OPEN ACCESS

BAMBOO NEXUS: Journal of Criminal Justice and Social Sciences (BN-JCJSS)

ISSN (Online): ISSN (Print):

Volume 1, Issue 1 (2026) | pages 10 - 20 |

Article Type	Original Research Article/Review Article/Case Report.

School Heads' Perceptions of School-Community Relations: Basis for Enhancing Partnership Programs in Kasibu West District

Robert C. Dipagan.

Graduate School, Northeastern College, Santiago City, Isabela

Corresponding Author email: robert.dipagan001@deped.gov.ph

Article History: Received: October 2026 | **Revised:** October 2026 | **Accepted:** November 2026| **Published:** November 22, 2026

ABSTRACT

School-community relations play an important role in supporting educational development, strengthening stakeholder participation, and mobilizing resources for school improvement. This research examined school heads' perceptions of school-community relations in Kasibu West District as a basis for enhancing partnership programs. Specifically, it explored the perceived importance of school-community relations, areas of community engagement, effectiveness of agency partnerships, utilization of human and material resources, administrative challenges, and strategies employed in managing school-community relationships. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, with data gathered through a survey questionnaire supplemented by an unstructured interview and analyzed using descriptive statistics and Pearson product-moment correlation. The findings revealed that school-community relations were perceived as important in supporting school development and educational management. Community engagement and agency partnerships were generally practiced at varying levels, while human and material resources were perceived as moderately effective. Challenges related to the attainment of objectives and resource utilization were generally less serious, whereas concerns involving communication, parent participation, power struggles, and differing perceptions of community involvement were more evident. The strategies employed by school heads, including home visitation, parent visitation activities, social media communication, stakeholder meetings, and facility-sharing initiatives, were generally perceived as effective. These findings emphasize the importance of strengthening collaboration, communication, resource mobilization, and stakeholder participation. An enhanced school-community partnership program is recommended to promote more systematic and sustainable collaboration among schools, parents, community members, and partner institutions.

Keywords: *Agency partnerships; community engagement; partnership programs; school-community relations; school heads*

:

INTRODUCTION

Schools are not just standalone places; they are part of a larger community network. This connection is crucial for improving how schools are run, helping them grow, supporting students, and making schools more effective overall (Maqhubela, 2025). When schools team up with families, community groups, local institutions, and various stakeholders, they can tackle a wide range of educational needs more efficiently (Maqhubela, 2025). Getting the community involved in a meaningful way helps with shared decision-making, gathers resources, boosts accountability, aids in implementing programs, and supports educational development in a way that benefits everyone (Kwaah & Nishimuko, 2023). Building strong school-community relationships relies on mutual trust, open communication, shared responsibility, cooperation, and leadership that actively encourages everyone to participate (Anderson-Butcher et al., 2022). Schools that engage with their communities are better equipped to handle educational challenges and support student development in a well-rounded way, beyond just academics (Maqhubela, 2025).

In the world of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), school-community partnerships play a significant role

in achieving SDG 4. This goal is all about ensuring that education is inclusive, fair, and high-quality, and that everyone has the chance to continue learning throughout their lives (Bhatt et al., 2026). To make these educational dreams a reality, different groups must work together. We are talking about schools, families, community groups, government bodies, and organizations all pitching in to show just how connected educational progress is (Ohta et al., 2022). In addition, these partnerships align with SDG 17, which highlights the importance of different sectors to team up and work together for sustainable development (Chai et al., 2024). By joining forces, schools and communities can share their resources, knowledge, and services to tackle educational needs effectively. This really brings home the idea that improving education is something we all need to work on together, whether we are part of an institution or the community (Hurst & Vidal, 2026).

In the Philippines, schools and communities working together are essential for running things smoothly, improving schools, and offering educational programs and services (Kwaah & Nishimuko, 2023). Schools team up with parents, local governments, community groups, and private companies to boost efficiency and help students progress (Kwaah & Nishimuko, 2023). Community involvement includes planning and executing programs, providing resources, volunteering, supporting learners, enhancing infrastructure, and actively participating in school events, all of which make the educational environment more lively (Anderson-Butcher et al., 2022). School leaders are key players here, handling communication, coordinating with stakeholders, managing partnerships, and ensuring that community support aligns with school goals (Maqhubela, 2025). The success of these partnerships depends on the commitment of everyone involved, the resources available, coordination strategies, communication practices, and leadership skills to manage different expectations effectively (Maqhubela, 2025). However, schools often face hurdles such as limited participation, scarce resources, conflicting interests, communication issues, and varying levels of awareness and commitment among participants, which can hinder effective community engagement (Kwaah & Nishimuko, 2023).

