistently recorded the
 119 lowest.

120

121 Table 1: Summary of Mean Scores of Awareness and Acceptance of VMPEO per
 122 Stakeholder Category

Stakeholder	Awareness (Mean)	Acceptance (Mean)
Faculty	4.75	4.83
Students	4.70	4.81
Industry Partners	4.60	4.70
Non-Teaching Staff	4.57	4.68

123

124 These results suggest that those more engaged in university operations (faculty,
 125 students) are more familiar with and supportive of the institution's strategic vision. The
 126 relatively lower scores from parents point to gaps in outreach and communication.

127

128 **Differences by Sex**

129 An independent samples t-test revealed no significant difference in the acceptance
 130 of VMPEO between male and female respondents ($P = .95$), indicating that sex does not
 131 influence stakeholders’ acceptance levels.

132 Table 2: Difference in Acceptance of VMPEO According to Sex

T	Df	P-value	Mean Difference
0.059	297	.95	-0.003

133

134

Differences by Age

135

One-way ANOVA indicated significant differences in acceptance based on age (F = 4.51, P = .001). Post hoc tests showed that stakeholders aged 21–30 had significantly higher acceptance than those aged 41–50 and older.

136

137

138

139

Table 3: ANOVA – Acceptance of VMPEO by Age Group

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	3.774	5	0.755	4.510	.001
Within Groups	49.038	293	0.167		
Total	52.812	298			

140

141

This suggests that younger stakeholders are more engaged or have more recent exposure to VMPEO initiatives.

142

143

144

Differences by Educational Attainment

145

Awareness and acceptance varied significantly by educational attainment (P = .000). Respondents with college and graduate-level education scored significantly higher compared to those with high school education.

146

147

148

149

Table 4: Post Hoc Analysis – Acceptance by Educational Attainment

Group (I vs. J)	Mean Diff.	P-value	Interpretation
High School vs. College	-0.38	.000	Significant difference
High School vs. Graduate	-0.44	.000	Significant difference
High School vs. Elementary	~0.02	1.000	No significant difference

150

151

This confirms that education enhances stakeholders’ ability to understand and align with institutional goals.

152

153

154

Differences by Stakeholder Category

155

There was a statistically significant difference in acceptance based on stakeholder category (P = .000). Parents showed significantly lower acceptance compared to faculty (P = .004), students (P < .001), and industry partners (P < .001).

156

157

158

159

Table 5: Post Hoc Comparison – Acceptance by Stakeholder Category

Group (I vs. J)	Mean Diff.	P-value	Interpretation
Parent vs. Student	- 0.40	.000	Significant difference
Parent vs. Faculty	-0.45	.004	Significant difference
Parent vs. Alumni	-0.25	.383	No significant difference

160 These results reflect differences in stakeholder engagement. Those closer to daily
 161 university operations are more accepting of the VMPEO.

162

163 **Correlation Between Awareness and Acceptance**

164 Pearson correlation analysis indicated a strong positive correlation between
 165 awareness and acceptance ($r = .874$, $P = .000$). This means that as awareness increases,
 166 so does acceptance.

167

168 Table 6: Pearson Correlation Between Awareness and Acceptance

	Awareness	Acceptance
Awareness	1.000	.874
Acceptance	.874	1.000
P-value		.000

169

170 The high correlation ($r = .874$) underscores the importance of increasing stakeholder
 171 familiarity with DOrSU's VMPEO as a strategy to boost acceptance.

