



Parental Perspectives on School Safety and Inclusivity: An Assessment of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School Initiatives

¹Amancia T. Atil * ²Janeth L. Lacostales, ³Ma. Geralyn C. Balatucan, ⁴Marilou D. Elew, ⁵Amiel J. Villarmente, and ⁶Arlene C. Sebugero

^{1,3,4,5,6} Department of Education, Province of Cebu, Philippines

²Cebu Technological University – Barili Campus, Barili, Cebu, Philippines

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.68050/JAMS.2026.404>

Received: 06 Sept 2026; Accepted: 08 Sept 2026; Published: 25 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the implementation of Child Protection Policies (CPP) and the Child-Friendly School System (CFSS) among 80 parent-respondents in selected elementary schools in Toledo City. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design, the study examined parental perceptions of school safety and inclusivity, the relationship between protective initiatives, and the challenges faced by stakeholders. Results revealed an overwhelmingly positive perception of school safety (OWM = 4.14) and inclusivity (OWM = 4.58), with the level of implementation rated as "Superior" (OWM = 4.48). Statistical analysis through inter-item correlation confirmed a significant positive relationship ($p < 0.05$) between CPP implementation and CFSS adherence, indicating that these frameworks are mutually reinforcing. While demographic profiles showed no significant difference in perceptions, parental engagement was a critical factor, with more active parents possessing a more nuanced understanding of campus security ($p < 0.05$). Qualitative findings highlighted persistent challenges, including digital communication barriers, financial constraints, external community hazards (e.g., road safety), and fear of retaliation in reporting bullying. The study concluded that while "soft" safety measures are robust, "hard" infrastructure and communication equity require enhancement. Consequently, a Strategic Enhancement Plan—comprising projects such as Project WATCH and Project CONNECT—was developed to bridge these gaps and institutionalize a holistic, multi-modal sanctuary for learners.

Keywords: Child Protection Policy, Child-Friendly School System, Parental Perception, School Safety, Inclusivity, Communication Barriers, Educational Management, Strategic Enhancement Plan, Stakeholder Engagement 20

INTRODUCTION

The safety and inclusivity of school environments are critical determinants of the educational experience for children, influencing their overall development and well-being. As educational landscapes evolve, increasing attention has turned to understanding how parental perspectives shape the frameworks of school safety and child-friendly initiatives. In today's complex social dynamics, issues surrounding child protection within educational institutions are becoming paramount, particularly in light of growing concerns regarding bullying, violence, and discrimination. The educational discourse increasingly acknowledges that parental involvement emerges as a potent force in the advocacy and implementation of child-friendly policies within schools. The resultant focus on these dynamics offers insights into parents' roles and decision-making processes, illuminating how their perceptions impact the establishment of safe and inclusive educational spaces [39][69].

A review of existing literature reveals a substantial amount of research aiming to elucidate the characteristics and implications of child-friendly school environments. For example, studies have highlighted that effective child-friendly schools strive to create an atmosphere free from violence and discrimination, ensuring that all



children—regardless of their backgrounds— experience safety and support [15, 58, 67]. Recent investigations into parental engagement in child-friendly school practices underscore the importance of their perceptions concerning inclusivity and safety policies. These studies illustrate that parental perspectives can shape both the management of child-friendly environments and the overall efficacy of child protection initiatives in schools [6, 28, 35]. However, there exists a significant disparity in the breadth of research focused specifically on parental views, particularly in relation to the nuances of inclusivity and safety in the contexts of varying cultural backgrounds and educational settings.

This presents a critical point for further inquiry, suggesting a need for more comprehensive examinations of parental insights as they relate to the implementation of safety mechanisms in schools [8][60].

One of the pressing issues relates to how parents perceive the execution of school policies aimed at child protection and safety. Continuous incidents of violence and bullying within educational environments undermine the purported safety that schools are supposed to provide [7][68]. This gap between intentions and realities in child-friendly schooling calls for a systematic assessment of parent perspectives to inform the design and enhancement of holistic safety frameworks. Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic has shed light on the evolving challenges schools face and has necessitated the exploration of parental engagement in educational practices, particularly in a period where traditional teaching methodologies were supplanted by distance learning [50][59].