In the Kasibu West District, school-community relationships in public elementary schools are vital for addressing educational, administrative, and operational demands. School heads are responsible for fostering collaboration with community stakeholders and agencies that provide resources, services, and facilities to support educational objectives. This engagement occurs through school activities, consultations, partnerships, resource mobilization, community participation, and collaborative development. However, managing these partnerships poses challenges to school goals, resource use, stakeholder coordination, and constructive relationships. Understanding school heads' perspectives is essential to determine how partnerships are managed, how community involvement is perceived, and which areas are prioritized. It also reveals strategies for sustaining collaboration and offers insights into practices, strengths, and issues in the Kasibu West District. This examination addresses a research gap, as studies emphasizing school head perceptions in specific locales remain limited. Evaluating partnerships and management strategies through school heads' perspectives can inform programs and improve collaboration and educational outcomes in Kasibu West District elementary schools(Barokah et al., 2025; Tambis et al., 2025). In rural, resource-limited contexts, adaptive, participatory leadership strengthens partnerships and educational quality despite resource and coordination challenges(Barokah et al., 2025; Tambis et al., 2025).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study aimed to examine school heads' perceptions of school-community relations as a basis for enhancing partnership programs in the Kasibu West District, Division of Nueva Vizcaya. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of school heads in terms of age, gender, civil status, present position, highest educational attainment, and level of training attended?
2. How do school heads perceive the importance of school-community relations?
3. What are the perceived areas of school–community engagement and collaboration?
4. How do school heads assess the effectiveness of partnerships with agencies involved in school-community relations?
5. How do school heads assess the effectiveness of resources utilized in promoting school-community relations in terms of human and material resources?
6. What administrative challenges are encountered in promoting school-community relations in terms of

attainment of objectives, utilization of resources, and school-community relationships?
7. What strategies do school heads employ to manage school-community relationships?
8. Is there a significant relationship among the perceived areas of community engagement, effectiveness of agency partnerships, utilization of human and material resources, and strategies employed in managing school-community relationships?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine school heads' perceptions of school-community relations in the Kasibu West District, Division of Nueva Vizcaya. The descriptive component was used to assess the respondents' perceptions regarding the importance of school-community relations, areas of community engagement, effectiveness of agency partnerships, utilization of human and material resources, administrative challenges, and strategies for managing school-community relationships. The correlational component was intended to examine the possible relationships among relevant variables in the study. This research design provided a systematic approach to describing existing school-community partnership practices and identifying areas that may serve as a basis for enhancing partnership programs in the district.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants in the study were twenty-seven (27) school heads from public elementary schools in the Kasibu West District, Division of Nueva Vizcaya. They were selected through purposive sampling because of their direct involvement in school administration, stakeholder coordination, resource management, and the implementation of school-community partnership programs. Their professional responsibilities and experiences in managing school-community relationships made them appropriate respondents for assessing the practices, effectiveness, challenges, and strategies associated with school-community engagement. The study covered school heads identified in the researcher's target population during School Year 2025–2026.

Research Instrument

This study utilized a structured questionnaire and an unstructured interview to gather data on school–community relations. The questionnaire was developed based on a review of related literature and studies and was aligned with the objectives of the research. It consisted of sections covering the respondents' profile, the perceived importance of school–community relations, areas of community engagement, agencies involved in partnerships, effectiveness of human and material resource utilization, administrative challenges, and strategies for managing school–community relationships. The questionnaire was intended to gather quantitative data using structured response options, while the unstructured interview was used to obtain additional insights and clarify responses where necessary. The instrument was subjected to validation to assess the clarity, relevance, and appropriateness of its items. As indicated in the original manuscript, the initial questionnaire was presented to selected teachers and parents who were not included in the study participants to obtain comments and suggestions for improvement.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher sought the necessary permission and approval from the appropriate educational authorities before conducting the study. Upon securing the required authorization, the questionnaires were personally distributed to the twenty-seven (27) school heads in the Kasibu West District with the assistance and endorsement of the district supervisor. The respondents were informed of the purpose of the research and were requested to provide honest responses to the questionnaire. Follow-up visits and coordination were undertaken, when necessary, to facilitate the retrieval of completed questionnaires and ensure the completeness of the collected data. Unstructured interviews were also conducted to obtain supplementary information and clarify relevant responses. After retrieval, the questionnaires were checked, organized, and prepared for analysis.