172

173 **5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

174

175 **Conclusion**

176

177 Based on the findings and statistical results of the study, the following conclusions were
 178 drawn:

179

- 180 1. The demographic profile of the respondents was thoroughly examined in terms of
 181 stakeholder category, age, sex, and educational attainment, with respondents
 182 including industry partners, students, parents, faculty, alumni, and non-teaching
 183 staff, where industry partners comprised the largest group and parents the smallest.
- 184 2. The study found that the level of awareness of DOrSU's Vision, Mission, and
 185 Program Educational Objectives (PEO) was generally high among BEED
 186 stakeholders, with faculty and students exhibiting the highest levels, whereas
 187 parents showed comparatively lower awareness, and overall, stakeholders were
 188 fully aware of the university's goals, particularly its commitment to institutional
 189 excellence and educational quality.
- 190 3. In terms of acceptance, most BEED stakeholders demonstrated full acceptance of
 191 DOrSU's Vision, Mission, and Program Educational Objectives, with faculty and
 192 students showing the highest levels of full acceptance, while parents exhibited lower
 193 levels compared to other groups, and this highlighted a gap in engagement and
 194 alignment that could be addressed through targeted strategies.
- 195 4. Significant differences in the level of awareness of DOrSU's VMPEO were observed
 196 when BEED stakeholders were grouped by stakeholder category, age, sex, and
 197 educational attainment, with parents exhibiting lower awareness compared to
 198 faculty, students, and industry partners.

198

199 **Recommendation**

200

- 201 1. Although alumni participation in the survey was relatively low, their responses
 202 indicated consistent support for the goals; to enhance future engagement,
 203 administrators can implement tracking strategies and establish a dedicated
 204 database to communicate regularly through an online platform such as social media.
- 205 2. In response to the high but varied awareness of DOrSU's VMPEO among BEED
 206 stakeholders, the university should sustain campaigns, institutionalize orientations,

- 207 incorporate VMPEO discussions into classes, and display key statements to ensure
208 stakeholders internalize its significance academically and non-academically.
- 209 3. Regarding VMPEO acceptance, which was generally positive but uneven across
210 categories, the university can offer reflective opportunities like workshops,
211 integration programs, and school events, helping stakeholders feel they are
212 contributing to the university's mission and support it meaningfully.
- 213 4. The study revealed awareness differences based on stakeholder category, age, sex,
214 and education; the university may offer targeted sessions like parent-alumni
215 orientations and student-based activities, ensuring all groups can engage with
216 institutional goals, regardless of background, using customized approaches.
- 217 5. Considering significant acceptance differences among demographic groups,
218 targeted efforts like community narratives, success stories, and inclusion in planning
219 can build stronger alignment, especially among parents and those with lower
220 educational attainment, clarifying the VMPEO's relevance and promoting
221 stakeholder ownership.
- 222 6. Given the identified gap between VMPEO awareness and acceptance, the university
223 is encouraged to implement annual surveys, FGDs, or feedback tools to monitor
224 improvement areas, ultimately building increased acceptance across all groups for a
225 purpose-driven academic community.

226 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

227
228
229 First and foremost, we offer our deepest thanks to God, whose grace and guidance
230 gave us the strength, patience, and determination to complete this research journey. In
231 every step, we felt His presence sustaining us. We are profoundly grateful to our families for
232 their unconditional love, moral support, and understanding. Their belief in us never wavered,
233 and their financial support made it possible for us to accomplish the work we set out to do.
234 For every sacrifice they made along the way, we are truly thankful. To our adviser, Ms.
235 Marisa Langoban, we express our sincere appreciation for her constant guidance, valuable
236 insights, and genuine concern. Her support and encouragement inspired us to keep going,
237 even in the most challenging moments. We also extend our heartfelt thanks to our panel
238 members—Ms. Mary Lovely P. Mendez, Ms. Leneth Pearl S. Pingot, and our Chairman, Mr.
239 Bryan L. Susada—for their thoughtful feedback, constructive suggestions, and
240 encouragement. Their words of guidance played a crucial role in refining and improving the
241 quality of our study. This research would not have been possible without the help, support,
242 and inspiration of all those mentioned above. To each of you, we are deeply grateful.

243 254 **REFERENCES**

- 255
256
257 1. Aguirre, D. D. (2016). *Alignment of vision, mission, goals, and outcomes (VMGO)*
258 *with university performance in the Philippines*. *International Journal of Research in*
259 *Business and Social Science*, 5(5), 19–27.

