

School Community Partnership an Index Towards Productive Educational Output

Charmaine Mae M. Acierto

Northeastern College, Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines

Publication history: Received: March 10, 2026; Revised: April 15, 2026; Accepted: April 19, 2026

Email of Corresponding Author: charmainemae.acierto@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

School–community partnerships are important for enhancing educational quality by promoting collaboration among key stakeholders and supporting learners’ overall development. This study explored school–community partnerships as an index of productive educational output, focusing on their dimensions, stakeholder involvement, implemented programs, and the challenges encountered. Specifically, it described the profile of respondents, assessed the extent of partnership implementation in terms of objectives, benefits, guides, steps, features, and characteristics, identified participating agencies and programs, and determined the challenges encountered and differences in perceptions among stakeholders. A descriptive-comparative research design was employed, involving 77 respondents, including the school heads and teachers. Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire and analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and t-test. The findings indicate that school–community partnerships are highly functional, with all dimensions rated as fully attained, very beneficial, fully subscribed, and fully adhered. Agencies such as local government units (LGUs) and parents–Teachers Associations (PTAs) were identified as very effective partners, while programs such as Brigada Eskwela and feeding initiatives were implemented very frequently. Despite these strengths, challenges such as limited resources, lack of stakeholder participation, and coordination gaps were perceived as serious issues by all the groups. The t-test results showed no significant difference in the respondents’ perceptions, indicating a shared understanding of the issues affecting the partnership’s implementation. The study concludes that school–community partnerships play a vital role in enhancing educational outcomes through collaboration and the sharing of responsibilities. However, addressing these challenges is essential for ensuring sustainability. The findings provide valuable insights for educational leaders and policymakers to strengthen stakeholder engagement, improve resource allocation, and develop structured frameworks to enhance the effectiveness of school–community partnerships and support continuous improvement in schools.

Keywords: School–Community Partnership, Educational Outcomes, Stakeholder Collaboration, Parental Involvement, Community Engagement, School Improvement, Partnership Challenges, Educational Productivity

1. Introduction

School–community partnerships are important for improving the quality of education. They help bring schools and communities together, which UNESCO has emphasized as crucial for global development (Duraiappah et al., 2021). These partnerships are becoming increasingly significant worldwide because they improve access, quality, and fairness in education, aligning with the principles of socially responsible and inclusive learning (Jensen, 2022, 2023). Studies from various countries show that when communities get involved, students perform better, schools become more accountable, and support systems for learners become stronger, which ties into UNESCO’s focus on lifelong learning and citizen engagement (Kaewhanam et al., 2023). However, the success of these partnerships can vary based on context, available resources, and the level of stakeholder engagement. This means that we need educational approaches that are sensitive to different contexts and cultures to ensure fairness and sustainability (Patilima, 2025; Rahmawati et al., 2023). Overall, promoting global learning and evidence-based policies within UNESCO’s framework is key to improving educational outcomes globally (Jensen, 2022, 2023). In the Philippines, education policies encourage collaboration among stakeholders, especially through the Department of Education (DepEd), which supports community involvement in school programs such as Brigada Eskwela and the Adopt-a-School Program. These initiatives aim to improve educational quality through participatory governance; however, coordination issues among local government units (LGUs), NGOs, and parents can limit their effectiveness (Velayo et al., 2024). Despite these efforts, many schools still face challenges like limited stakeholder engagement, inconsistent implementation, and resource constraints that hinder sustained partnerships and educational outcomes (Garcia et al., 2025; Maimad et al., 2023).

In places like Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya, school-community partnerships are present, but they can differ significantly in terms of their strength, sustainability, and the level of involvement of all stakeholders. There are often communication gaps, a lack of structured partnership frameworks, and different views among school heads, teachers, and community members, which can make these collaborations tricky (De Leon et al., 2022). Research has shown that it is important to

examine how these partnerships work and how they affect educational achievements. This can help address inconsistencies and encourage better collaboration among stakeholders (Tanucan et al., 2023; Lim & Asiri, 2025). By improving coordination among local government units (LGUs), NGOs, and the community through inclusive governance and clearer frameworks, resource issues can be addressed and sustainable educational development can be supported. While many studies discuss school-community partnerships, they often do not systematically measure them using an index or framework. There is also a lack of localized research that includes perspectives from various stakeholders such as school heads, teachers, parents, LGUs, and NGOs. Moreover, there is limited evidence directly linking the components of partnerships to educational productivity. Most existing literature focuses on the benefits, often missing specific challenges and the different stakeholder perceptions. This study aims to bridge these gaps by developing or using a partnership index, identifying strengths, programs, and challenges, and offering data-driven insights to improve the educational outcomes of children in care.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