Data Analysis Procedure

The gathered data were organized, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate descriptive statistical tools. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the respondents' demographic and professional profiles.

Weighted mean was employed to determine the respondents' perceptions regarding the importance of school-community relations, areas of community engagement, effectiveness of partnerships and resource utilization, administrative challenges, and strategies for managing school-community relationships. Ranking was used to identify the relative order of the indicators based on their computed weighted means. The results were interpreted using the corresponding descriptive classifications provided in the research instrument. Information obtained through the unstructured interviews was used to supplement and clarify the quantitative findings where relevant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Profile of the School Heads

Profile Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	4	20%
	Female	16	80%
	Total	20	100%
Age	40–45 years	4	20%
	46–50 years	6	30%
	51–55 years	4	20%
	56–60 years	4	20%
	61–65 years	2	10%
	Total	20	100.00
Civil Status	Married	19	95%
	Widowed	1	5%
	Total	20	100.00
Present Position	Head Teacher III	5	25%
	Principal I	10	50%
	Principal II	5	25%
	Total	20	100
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree	9	45%
	Master's Degree	8	40%
	Doctor's Degree	3	15%
	Total	20	100%
Seminars and Trainings Attended (Frequency of Mention)	Division	20	—
	Regional	20	—
	National	18	—
	International	15	—

Note. The percentages are based on 20 respondents. Seminars and training attended are presented as frequency of mention because respondents may have attended training at multiple levels.

The profile of school heads indicates that most respondents were female (80.00%), while 20.00% were male. The largest age group was 46–50 years old (30.00%); those aged 40–45, 51–55, and 56–60 each represented 20.00%, and 10.00% were 61–65. This suggests that respondents were experienced school leaders with substantial professional and leadership experience and relevant perspectives on managing school-community relations. Regarding civil status, 95.00% were married and 5.00% widowed. Regarding their current positions, 50.00% were Principal I, while Head Teacher III and Principal II each accounted for 25.00%. Thus, respondents were mainly principal-level school heads involved in administration, stakeholder coordination, resource management, and partnership development. Regarding educational attainment, 45.00% held a bachelor's degree, 40.00% a master's degree, and 15.00% a doctorate degree, indicating varied formal academic preparation, with many having pursued graduate studies.

All 20 respondents had attended division-level and regional-level training; 18 had attended national-level and 15 international training. These results demonstrate engagement in professional development across levels, which may support administrative knowledge, leadership practices, and perspectives for managing school-community partnerships. Overall, respondents' positions, educational backgrounds, and training experiences provide contextual information for interpreting their perceptions of school-community relations in the Kasibu West District.

Table 2. Perceived Importance of School-Community Relations

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Discipline of students	4.89	0.31	Important
Welfare of teachers	4.91	0.29	Important
Promotion of school facilities	4.90	0.30	Important
Provision of school finance	4.91	0.29	Important
Provision of health services	4.92	0.28	Important
Provision of security to the school	4.80	0.40	Important
Planning of the curriculum	4.90	0.30	Important
Lobbying benefits of the school	4.81	0.39	Important
Monitoring student progress	4.71	0.46	Important
Management decision	4.88	0.32	Important
Average Weighted Mean	4.94	0.33	Important

School-community relations are important across all indicators. They support school functioning and student well-being. In terms of student discipline (mean = 4.89, SD = 0.31) and teacher welfare (mean = 4.91, SD = 0.29), respondents agreed that collaboration helps create a positive learning environment. The community promotes school facilities (Mean = 4.90, SD = 0.30) and provides school finance (Mean = 4.91, SD = 0.29), helping schools to run smoothly. Offering health services (mean = 4.92, SD = 0.28) and ensuring school security (mean = 4.80, SD = 0.40) show that involvement extends beyond academics. In curriculum planning (mean = 4.90, SD = 0.30) and management decisions (mean = 4.88, SD = 0.32), school-community collaboration is strategic, aligning with findings on governance and curriculum implementation (Berhanu & Naidoo, 2024). Monitoring student progress (mean = 4.71, SD = 0.46) and lobbying for school benefits (mean = 4.81, SD = 0.39) further show the community's role in accountability and resource advocacy (Owan et al., 2022). Together, these indicators yielded an average weighted mean of 4.94, underscoring the importance of school-community relations. The findings show that stakeholder collaboration improves institutional performance and student outcomes through shared decision-making, resource sharing, and inclusive participation (Maqhubela, 2025).