- 260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
2. Aldowah, H., Al-Samarraie, H., & Fauzy, W. M. (2019). *Educational Data Mining and Learning Analytics for 21st century higher education: A Review and Synthesis*. *Telematics and Informatics*. <https://doi:10.1016/j.tele.2019.01.007>
 3. Alhejji, H., Garavan, T., Carbery, R., O'Brien, F., & McGuire, D. (2015). *Diversity Training Programme Outcomes: A Systematic Review*. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 27(1), 95–149. <https://doi:10.1002/hrdq.21221>
 4. Almarghani, E. M., & Mijatovic, I. (2017). *Factors affecting student engagement in HEIs - it is all about good teaching*. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 22(8), 940–956. <https://doi:10.1080/13562517.2017.1319808>
 5. Anderson, R., & Lee, C. (2016). Stakeholder engagement in higher education: The role of communication in fostering alignment and support. *Journal of Higher Education Policy*, 45(2), 120-136.
 6. Ayers, D. F. (2015). *Credentialing Structures, Pedagogies, Practices, and Curriculum Goals*. *Community College Review*, 43(2), 191–214. <https://doi:10.1177/0091552115569847>
 7. Bachmann, R., Gillespie, N., & Priem, R. (2015). *Repairing Trust in Organizations and Institutions: Toward a Conceptual Framework*. *Organization Studies*, 36(9), 1123–1142. <https://doi:10.1177/0170840615599334>
 8. Bae, S., Lee, K., & Yoo, H. (2019). Age-related differences in institutional engagement and awareness. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, 42(3), 58-72.
 9. Baker, R., & Smith, J. (2019). *Strategic planning and institutional direction in higher education*. *Higher Education Review*, 45(2), 112-130.
 10. Barrick, M. R., Thurgood, G. R., Smith, T. A., & Courtright, S. H. (2015). *Collective Organizational Engagement: Linking Motivational Antecedents, Strategic Implementation, and Firm Performance*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(1), 111–135. <https://doi:10.5465/amj.2013.0227>
 11. Bhuyan, R., Bejan, R., & Jeyapal, D. (2017). *Social workers' perspectives on social justice in social work education: when mainstreaming social justice masks structural inequalities*. *Social Work Education*, 36(4), 373–390. <https://doi:10.1080/02615479.2017.1298741>
 12. Bishop, D. V. M., Snowling, M. J., Thompson, P. A., & Greenhalgh, T. (2016). *CATALISE: A Multinational and Multidisciplinary Delphi Consensus Study. Identifying Language Impairments in Children*. *PLOS ONE*, 11(7), e0158753. <https://doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0158753>
 13. Brewster, C., Chung, C., & Harris, H. (2017). *Global trends in education and graduate outcomes*. *International Journal of Educational Policy*, 9(1), 23–39.
 14. Bridgstock, R., & Jackson, D. (2019). *Strategic institutional approaches to graduate employability: navigating meanings, measurements and what really matters*. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 1–17. <https://doi:10.1080/1360080x.2019.1646378>
 15. Brown, T., & Green, P. (2019). Institutional communication and stakeholder engagement: A study of universities in Asia. *Educational Management Review*, 13(4), 224-239.
 16. Bryant, L., & Turnbull, A. (2018). Tailoring communication strategies for different demographic groups in higher education. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 31(4), 112-127.
 17. Bubb, S., & Jones, M.-A. (2020). *Learning from the COVID-19 home-schooling experience: Listening to pupils, parents/carers and teachers*. *Improving Schools*, 136548022095879. <https://doi:10.1177/1365480220958797>
 18. Bundy, J., Vogel, R. M., & Zachary, M. A. (2017). *Organization-stakeholder fit: A dynamic theory of cooperation, compromise, and conflict between an organization and its stakeholders*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(2), 476–501. <https://doi:10.1002/smj.2736>