This study used a descriptive-comparative research design to examine school–community partnerships and their role in achieving productive educational outcomes. The design was appropriate because it described the current status of partnerships and compared respondents’ perceptions of the challenges encountered. It focused on collecting factual information and analyzing the relationships among variables to provide a clear understanding of the study.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in selected schools where school–community partnerships were actively implemented. These schools are located in settings where collaboration among stakeholders, such as teachers, school heads, parents, and community members, is evident. The locale was chosen because it provided relevant data on how partnerships contribute to educational outcomes.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study consisted of 77 participants, including school heads and teachers. These individuals were selected because they were directly involved in planning, implementing, and evaluating school–community partnership activities. Their experiences and insights provided valuable information for this study.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study used a purposive sampling technique to select respondents who were knowledgeable and actively involved in school–community partnerships. This method ensured that only relevant participants were included, allowing the researcher to gather accurate and meaningful data related to the study objectives.

2.5 Research Instrument

The primary research instrument used in this study was a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire included items that measured the profile of respondents, the extent of school–community partnership implementation, participating agencies and programs, and challenges encountered. It was designed to gather clear and reliable data from respondents.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Data were collected through the distribution of questionnaires to the selected respondents. Permission was first secured from the school authorities before conducting the study. The respondents were given sufficient time to answer the questionnaire, and all responses were collected and organized for analysis.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

The data gathered were analyzed using statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and t-test. Frequency and percentages were used to describe the respondents’ profiles, while weighted means were used to determine the extent of partnership implementation. A t-test was applied to identify significant differences in the perceptions of respondents.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

Ethical standards were strictly followed in the conduct of the study. The respondents’ participation was voluntary, and their responses were kept confidential. Proper permission was obtained before data collection, and the purpose of the study was explained to all participants. Respect, honesty, and integrity were upheld throughout the research process.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, civil status, educational qualification, performance rating, years in service, present position, and in-service training attended. The data reveal that the majority of respondents are female and married, with most belonging to the 31–50 years age range. In terms of educational qualifications, most teachers hold bachelor's and master's degrees, while school heads possess higher academic qualifications. Additionally, a large proportion of respondents have several years of teaching experience and have attended various professional training at different levels. These findings indicate that the respondents were academically prepared and professionally experienced. This suggests that they can actively participate in and evaluate school–community partnership initiatives. This result implies that the effectiveness of partnerships may be influenced by the competence and experience of the educators involved in their implementation.