Table 3. Perceived Areas of School-Community Engagement and Collaboration

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Fund raising for school projects	2.95	0.75	Sometimes
Management of school PTA funds	3.29	0.65	Sometimes
Construction of non-DepEd buildings	2.19	0.81	Seldom
Utilization, maintenance, and security of school facilities	2.48	0.77	Seldom
Physical improvement of the school	3.38	0.62	Sometimes
Provision of instructional materials	3.67	0.55	Often
Assistance to socio-cultural programs	2.67	0.72	Sometimes
Provision of school furniture	2.24	0.80	Seldom
Provision of electricity	2.81	0.70	Sometimes
Provision of program planning	3.29	0.65	Sometimes
Average	2.90	0.70	Sometimes

When it comes to school-community engagement, there is a mix of participation levels across different activities, showing that involvement in education is not one-size-fits-all. For instance, providing instructional materials (Mean = 3.67, SD = 0.55) and improving the school's physical environment (Mean = 3.38, SD = 0.62) happen fairly regularly, which means there is a steady effort to support the resources and infrastructure needed for teaching and learning. This indicates that stakeholders are backing the material conditions necessary for education. On the other hand, activities like fundraising for school projects (Mean = 2.95, SD = 0.75), managing PTA funds (Mean = 3.29, SD = 0.65), helping with socio-cultural programs (Mean = 2.67, SD = 0.72), and planning programs (Mean = 3.29, SD = 0.65) happen occasionally. This suggests a moderate level of involvement in governance and cultural activities, which might point to some challenges in maintaining consistent participation or organizational capacity (Giampietro & Romiti, 2025; Maqhubela, 2025). There are also areas like building non-DepEd structures (Mean = 2.19, SD = 0.81), using and maintaining school facilities (Mean = 2.48, SD = 0.77), and providing school furniture (Mean = 2.24, SD = 0.80) that are rarely reported. This could be due to resource limitations or unclear roles (Anlimachie & Teise, 2026). Overall, with an average weighted mean of 2.90 (SD = 0.70), these collaborations happen "sometimes," showing that while partnerships exist, they are not always consistent. These insights

highlight the need for formalized frameworks, leadership strategies, clear roles, and trust to build stronger, sustainable school-community partnerships (Maqhubela, 2025).

Table 4. Effectiveness of Agency Partnerships

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Traditional rulers for community mobilization	2.05	0.79	Seldom
Police for school security	2.33	0.74	Seldom
San Mateo District for electricity supply	2.71	0.70	Sometimes
San Mateo District for water supply	2.14	0.77	Seldom
Bankers for current/savings accounts, loans, and so on	2.19	0.76	Seldom
Contractors for construction of buildings	2.29	0.75	Seldom
Media houses for information dissemination	3.24	0.64	Sometimes
Mosques/churches for moral development	3.38	0.62	Sometimes
Sister schools for lodging support	3.19	0.65	Sometimes
Hospital for health care delivery	2.62	0.71	Sometimes
Parents for volunteer services	3.67	0.55	Often
Senior citizens for lobbying benefits	2.57	0.72	Seldom
Average	2.70	0.70	Sometimes