- 313 19. Butt, A., Naaranoja, M., & Savolainen, J. (2016). *Project change stakeholder*
314 *communication. International Journal of Project Management*, 34(8), 1579–
315 1595. <https://doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.08.010>
- 316 20. Caldwell, N. D., Roehrich, J. K., & George, G. (2017). *Social Value Creation and*
317 *Relational Coordination in Public-Private Collaborations. Journal of Management*
318 *Studies*, 54(6), 906–928. <https://doi:10.1111/joms.12268>
- 319 21. Cardoso, S., Rosa, M. J., & Stensaker, B. (2015). *Why is quality in higher education*
320 *not achieved? The view of academics. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher*
321 *Education*, 41(6), 950–965. <https://doi:10.1080/02602938.2015.1052775>
- 322 22. Chan, C. K. Y., Fong, E. T. Y., Luk, L. Y. Y., & Ho, R. (2017). *A review of literature*
323 *on challenges in the development and implementation of generic competencies in*
324 *higher education curriculum. International Journal of Educational Development*, 57,
325 1–10. <https://doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017>
- 326 23. Chen, Z., Wang, J., & Li, F. (2020). Gender equality in educational engagement:
327 Examining institutional awareness among students. *Gender and Education*, 32(3),
328 279-297. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS2.1615>
- 329 24. Clemente, B. G., Clemente, R. C., Calanoga, M. C. M., Lavarias, G. M., Aquino, I.
330 P., & Bistayan, P. A. (2021). *Multisectoral awareness and acceptability of the VMGO*
331 *and meaning making of the vision and mission. Linguistics and Culture Review*,
332 5(S2), 956–973. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS2.1615>
- 333 25. Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed*
334 *methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- 335 26. Dagdag, J. D., Palapuz, N. A., Caliboso, J. C., Peru, E. I., & Mauro, R. P. (2023).
336 Stakeholders' awareness and acceptance of the vision, mission, goals, and
337 outcomes statements of a teacher education college. *International Journal of*
338 *Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 13(1).
339 <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i1.25395>
- 340 27. Davis, M., & West, D. (2016). *Visionary leadership in education: Long-term goals*
341 *and aspirations. Journal of Educational Leadership*, 34(1), 56–70.
- 342 28. Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). *The Impact of Leadership on Student*
343 *Outcomes. Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–
344 258. <https://doi:10.1177/0013161x15616863>
- 345 29. Di Maddaloni, F., & Davis, K. (2018). *Project manager's perception of the local*
346 *communities' stakeholder in megaprojects. An empirical investigation in the UK.*
347 *International Journal of Project Management*, 36(3), 542–565. [https://doi:](https://doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.11.003)
348 [10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.11.003](https://doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.11.003)
- 349 30. Dmytriiev, S. D., Freeman, R. E., & Hörisch, J. (2021). *The Relationship between*
350 *Stakeholder Theory and Corporate Social Responsibility: Differences, Similarities,*
351 *and Implications for Social Issues in Management. Journal of Management Studies*,
352 58(6), 1441–1470. <https://doi:10.1111/joms.12684>
- 353 31. Dyer, G., & Dyer, M. (2017). *Strategic leadership for sustainability by higher*
354 *education: the American College & University Presidents' Climate Commitment.*
355 *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 140, 111–116. [https://doi:](https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.077)
356 [10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.077](https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.077)
- 357 32. Dzimińska, M., Fijałkowska, J., & Sułkowski, Ł. (2018). *Trust-Based Quality Culture*
358 *Conceptual Model for Higher Education Institutions. Sustainability*, 10(8),
359 2599. <https://doi:10.3390/su10082599>
- 360 33. Evans. (2019). *Competencies and Pedagogies for Sustainability Education: A*
361 *Roadmap for Sustainability Studies Program Development in Colleges and*
362 *Universities. Sustainability*, 11(19), 5526. <https://doi:10.3390/su11195526>
- 363 34. Ferrer-Estévez, M., & Chalmeta, R. (2021). *Integrating Sustainable Development*
364 *Goals in educational institutions. The International Journal of Management*
365 *Education*, 19(2), 100494. <https://doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100494>