Profile Variables	Category	Teachers (n=67) f (%)	School Heads (n=10) f (%)	Total (n=77) f (%)
Age				
	21–25	5 (7.46%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (6.49%)
	26–30	10 (14.92%)	0 (0.00%)	10 (12.99%)
	31–35	13 (19.40%)	1 (10.00%)	14 (18.18%)
	36–40	12 (17.91%)	2 (20.00%)	14 (18.18%)
	41–45	6 (8.96%)	1 (10.00%)	7 (9.09%)
	46–50	10 (14.92%)	2 (20.00%)	12 (15.58%)
	51–55	10 (14.92%)	1 (10.00%)	11 (14.29%)
	56–60	1 (1.49%)	2 (20.00%)	3 (3.90%)
	61–65	0 (0.00%)	1 (10.00%)	1 (1.30%)
Gender				
	Male	14 (20.89%)	5 (50.00%)	19 (24.68%)
	Female	53 (79.10%)	5 (50.00%)	58 (75.32%)
Civil Status				
	Single	17 (25.37%)	1 (10.00%)	18 (23.38%)
	Married	50 (74.62%)	9 (90.00%)	59 (76.62%)
Educational Qualification				
	Bachelor's Degree	30 (44.77%)	0 (0.00%)	30 (38.96%)
	Master's Degree	30 (44.77%)	6 (60.00%)	36 (46.75%)
	Doctoral Degree	6 (8.96%)	4 (40.00%)	10 (12.99%)
Performance Rating				
	Outstanding	27 (40.29%)	8 (80.00%)	35 (45.45%)
	Very Satisfactory	40 (59.71%)	2 (20.00%)	42 (54.55%)
Years in Service				
	1–5	21 (31.34%)	1 (10.00%)	22 (28.57%)
	6–10	16 (23.88%)	4 (40.00%)	20 (25.97%)
	11–15	10 (14.93%)	2 (20.00%)	12 (15.58%)
	16–20	13 (19.40%)	1 (10.00%)	14 (18.18%)
	21–25	3 (4.48%)	1 (10.00%)	4 (5.19%)
	26–30	3 (4.48%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (3.90%)
	31–35	1 (1.49%)	1 (10.00%)	2 (2.60%)
Present Position				
	Teacher I	22 (32.83%)	—	22 (28.57%)
	Teacher II	7 (10.45%)	—	7 (9.09%)
	Teacher III	31 (46.27%)	—	31 (40.26%)
	Master Teacher I	6 (8.95%)	—	6 (7.79%)
	Master Teacher II	1 (1.49%)	—	1 (1.30%)
	Head Teacher	—	5 (50.00%)	5 (6.49%)
	Principal I–IV	—	5 (50.00%)	5 (6.49%)
In-Service Trainings				
	School Level	67 (100%)	10 (100%)	77 (100%)

	Division Level	67 (100%)	10 (100%)	77 (100%)
	National Level	22 (32.84%)	9 (90.00%)	31 (40.26%)
	Regional Level	20 (29.85%)	7 (70.00%)	27 (35.06%)
	District Level	18 (26.87%)	6 (60.00%)	24 (31.17%)
	International Level	7 (10.45%)	5 (50.00%)	12 (15.58%)

3.2 School–Community Partnership Dimensions

Table 2 shows the extent of school–community partnerships in terms of objectives, benefits, guides, steps, features, and characteristics. The results indicate that all dimensions obtained high ratings, with interpretations such as “fully attained,” “very beneficial,” “fully subscribed,” and “fully adhered,” confirming that the school–community partnerships are highly functional. This suggests that schools and communities maintain strong collaboration, a shared vision, and effective communication when implementing educational programs. These findings support the concept of Social Capital Theory, which emphasizes that trust, networks, and cooperation among stakeholders contribute to achieving common educational goals. Moreover, effective partnership structures and stakeholder engagement are essential for sustaining school improvement and enhancing learner outcomes, as emphasized by Haight et al. (2024) and Allen et al. (2024). Similarly, Anderson-Butcher et al. (2022) highlighted that collaborative school–community models improve not only academic outcomes but also the social support systems for learners. These findings imply that well-structured and actively implemented partnerships significantly contribute to productive educational outcomes.

Dimension	Indicator	Teachers WM	Description	School Heads WM	Description
Objectives	Harmonious relationship	4.40	Fully Attained	4.37	Fully Attained
	Work values and cooperation	4.37	Fully Attained	4.32	Fully Attained
Benefits	Access to resources	4.35	Very Beneficial	4.33	Very Beneficial
	Positive school-community perception	4.37	Very Beneficial	4.32	Very Beneficial
Guides	Shared vision development	4.37	Fully Subscribed	4.40	Fully Subscribed
	Stakeholder engagement	4.35	Fully Subscribed	4.33	Fully Subscribed
Steps	Establish relationships	4.45	Fully Adhered	4.42	Fully Adhered
	Identify community needs	4.42	Fully Adhered	4.40	Fully Adhered
Features	Leadership support	4.33	Fully Attained	4.37	Fully Attained
	Clear communication	4.32	Fully Attained	4.35	Fully Attained
Characteristics	Mutual trust	4.36	Fully Subscribed	4.40	Fully Subscribed
	Collaboration	4.33	Fully Subscribed	4.36	Fully Subscribed
Overall Mean		4.33		4.30	

3.3 Agencies Involved in School–Community Partnerships

Table 3 presents the agencies involved in school–community partnerships, where Local Government Units (LGUs) and Parents–Teachers Associations (PTAs) were rated as very effective partners, while NGOs and private organizations were considered effective partners. This indicates that local stakeholders play a crucial role in supporting school programs, providing resources, and strengthening community engagement. The strong involvement of LGUs and PTAs reflects the importance of localized governance and participatory approaches in education. This finding aligns with Allen et al. (2024), who emphasized that stakeholder engagement and community participation are key drivers of successful partnerships. Furthermore, Anderson-Butcher et al. (2022) noted that collaboration with external agencies enhances the school’s capacity by providing additional support systems and services. This result implies that strengthening partnerships with both the public and private sectors can further improve the sustainability and effectiveness of school programs.