How well agency partnerships help schools depends on who they work with. For instance, traditional rulers don't seem to be very effective partners, with a mean score of 2.05 and a standard deviation of 0.79, which shows there is not much collaboration happening there. The police and San Mateo District's water supply have slightly better ratings, with means of 2.33 and 2.14, respectively, and standard deviations around 0.74 to 0.77, indicating some support in terms of safety and infrastructure. Bankers and contractors, with means of 2.19 and 2.29 and standard deviations of 0.76 and 0.75, also fall into the "seldom effective" category, pointing to issues in getting resources and developing facilities. On the flip side, media houses, mosques/churches, sister schools, and hospitals are sometimes effective partners, with means ranging from 2.62 to 3.38 and standard deviations between 0.62 and 0.71, showing that they collaborate more frequently. Parents volunteering their services score the highest, with a mean of 3.67 and a standard deviation of 0.55, highlighting their consistent involvement. Overall, the weighted mean is 2.70 with a standard deviation of 0.70, suggesting that partnerships happen sometimes but there is definitely room for improvement. For these partnerships to really work, there need to be clear roles, trust, good communication, and shared goals (Haight et al., 2024; Shand et al., 2025; Strauser et al., 2026). These insights point to the importance of having strategic frameworks and committed leadership to boost collaboration and support for students (Gao et al., 2024; Ngobeni, 2024).

Table 5. Effectiveness of Resources Utilized (Human and Material Resources)

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
A. Human Resources	3.39	0.59	Moderately Effective
B. Material Resources	2.73	0.68	Moderately Effective

The findings in Table 5 show that human and material resources in school-community relations were moderately effective, with means of 3.39 for human resources and 2.73 for material resources. Community involvement was evident in school-related services, cleanliness drives, and the provision of expertise and assistance, indicating that stakeholders contributed skills, knowledge, and services to support activities. However, resource mobilization and community capacity-building need strengthening to broaden participation. The use of school facilities for community activities showed resource-sharing opportunities, although some facilities remained underused. These findings highlight the need to strengthen collaboration, define partnership roles, and maximize available resources. Cummins and Patel (2025) emphasized leadership in sustaining partnerships, while Haight et al. (2024) highlighted conditions for collaboration. Similarly, Shand et al. (2025) emphasized structured frameworks. These perspectives reinforce the need for school heads to promote collaborative initiatives, encourage participation, and coordinate resource use.

Table 6. Administrative Challenges Encountered This table can be organized into three subsections based on the original manuscript: attainment of objectives, utilization of resources, and school-community partnerships.

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
A. Attainment of Objectives	1.25	0.40	Least Serious
B. Utilization of Resources	1.50	0.56	Least Serious
C. School-Community Partnership	2.91	0.68	Moderately Serious

Table 6 indicates that challenges in school-community relations varied across three areas: attainment of objectives, resource utilization, and partnership-related concerns. Challenges in objectives and resource utilization were perceived as the least serious, suggesting that school heads faced difficulties in implementing initiatives. However, partnership-related challenges were moderately serious, particularly power struggles, irregular parent attendance at PTA meetings, and differing perceptions of community involvement. These results suggest that while school heads manage resource-related concerns, stakeholder relationships require attention from the DEECD. Strengthening communication, decision-making, stakeholder roles, and parental participation may address these concerns. Haight et al. (2024) emphasized leadership, recognition of expertise, communication channels, and support resources to promote understanding, trust, and shared responsibility among school heads, parents, and community partners.

Table 7. Strategies Employed in Managing School-Community Relationships

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Teachers visiting the homes of their students	4.14	0.48	Effective
Teachers using the visit to inform parents on new trends in the school	3.19	0.64	Moderately Effective
Parents on their own visiting the school	3.71	0.56	Effective
School administration recognizing parents' visits and securing their support for school projects	3.76	0.55	Moderately Effective
Organizes Parent Visitation Days	3.24	0.65	Effective
Using visitation days to educate parents about the school	4.19	0.47	Effective
Inviting community key members to board meetings	3.24	0.65	Effective
Allowing community to use school facilities	3.76	0.55	Effective
Using GSM phone facilities to communicate to parents	3.19	0.64	Moderately Effective
Students always going for field trips around the community	2.67	0.71	Moderately Effective
Using social media to communicate to parents for information dissemination and related concerns	3.81	0.54	Effective
Average	3.54	0.59	Effective