- 366 35. Findler, F., Schönherr, N., Lozano, R., & Stacherl, B. (2018). *Assessing the Impacts*
367 *of Higher Education Institutions on Sustainable Development—An Analysis of Tools*
368 *and Indicators. Sustainability, 11(1), 59.* <https://doi:10.3390/su11010059>
- 369 36. Fleacă, E., Fleacă, B., & Maiduc, S. (2018). *Aligning Strategy with Sustainable*
370 *Development Goals (SDGs): Process Scoping Diagram for Entrepreneurial Higher*
371 *Education Institutions (HEIs). Sustainability, 10(4),*
372 *1032.* <https://doi:10.3390/su10041032>
- 373 37. Gao, S., & Wu, L. (2019). Gender equality and its impact on educational outcomes
374 in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy, 48(1), 105-120.*
- 375 38. Garcia, S., Rogayan, D., & Gagasa, K. L. (2021). Stakeholders' Awareness and
376 Acceptability of University's Vision and Mission, and Teacher Education Program
377 Goals and Objectives in a State Institution in Central Luzon, Philippines.
378 *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research,*
379 *2(1), 17-23.* https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.02.01.03BAMR_Journal+2BAMR
380 [Journal+2EjournalUPI+2](https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.02.01.03BAMR_Journal+2EjournalUPI+2)
- 381 39. Gupta, K., Crilly, D., & Greckhamer, T. (2020). *Stakeholder Engagement Strategies,*
382 *National Institutions, And Firm Performance: A Configurational Perspective.*
383 *Strategic Management Journal.* <https://doi:10.1002/smj.3204>
- 384 40. Guthrie, K., & Thompson, T. (2021). The role of age in information retention and
385 awareness in higher education. *Journal of Educational Studies, 45(1), 18-34.*
- 386 41. Harris, J., & Schilling, L. (2019). Stakeholder alignment in higher education: The role
387 of institutional mission and values. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy,*
388 *35(2), 98-112.*
- 389 42. Hayter, C. S., & Cahoy, D. R. (2016). *Toward a strategic view of higher education*
390 *social responsibilities: A dynamic capabilities approach. Strategic Organization,*
391 *16(1), 12–34.* <https://doi:10.1177/1476127016680564>
- 392 43. Hickey, G., McGilloway, S., O'Brien, M., Leckey, Y., Devlin, M., & Donnelly, M.
393 (2018). *Strengthening stakeholder buy-in and engagement for successful*
394 *exploration and installation: A case study of the development of an area-wide,*
395 *evidence-based prevention and early intervention strategy. Children and Youth*
396 *Services Review, 91, 185–195.* <https://doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.06.008>
- 397 44. Hitt, D. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2016). *Systematic Review of Key Leader Practices*
398 *Found to Influence Student Achievement. Review of Educational Research, 86(2),*
399 *531–569.* <https://doi:10.3102/0034654315614911>
- 400 45. Huang, H., & Li, J. (2018). Gender and institutional awareness in higher education:
401 A comprehensive study. *Journal of Educational Research, 50(2), 133-148.*
- 402 46. Ikoni, J. O., Titus, M. K., Onesmus, W. G., & Julius, W. M. (2016). *Development of*
403 *Pharmacy Education in Kenya Universities to date. African Journal of Pharmacy and*
404 *Pharmacology, 10(18), 385–392.* <https://doi:10.5897/ajpp2015.4407>
- 405 47. Johnson, R., & Allen, P. (2016). Engaging stakeholders in the implementation of
406 institutional missions. *Higher Education Review, 28(3), 118-134.*
- 407 48. Joosten, Y. A., Israel, T. L., Head, A., Vaughn, Y., Villalta Gil, V., Mouton, C., &
408 Wilkins, C. H. (2018). *Enhancing translational researchers' ability to collaborate with*
409 *community stakeholders: Lessons from the Community Engagement Studio. Journal*
410 *of Clinical and Translational Science, 2(4), 201–*
411 *207.* <https://doi:10.1017/cts.2018.323>
- 412 49. Kahu, E. R., & Nelson, K. (2018). Student engagement in the educational interface:
413 Understanding the mechanisms of student success. *Higher Education Research &*
414 *Development, 37(1), 58–71.* <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1344197>
- 415 50. Kelly, M. E., Patterson, F., O'Flynn, S., Mulligan, J., & Murphy, A. W. (2018). A
416 systematic review of stakeholder views of selection methods for medical schools
417 admission. *BMC Medical Education, 18(1), 139.* [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1235-x)
418 [1235-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1235-x)