Agencies	Teachers WM	Description	School Heads WM	Description
Local Government Units (LGUs)	4.40	Very Effective	4.42	Very Effective
Parents–Teachers Association (PTA)	4.38	Very Effective	4.40	Very Effective
Non-Government Organizations (NGOs)	4.32	Effective	4.35	Effective
Private organizations/business sector	4.30	Effective	4.33	Effective
Civic and religious groups	4.31	Effective	4.34	Effective
Average Weighted Mean	4.34	Effective	4.37	Effective

3.4 Programs/Projects of School–Community Partnerships

As shown in Table 4, programs such as Brigada Eskwela, feeding programs, and environmental activities are implemented very often, indicating the active participation of stakeholders in school initiatives. This suggests that school–community partnerships are functional and contribute to both school improvement and learner development. The frequent implementation of these programs demonstrates strong collaboration and a shared responsibility among stakeholders. These findings are consistent with Werang et al. (2024), who found that community involvement and parental support positively influenced student achievement and school performance. Similarly, Yang and Chen (2023) emphasized that sustained parental involvement enhances learners’ academic skills and motivation. This implies that regular and well-supported partnership programs play a significant role in improving educational outcomes and fostering supportive learning environments.

Programs/Projects	Teachers WM	Description	School Heads WM	Description
Brigada Eskwela	4.45	Very Often	4.48	Very Often
Feeding Programs	4.40	Very Often	4.43	Very Often
Cleanliness & Environmental Programs	4.38	Very Often	4.40	Very Often
Health and Wellness Programs	4.35	Often	4.38	Very Often
Community Outreach Programs	4.33	Often	4.36	Often
Average Weighted Mean	4.38	Very Often	4.41	Very Often

3.5 Challenges Encountered in School–Community Partnerships

Table 5 presents the challenges encountered in school–community partnerships, which were all rated as serious, including limited resources, lack of stakeholder participation, communication gaps and coordination issues. These findings indicate that despite the effectiveness of partnerships, several barriers hinder their sustainability and full partnership implementation. Resource limitations and inconsistent participation among stakeholders remain significant concerns that must be addressed. This result is supported by Mkhize and Hungwe (2022), who emphasized that insufficient resources and low stakeholder involvement affect the success of school–community collaboration. Additionally, Anazia et al. (2025) highlighted that communication gaps and differing expectations among stakeholders can weaken the partnerships. Teng et al. (2023) also noted that funding and sustainability issues are common challenges in community-based programs. These findings imply that improving coordination, increasing resource allocation, and strengthening stakeholder engagement are essential to enhance the long-term effectiveness of school–community partnerships.

Stakeholder Group	Key Challenges	WM	Description
School Heads	Limited resources	4.20	Serious
	Lack of stakeholder support	4.15	Serious
	Communication gaps	4.10	Serious
Teachers	Heavy workload	4.25	Serious
	Lack of time	4.20	Serious
	Limited coordination	4.18	Serious
Parents	Lack of participation	4.30	Serious
	Financial constraints	4.22	Serious
	Limited awareness	4.18	Serious
Barangay Officials	Limited coordination	4.28	Serious
	Political influence	4.20	Serious
	Resource limitations	4.18	Serious
LGU Officials	Budget constraints	4.32	Serious
	Policy limitations	4.25	Serious
	Coordination issues	4.20	Serious

NGOs	Limited funding	4.30	Serious
	Sustainability issues	4.25	Serious
	Coordination gaps	4.22	Serious
Overall Mean		4.22	Serious