When teachers visit students' homes (Mean = 4.14, SD = 0.48), it helps build trust and understanding. This aligns with research showing that home visits encourage cooperation, especially in collectivist cultures and for students who might be at risk (Mohd-Tajuddin et al., 2026). Using these visits to keep parents informed about what is happening at school (Mean = 3.19, SD = 0.64) is somewhat effective. When parents take the initiative to visit schools (Mean = 3.71, SD = 0.56) and when schools secure parental support during these visits (Mean = 3.76, SD = 0.55), it makes a big difference. Organizing parent visitation days and educating parents (Means = 3.24 and 4.19) are great ways to get parents involved and make them feel welcome (Cummins & Patel, 2025). Inviting important community members to board meetings (Mean = 3.24, SD = 0.65) and letting the community use school facilities (Mean = 3.76, SD = 0.55) help promote shared responsibility. Communication tools, such as GSM phones (Mean = 3.19, SD = 0.64) and social media (Mean = 3.81, SD = 0.54), keep the information flowing (Bell et al., 2025). Field trips (Mean = 2.67, SD = 0.71) offer hands-on learning experiences. Overall, with an average weighted mean of 3.54, these strategies are pretty effective, supporting the idea that inclusive, culturally responsive approaches are key to

fostering collaboration (Maisela, 2026; Pusztai et al., 2025).

Table 8. Pearson Correlation Analysis of School-Community Relations Dimensions

Variables Correlated	Pearson r	p-value	Decision on H_0	Interpretation
Community Engagement and Agency Partnerships	0.520	0.019	Reject H_0	Moderate, Significant
Community Engagement and Human Resources	0.440	0.052	Fail to Reject H_0	Moderate, Not Significant
Community Engagement and Material Resources	0.390	0.089	Fail to Reject H_0	Weak, Not Significant
Community Engagement and Management Strategies	0.610	0.004	Reject H_0	Strong, Significant
Agency Partnerships and Human Resources	0.480	0.032	Reject H_0	Moderate, Significant
Agency Partnerships and Material Resources	0.550	0.012	Reject H_0	Moderate, Significant
Agency Partnerships and Management Strategies	0.660	0.002	Reject H_0	Strong, Significant
Human Resources and Material Resources	0.420	0.065	Fail to Reject H_0	Moderate, Not Significant
Human Resources and Management Strategies	0.630	0.003	Reject H_0	Strong, Significant
Material Resources and Management Strategies	0.580	0.007	Reject H_0	Moderate, Significant

Pearson's correlation analysis shows connections among school-community relations. Community engagement has a moderate link with agency partnerships ($r = 0.520$, $p = 0.019$), suggesting that community involvement strengthens ties with agencies, crucial for supporting students and schools (Shand et al., 2025). Community engagement has a strong connection with management strategies ($r = 0.610$, $p = 0.004$), showing that strategic leadership helps build community ties and sustain partnerships (Ngobeni, 2024). Although links with human resources ($r = 0.440$, $p = 0.052$) and material resources ($r = 0.390$, $p = 0.089$) were not statistically significant, they suggest areas for better resource alignment through collaboration (Wang et al., 2025). Agency partnerships showed moderate to strong ties with human resources ($r = 0.480$, $p = 0.032$) and material resources ($r = 0.550$, $p = 0.012$), confirming that agency collaborations help schools access human and material support (Cummins & Patel, 2025). A strong link between agency partnerships and management strategies ($r = 0.660$, $p = 0.002$) highlights strategic planning and leadership in maintaining collaborations. Human resources and management strategies are strongly connected ($r = 0.630$, $p = 0.003$), showing that strategic resource management builds capacity and effective partnerships (Ngobeni, 2024). Material resources and management strategies also correlate significantly ($r = 0.580$, $p = 0.007$), indicating that resources complement effective management (Shand et al., 2025). Overall, these findings highlight school-community partnerships as dependent on leadership, engagement, and resource integration (Cummins & Patel, 2025; Ngobeni, 2024).

CONCLUSION

This study revealed that school–community relations are an important component of school development and educational management in the Kasibu West District. Respondents recognized the importance of community participation in supporting student discipline, teacher welfare, school facilities, financial assistance, health services, school security, curriculum planning, and decision-making. Community engagement was evident in school activities, particularly in providing instructional materials, improving facilities, program planning, and other school-related initiatives. Partnerships with community stakeholders and agencies were demonstrated through parental volunteerism, collaboration with religious institutions, media involvement, and support from sister schools. Human and material resources were moderately effective in supporting school–community relations, although participation and resource utilization varied across activities. Findings further indicated that challenges in attaining objectives and utilizing resources were generally less serious, while concerns involving school–community partnerships, including communication, parent participation, differences in understanding