- 419 51. Kibler, A. K., & Valdés, G. (2016). *Conceptualizing Language Learners: Socioinstitutional Mechanisms and their Consequences*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 96–116. <https://doi:10.1111/modl.12310>
- 420
- 421
- 422 52. Kissell, R. E., & Trujillo, T. (2020). *Leading Towards Equity Through Decades of Reform: Oral Histories of District Politics and Community-Driven Reform in Oakland*. *Urban Education*, 004208592095490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004208592>
- 423
- 424
- 425 53. Koehler, M., & Chamberlain, J. (2017). The role of age in cognitive processing and educational exposure: Implications for institutional engagement. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(2), 291-304.
- 426
- 427
- 428 54. Laurente, M. L. (2019). Stakeholders' Awareness and Acceptability of the Leyte Normal University's Vision, Mission, Goal and Objectives. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 7(4), 108-117. <https://doi.org/10.31686/ijer.vol7.iss4>
- 429
- 430
- 431
- 432 55. Leal Filho, W., Pallant, E., Enete, A., Richter, B., & Brandli, L. L. (2018). *Planning and implementing sustainability in higher education institutions: an overview of the difficulties and potentials*. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 1–9. <https://doi:10.1080/13504509.2018.1461707>
- 433
- 434
- 435 56. Leal Filho, W., Shiel, C., & Paço, A. (2016). *Implementing and operationalising integrative approaches to sustainability in higher education: the role of project-oriented learning*. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 133, 126–135. <https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.05.079>
- 436
- 437
- 438
- 439
- 440 57. Leal Filho, W., Tripathi, S. K., Andrade Guerra, J. B. S. O. D., Giné-Garriga, R., Orlovic Lovren, V., & Willats, J. (2018). *Using the sustainable development goals towards a better understanding of sustainability challenges*. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 1–12. <https://doi:10.1080/13504509.2018.1505674>
- 441
- 442
- 443
- 444
- 445 58. Lee, M. T., & Raschke, R. L. (2020). *Innovative sustainability and stakeholders' shared understanding: The secret sauce to "performance with a purpose."* *Journal of Business Research*, 108, 20–28. <https://doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.10.020>
- 446
- 447
- 448 59. Li, X., & Kim, J. (2017). The role of student engagement in institutional knowledge: A study of higher education communities. *Journal of Educational Research*, 60(1), 45-57.
- 449
- 450
- 451 60. Masika, R., & Jones, J. (2015). *Building student belonging and engagement: insights into higher education students' experiences of participating and learning together*. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 21(2), 138–150. <https://doi:10.1080/13562517.2015.1122585>
- 452
- 453
- 454
- 455 61. McDonald, S., & Dore, R. (2020). Institutional mission and stakeholder engagement in higher education: A case study. *Educational Management Review*, 14(4), 226-242.
- 456
- 457
- 458 62. McLaughlin, T., & Marshall, J. (2015). *Institutional vision and mission awareness in higher education*. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(5), 751–766.
- 459
- 460 63. Miller, S., & Boud, D. (2016). Mission alignment and institutional success: The role of stakeholder buy-in. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 40(1), 67-81.
- 461
- 462 64. Mirtl, M., T. Borer, E., Djukic, I., Forsius, M., Haubold, H., Hugo, W., ... Haase, P. (2018). *Genesis, goals and achievements of Long-Term Ecological Research at the global scale: A critical review of ILTER and future directions*. *Science of The Total Environment*, 626, 1439–1462. <https://doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.120>
- 463
- 464
- 465 65. Moerschell, L., & Novak, S. S. (2019). *Managing crisis in a university setting: The challenge of alignment*. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. <https://doi:10.1111/1468-5973.12266>
- 466
- 467
- 468 66. Naveed Bin Rais, R., Rashid, M., Zakria, M., Hussain, S., Qadir, J., & Imran, M. A. (2021). *Employing Industrial Quality Management Systems for Quality Assurance in*
- 469
- 470