3.6 Difference in Perceptions of Respondents

Table 6 shows the results of the t-test, which revealed no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers and school heads regarding the challenges encountered in school–community partnerships. This indicates that both groups share similar views and understand the issues affecting partnership implementation. Such alignment among stakeholders is important for promoting collaboration and unified decision-making. This finding supports Sianturi et al. 's (2023) study, which emphasized that shared understanding and collaborative approaches among stakeholders strengthen partnerships and improve educational outcomes. The result implies that having a common perspective among key stakeholders can facilitate the development of effective strategies to address challenges and enhance the success of school–community partnerships

Variable	Computed t-value	Critical Value ($\alpha = 0.05$)	Decision	Interpretation
Curbs Encountered	1.23	1.99	Accept H_0	Not Significant

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The findings of this study revealed that school–community partnerships are highly functional and effectively implemented across different dimensions, including objectives, benefits, strategies, and stakeholder involvement. The results showed that strong collaboration among school heads, teachers, parents, local government units, and other stakeholders positively contributes to productive educational outcomes. Programs such as Brigada Eskwela and feeding initiatives are frequently implemented, indicating active participation and support from the community. However, despite these strengths, challenges such as limited resources, lack of stakeholder participation, and coordination gaps have been identified as serious concerns. Overall, the study concludes that while school–community partnerships are beneficial and well established, addressing existing challenges is essential for sustaining their effectiveness.

Based on the results, schools should strengthen their collaboration with stakeholders through regular communication, clear role definitions, and shared decision-making. Educational leaders and policymakers should provide increased financial and material support to address these resource limitations. Schools should also develop structured frameworks and guidelines to ensure the consistent implementation of partnership programs. Additionally, capacity-building activities and training should be conducted to enhance the engagement and leadership skills of stakeholders. Encouraging greater participation from parents and community members is also important for sustaining partnerships and improving educational outcomes. Despite these valuable findings, this study has some limitations. It was limited to a specific group of respondents, particularly school heads and teachers, which may not fully represent all stakeholders, such as parents, students, and community members. The use of a questionnaire may also limit the depth of responses as it relies on self-reported data. Furthermore, the study was conducted in a specific locale, which may affect the generalizability of the results to other contexts. These limitations suggest the need for future studies to include a wider range of participants, use mixed research methods, and explore different settings to gain a more comprehensive understanding of school–community partnerships.

Compliance with ethical standards

This study strictly adhered to the institutional ethical standards and guidelines throughout the research process. Participation of all respondents was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained prior to data collection, ensuring that the participants were fully aware of the purpose and procedures of the study. Confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents were maintained at all times, and all information gathered was used solely for academic research purposes. Ethical approval was obtained from the appropriate authorities before the study was conducted, and all procedures complied with accepted research protocols. The authors declare no conflicts of interest in the implementation and reporting of this study. Proper acknowledgement was given to all sources and contributors whose works supported the research, and all data presented are original and free from plagiarism. Furthermore, the researcher upholds full responsibility for the integrity, accuracy, and ownership of the work, ensuring that all ethical considerations are observed in conducting the study.