community involvement, and power struggles, were more evident. Meanwhile, strategies employed by school heads, such as home visitation, parent visitation activities, social media communication, stakeholder participation in meetings, and sharing school facilities, were perceived as effective. Overall, they support initiatives, mobilize resources, foster collaboration, and need stronger partnerships.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on this study's findings and conclusions, school heads are encouraged to strengthen school-community relationships by involving parents, community leaders, and other stakeholders in school planning, development projects, instructional support, facility improvement, and activities. Schools may also enhance partnerships with local government units, health institutions, law enforcement agencies, religious organizations, media groups, and other community partners to support learners, teachers, and school programs. Greater attention should be given to consistent community participation and mobilizing human and material resources through collaborative, well-coordinated initiatives. School heads can address partnership challenges through open communication, transparent decision-making, defined roles and responsibilities, regular stakeholder consultations, and constructive conflict resolution. Existing strategies, such as home visitation, parent visitation days, social media communication, stakeholder meetings, and community involvement in school activities, should be sustained and strengthened. The district may consider implementing an enhanced school-community partnership program to strengthen collaboration, resource mobilization, communication, and shared responsibility. Future researchers may conduct similar studies in other districts or divisions and include stakeholder perspectives.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to the perceptions of school heads regarding school-community relations in the Kasibu West District. The findings were based on the responses of the selected respondents and the research instruments used to assess community engagement, agency partnerships, human and material resource utilization, administrative challenges, and management strategies. As the study employed a descriptive-correlational research design, the results describe the respondents' perceptions and examine associations among the selected variables but do not establish causal relationships. The study was also geographically limited to one district, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings to other districts or school divisions with different educational and community contexts. Furthermore, the reliance on questionnaire responses, supplemented by interviews, may reflect the respondents' individual experiences, perceptions, and interpretations of school-community relationships. These limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings and their applicability to other educational settings.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Future research should explore school-community relations across multiple districts, school divisions, and geographical settings to provide a broader understanding of the practices, challenges, and strategies associated with effective school-community partnerships. Researchers may also include other stakeholders, such as teachers, parents, community leaders, local government representatives, and partner organizations, to obtain a more comprehensive perspective on school-community collaboration. Further studies should employ mixed-methods, longitudinal, or comparative research designs to examine how partnership initiatives influence school development, learner outcomes, resource mobilization, and community participation over time. Future investigations may also assess the effectiveness of intervention programs or enhanced school-community partnership frameworks developed from the findings of the present study, particularly those focusing on communication, stakeholder participation, agency collaboration, and sustainable utilization of school and community resources.

ETHICS STATEMENT

The research adhered to ethical principles governing the conduct of research involving human participants. Participation in the study was voluntary, and respondents were informed of the purpose of the research and the nature of their participation. Informed consent was obtained before data collection, and respondents were assured that their responses would be treated with confidentiality and used solely for research purposes. The study respected the privacy, dignity, and rights of the participants, and no respondent was compelled to participate or

provide information beyond their willingness. The collected data were handled responsibly and presented in a manner that protects the identities and confidentiality of the respondents. The researchers also endeavored to ensure that the research process was conducted with integrity, transparency, and respect for the participants throughout the study.

REFERENCES

Anderson-Butcher, D., Bates, S., Sterling, K., Voegler, M., Dau, W., & Amorose, A. (2022). Canyons Community Schools: Universities and Colleges as Key Partners. *Children & Schools*, *45*(1), 17–26. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdac025

Anlimachie, M. A., & Teise, K. (2026). Participatory action research: a key strategy for repositioning rural teacher professional practice towards culturally responsive pedagogy. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727x.2026.2718128

Barokah, A. I., Yuliana, L., & Raharja, S. (2025). Developing a community-based academic supervision model: A strategic reform for enhancing professional learning in Indonesian primary schools. *European Journal of Sustainable Development Research*, *9*(4), em0332. https://doi.org/10.29333/ejosdr/16862

Bell, A. B., Hellman, A. B., & Uribe-Zarain, X. (2025). Fostering Inclusive Partnerships: An Inventory of Practices for Engaging Multilingual Families in School Communities. *TESOL Journal*, *16*(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.70066

Berhanu, K. Z., & Naidoo, P. (2024). The role of socio-demographic characteristics and school-community communication in community involvement in curriculum implementation of primary schools, Ethiopia. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *10*, 101101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101101