- 471 *Outcome-Based Engineering Education: A Review. Education Sciences*, 11(2),
472 45. <https://doi:10.3390/educsci11020045>
- 473 67. Nguyen, P., & Nguyen, T. (2018). The role of stakeholder acceptance in institutional
474 success in higher education. *Education and Society Journal*, 22(2), 78-95.
- 475 68. Nguyen, P., & Nguyen, T. (2019). The role of stakeholder awareness in the success
476 of university missions. *Education and Development Journal*, 15(2), 102-117.
- 477 69. Nguyen, T., & Nguyen, H. (2019). Engagement and awareness in higher education:
478 Insights from university staff and alumni. *Higher Education Review*, 25(3), 188-203.
- 479 70. Okumbe, J. A. (2015). *Educational management: Theory, practice, and pedagogy*.
480 *Pearson Education*.
- 481 71. Oliveira, L., & Figueira, Á. (2015). *Benchmarking Analysis of Social Media Strategies*
482 *in the Higher Education Sector. Procedia Computer Science*, 64, 779–
483 786. <https://doi:10.1016/j.procs.2015.08.628>
- 484 72. Painter, M., Pérezts, M., & Deslandes, G. (2020). *Understanding the human in*
485 *stakeholder theory: a phenomenological approach to affect-based learning*.
486 *Management Learning*, 52(2), 203–223. <https://doi:10.1177/1350507620978860>
- 487 73. Penuel, W. R., Riedy, R., Barber, M. S., Peurach, D. J., LeBouef, W. A., & Clark, T.
488 (2020). *Principles of Collaborative Education Research With Stakeholders: Toward*
489 *Requirements for a New Research and Development Infrastructure. Review of*
490 *Educational Research*, 003465432093812. <https://doi:10.3102/0034654320938126>
- 491 74. Pinheiro, R., Langa, P. V., & Pausits, A. (2015). *One and two equals three? The*
492 *third mission of higher education institutions. European Journal of Higher Education*,
493 5(3), 233–249. <https://doi:10.1080/21568235.2015.1044552>
- 494 75. Pizzutilo, F., & Venezia, E. (2021). *On the maturity of social responsibility and*
495 *sustainability integration in higher education institutions: Descriptive criteria and*
496 *conceptual framework. The International Journal of Management Education*, 19(3),
497 100515. <https://doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100515>
- 498 76. Pugh, G., Wilson, N., & Black, A. (2020). Reconnecting with disengaged alumni: A
499 strategy for higher education institutions. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*,
500 30(1), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2020.1712134>
- 501 77. Rabourn, K. E., & BrckaLorenz, A. (2019). Campus climate and the student
502 experience: Examining differences by student demographics. *Journal of College*
503 *Student Development*, 60(6), 695–710. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0063>
- 504 78. Ramísio, P. J., Costa Pinto, L. M., Gouveia, N., Costa, H., & Arezes, D.
505 (2019). *Sustainability Strategy in Higher Education Institutions: Lessons learned*
506 *from a nine-year case study. Journal of Cleaner Production*. [https://doi:](https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.02.257)
507 [10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.02.257](https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.02.257)
- 508 79. Ricci, M., St-Onge, C., Xiao, J., & Young, M. (2018). Students as stakeholders in
509 assessment: how students perceive the value of an assessment. *Perspectives on*
510 *Medical Education*, 7(6), 352–361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-018-0480-3>
- 511 80. Roberts, J., & Simpson, K. (2016). *A review of research into stakeholder*
512 *perspectives on inclusion of students with autism in mainstream schools*.
513 *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(10), 1084–
514 1096. <https://doi:10.1080/13603116.2016.1145267>
- 515 81. Rogers, G. D., Thistlethwaite, J. E., Anderson, E. S., Abrandt Dahlgren, M.,
516 Grymonpre, R. E., Moran, M., & Samarasekera, D. D. (2016). *International*
517 *consensus statement on the assessment of interprofessional learning outcomes*.
518 *Medical Teacher*, 39(4), 347–359. <https://doi:10.1080/0142159x.2017.1270441>
- 519 82. Salvioni, D. M., Franzoni, S., & Cassano, R. (2017). *Sustainability in the Higher*
520 *Education System: An Opportunity to Improve Quality and Image. Sustainability*,
521 9(6), 914. <https://doi:10.3390/su9060914>