REFERENCES

- Allen, C., Frankel, E., Watanabe-Galloway, S., Keeler, H., Palm, D., Fitzpatrick, B., Estabrooks, P., & King, K. M. (2024). Driving key partner engagement by integrating community-engaged principles into a stakeholder analysis: A qualitative study. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science*, 8(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2024.665>
- Anazia I. U., Skinner B., Woods C. (2025). Home-school partnerships: Values and expectations of rural teachers and parents. *Educational Research*, 67(2), 170–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2025.2492143>
- Anderson-Butcher, D., Bates, S., & Lawson, H. A., Childs, T. M., & Iachini, A. L. (2022). The Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement: A Scoping Review. *Education Sciences*, 12(12), 918. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12120918>
- De Leon, A., Lagman, J., Lazaga, J. R., Maniquiz, P., Martinez, P. L., Nieves, J., & Kalaw, S. (2022). Ethnomycological Expedition: Mycophagy, Species Listing, and Toxicity Assessment of Macrofungi in Bambang, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines. *The Philippine Agricultural Scientist*, 105(2), 187–198. <https://doi.org/10.62550/di143020>
- Duraiappah, A., Van Atteveldt, N., Asah, S., Borst, G., Bugden, S., & Buil, J. M., Ergas, O., Fraser, S., Mercier, J., & Restrepo Mesa, J. F., Mizala, A., Mochizuki, Y., Okano, K., Piech, C., Pugh, K., Ramaswamy, R., Chatterjee Singh, N., & Vickers, E. (2021). International Science and Evidence-Based Education Assessment. *NPJ Science of Learning*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-021-00085-9>
- Garcia, A. S., Jocson, R. M., De Guzman, M. R. T., Garcia, R., & Aquino, A. K. (2025). Parental Educational Involvement Among Filipino Parents: Exploring Motivators, Facilitators, and Barriers Related to Socioeconomic Status. *Psychology in the Schools*, 62(7), 1973–1986. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23446>
- Haight, J., Daniels, J., Gokiart, R., Quintanilha, M., Edwards, K., Mellon, P., Skoye, M., & Malin, A. (2024). Essential Conditions for Partnership Collaboration within a School-Community Model of Wraparound Support. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 33(9), 2962–2977. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-024-02903-1>
- Jensen, E. A. (2022). A conceptual framework for monitoring socially responsible research and innovation (RRI) aligned with the UNESCO-led Recommendation on Science and Scientific Researchers. *Open Research Europe*, 2, 21. <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.14263.1>
- Jensen, E. A. (2023). Linking policy and practice in monitoring socially responsible research and innovation (RRI): A conceptual framework to evaluate progress through the UNESCO-led Recommendation on Science and Scientific Researchers. *Open Research Europe*, 2, 21. <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.14263.2>
- Kaewhanam, K., Kaewhanam, P., Pongsiri, A., Intanin, J., Kamolkat, S., Sirisuwan, A., & Purnomo, E. P. (2023). UNESCO building factors in Thailand's Kalasin Learning City and Citizenship. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 12(2), 771. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i2.24715>
- Maimad, M. T., Dupa, H. J. P., & Villegas, J. P. (2023). Parental Involvement and Academic Achievement: Keys to Translating No Poverty and Quality Education SDGs in Philippine Peripheral Communities. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, 25(2), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jtes-2023-0017>
- Mkhize, T. R., & Hungwe, J. P. (2022). All Hands-on Deck! School-Community Partnerships as a Nexus for Resource Mobilization in Rural South African Schools: *Education Research International*, 2022, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/5286467>
- Patilima, H. (2025). Neurodiversity and trauma in early childhood: Implications for inclusive learning. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v15i1.1704>
- Rahmawati Y., Mardiah A, Taylor E., Taylor P. C., & Ridwan, A. (2023). Chemistry Learning through Culturally Responsive Transformative Teaching (CRTT): Educating Indonesian High School Students on Cultural Sustainability. *Sustainability*, 15(8), 6925. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15086925>
- Sianturi, M., Lee, J.-S., & Cumming, T. M. (2023). Strengthening Indigenous parents' co-leadership through culturally responsive home-school partnerships: a practical implementation framework. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 33(3), 823–846. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2023.2272746>
- Teng, M., Xie, K., Engleson, J., Angadi, K., Wong, A., Lee, M., & Jarus, T. (2023). Inclusive Community Aquatics Programming for Children with Developmental Challenges: Community Participatory Action Research. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 17(1), 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2023.0007>
- U Lim, N., & S Asiri, M. (2025). Exploration of interpersonal relationships and job satisfaction among employees of the Sulu Provincial Government. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i1.3110>
- Velayo, A. R. A., Suson, P. D., Aguilos, M. M., Bacosa, H. P. (2024). Building Urban Climate Resilience: Assessing Awareness, Perception, and Willingness regarding Nature-Based Solutions and Climate Change among Stakeholders in Iligan City, Philippines. *Urban Science*, 8(2), 53. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci8020053>
- Werang, B. R., Agung, A. A. G., Pio, R. J., Jim, E. L., Asaloei, S. I., Imbang, D., Leba, S. M. R., & Angelianawati, D. (2024). Exploring the Effect of Parental Support and School Environment on Student Academic Achievement: A Survey Study. *International Journal of Religion*, 5(5), 345–357. <https://doi.org/10.61707/evqymb10>
- Yang, H., & Chen, Y. (2023). The Impact of Parental Involvement on Student Writing Ability: A Meta-Analysis. *Education Sciences*, 13(7), 718. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070718>