Bhatt, P., Kumar, A., Choudhary, R., Dahiya, A., & Raj, S. (2026). The Role of Educational Facilities and Community Engagement in Achieving SDG 4: A Structural Model Evaluation of Northern India Educational System. *Sage Open*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440261416745

Chai, Y., Dai, B., Zhang, Y., & Wang, Y. (2024). Partnerships in educational tourism in China: a power perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *33*(7), 1330–1347. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2024.2346789

Cummins, N., & Patel, S. (2025). Leadership and Family-School-Community Partnerships in the Model Schools for Inner Cities Initiative. *Improving Schools*, *27*(2–3), 57–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/13654802251397190

Gao, C., Zou, J., Zheng, L., & Yuan, A. (2024). An empirical study on the effectiveness of collaborative school implementation in central China: a value-added approach. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *36*(1), 71–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2024.2417048

Giampietro, L., & Romiti, S. (2025). Parents, schools and community collaboration for improvement: insights from the evaluation processes. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, *10*(3), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1108/jpcc-09-2024-0165

Haight, J., Daniels, J., Gokiert, 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

Hurst, G. A., & Vidal, J. L. (2026). International partnerships for green chemistry education. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1039/d6rp00336b

Kwaah, C. Y., & Nishimuko, M. (2023). Improving School Quality in Junior High Schools in Ghana: Teachers' Myth and Reality of a Decentralization Policy. *Sage Open*, *13*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231188559

Maisela, M. L. (2026). Communication as a catalyst: strengthening literacy through teacher–parent partnerships. *Frontiers in Education*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1862053

Maqhubela, V. (2025). The Effects of Stakeholder Collaboration on Academic Performance and Institutional Effectiveness: A Case Study of Three Secondary Schools in the OR Tambo Inland District in the Eastern Cape of South Africa. *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 185–200. https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.20256212

Mohd-Tajuddin, A. H., Yusof, N., & Tugiman, N. (2026). Beyond the School Walls: Counsellors, Community, and Cooperative Strategies in Home Visit Programs. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2026.2640591

Ngobeni, S. (2024). Establishing sustainable school-community partnerships: strategies for school management teams. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print), 1–20.

https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2024.2369987
Ohta, R., Yata, A., & Sano, C. (2022). Students' Learning on Sustainable Development Goals through Interactive Lectures and Fieldwork in Rural Communities: Grounded Theory Approach. *Sustainability*, *14*(14), 8678. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14148678
Owan, V. J., Asuquo, M. E., & Etudo-Eyor, E. (2022). Leadership Styles, Public Relation Skills and School-Community Collaboration: A Quantitative Analysis of the Perception of Stakeholders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *28*(4), 715–737. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2045627
Pusztai, G., Bacskai, K., Ceglédi, T., Kocsis, Z., & Hine, M. G. (2025). Mission Possible? Institutional Family-School-Community Partnership Practices and Parental Involvement in Hungarian Majority and Minority Schools in Three Central and Eastern European Countries. *Social Sciences*, *14*(2), 107. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14020107
Shand, R., Jacobson, R., Hayes, K., Stephans, M., Wolf, J., & Terrones, F. (2025). Applying a Framework for More Effective District-wide School–Community Partnerships. *Urban Education*, *61*(4), 811–840. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420859251369742
Strauser, D. G., Kosciulek, J. F., & Warner, P. H. (2026). Embracing Collaboration Theory: Insights From Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors into Collaborative Employment-Focused Transition Programs. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*. https://doi.org/10.1177/21651434261466945
Tambis, D. J. E., Sinagpulo, J., Veruen, J., Palconit, M., & Gayrama, I. (2025). Instructional leadership among elementary school heads: Examining the relationships of demographic profiles, leadership practices and associated challenges. *CTU Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, *17*(3), 74–87. https://doi.org/10.22144/ctujoisd.2025.065
Wang, Y., Ma, J., & Lou, Y. (2025). Beyond proximity: the dynamics of design school-community interaction in social innovation. *CoDesign*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/15710882.2025.2526546

AI DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author used artificial intelligence (AI) tools solely to assist in improving the grammar, language, and manuscript readability. The author reviewed, revised, and validated the manuscript's content and assumes full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, integrity, and final version of the published paper.