- 522 83. Scandeliu, C., & Cohen, G. (2016). *Achieving collaboration with diverse*
523 *stakeholders—The role of strategic ambiguity in CSR communication. Journal of*
524 *Business Research*, 69(9), 3487–3499. [https://doi: 10.1016/j.ibusres.2016.01.037](https://doi:10.1016/j.ibusres.2016.01.037)
- 525 84. Seeber, M., Barberio, V., Huisman, J., & Mampaey, J. (2017). *Factors affecting the*
526 *content of universities' mission statements: an analysis of the United Kingdom*
527 *higher education system. Studies in Higher Education*, 1–
528 15. <https://doi:10.1080/03075079.2017.1349743>
- 529 85. Shapiro, H. B., Lee, C. H., Wyman Roth, N. E., Li, K., Çetinkaya-Rundel, M., &
530 Canelas, D. A. (2017). *Understanding the massive open online course (MOOC)*
531 *student experience: An examination of attitudes, motivations, and barriers.*
532 *Computers & Education*, 110, 35–50. [https://doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2017.03.003](https://doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2017.03.003)
- 533 86. Smith, L., Garcia, R., & Roberts, D. (2020). Exploring the link between stakeholder
534 alignment and institutional success in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*,
535 74(1), 3-20.
- 536 87. Sullivan, K., & Shaw, L. (2017). *Acceptance of institutional vision and mission: A*
537 *case study approach. Journal of Educational Planning*, 29(4), 145–158.
- 538 88. Torres, R. T., & Preskill, H. (2001). *Evaluation and Organizational Learning: Past,*
539 *Present, and Future. American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(3), 387–
540 395. <https://doi:10.1177/109821400102200316>
- 541 89. Tran, L. T., Nguyen, N. T., & Ho, L. H. (2020). Engaging alumni in university
542 development: A study of Vietnamese higher education. *Asia Pacific Education*
543 *Review*, 21(3), 441–453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-020-09638-z>
- 544 90. Van Zanten, J. A., & Van Tulder, R. (2018). *Multinational enterprises and the*
545 *Sustainable Development Goals: An institutional approach to corporate*
546 *engagement. Journal of International Business Policy.* [https://doi:10.1057/s42214-](https://doi:10.1057/s42214-018-0008-x)
547 [018-0008-x](https://doi:10.1057/s42214-018-0008-x)
- 548 91. Vargas, V. R., Lawthom, R., Prowse, A., Randles, S., & Tzoulas, K. (2018).
549 *Sustainable development stakeholder networks for organisational change in higher*
550 *education institutions: a case study from the UK. Journal of Cleaner Production.*
551 [https://doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.078](https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.078)
- 552 92. Verhulst, E., & Lambrechts, W. (2015). *Fostering the incorporation of sustainable*
553 *development in higher education. Lessons learned from a change management*
554 *perspective. Journal of Cleaner Production*, 106, 189–204. [https://doi:](https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.09.049)
555 [10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.09.049](https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.09.049)
- 556 93. Watson, R., Wilson, H. N., Smart, P., & Macdonald, E. K. (2017). *Harnessing*
557 *Difference: A Capability-Based Framework for Stakeholder Engagement in*
558 *Environmental Innovation. Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 35(2), 254–
559 279. <https://doi:10.1111/jpim.12394>
- 560 94. Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2018). *Understanding by design: Aligning educational*
561 *objectives with assessment. Educational Leadership*, 76(1), 27–34.
- 562 95. Wolff, L.-A., Sjöblom, P., Hofman-Bergholm, M., & Palmberg, I. (2017). *High*
563 *Performance Education Fails in Sustainability? —A Reflection on Finnish Primary*
564 *Teacher Education. Education Sciences*, 7(1),
565 32. <https://doi:10.3390/educsci7010032>
- 566 96. Yáñez, S., Uruburu, Á., Moreno, A., & Lumbreras, J. (2018). *The Sustainability*
567 *Report as an essential tool for the holistic and strategic vision of Higher Education*
568 *Institutions. Journal of Cleaner Production.* [https://doi:](https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.171)
569 [10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.171](https://doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.171)
- 570
- 571