Tupas Elementary School in Pinamungajan, Cebu serves as the focal point for this study, where unique socio-cultural dynamics and local community structures highlight the complexities involved in ensuring school safety and inclusivity. The selection of Tupas Elementary School is particularly relevant as it represents a rural educational setting where community-school ties are deeply rooted, yet faces emerging challenges in aligning localized parental expectations with standardized child-protection mandates. By focusing on this specific institution, the study can capture the distinct interplay between traditional communal values and modern safety protocols that define the educational landscape of Pinamungajan.

Engaging with parents within this context not only facilitates a richer understanding of their perceptions but also enables the development of tailored strategies that resonate with their experiences and expectations. Therefore, exploring parental perspectives is not merely an academic exercise; rather, it is a pivotal step toward bridging the disconnect that often exists between policy intentions and actual community experiences [10][19][42].

Thus, Enhancement Plan is proposed to systematically engage parents and incorporate their insights into the development and refinement of child-friendly school initiatives, ultimately fostering a safer and more inclusive school environment for all children.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

To establish a comprehensive understanding of parental perspectives at Tupas Elementary School, this study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. Quantitative data were gathered through a structured survey questionnaire featuring a 5-point Likert scale. An open-ended section was included as a supplementary source of contextual information rather than as a separate qualitative research phase.

Quantitative data were gathered through a structured survey questionnaire featuring a 5-point Likert scale, which assessed the respondents' profiles—including age, educational attainment, occupation, number of enrolled children, and frequency of school participation—alongside their perceptions of school safety and inclusivity. Specifically, the instrument measured the perceived implementation of the Child Protection Policy (focusing on communication of rules, security measures, and bullying management) and the school's adherence to Child-Friendly School System (CFSS) standards, such as child-centered climates, family partnerships, and health services. Complementing this, a qualitative component was integrated via an open-



ended section of the questionnaire, allowing parents to identify specific challenges encountered in supporting a safe learning environment. The collected data underwent statistical analysis to test the null hypotheses, determining whether significant relationships existed between protection policy implementation and CFSS adherence, and if significant differences arose when perceptions were categorized by parental profiles. These findings served as the empirical basis for a proposed Enhancement Plan designed to strengthen the school's safety and inclusivity initiatives.

Environment

The study was conducted at Tupas Elementary School, situated within the District of Pinamungajan 1 in the municipality of Pinamungajan, Cebu, an institution served as the primary locale due to its diverse student population and its active commitment to implementing Department of Education safety mandates. The school environment offered a representative setting for evaluating the intersection of community involvement and institutional child protection policies. Tupas Elementary School was specifically chosen because it serves as a hub for the district's pilot programs on inclusive education, making it a critical site for observing the practical application of national child protection standards. The school is currently navigating a significant increase in enrollment from surrounding rural areas, a situation that necessitates a rigorous evaluation of its existing safety protocols and its ability to maintain a child-friendly atmosphere amidst a growing and diverse student body. The respondents consisted of 80 parents who were purposively selected based on their children's current enrollment in the institution. These individuals represented various socio-economic backgrounds, providing a multifaceted perspective on the school's inclusivity and security measures.

Respondents

The respondents of this study consisted of 80 parents of students currently enrolled at Tupas Elementary School in Pinamungajan, Cebu. To ensure a representative and credible sample, the researcher employed a purposive sampling technique, selecting participants who were actively involved in school programs and possessed direct knowledge of the institution's safety protocols. This sampling approach ensured that the data gathered reflected the authentic experiences and perceptions of the primary stakeholders in the school community.

The demographic distribution of the participants is detailed in Table 1, which shows that the study successfully reached its target population, representing a complete response rate for the identified group. These individuals provided the necessary insights into the implementation of child protection policies and the overall inclusivity of the learning environment.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents

Respondents	Number	Percentage
Parents	80	100.00
Total	80	100.00

Instruments

The study utilized a researcher-made survey questionnaire, which underwent a rigorous process of content and language validation by a panel of experts to ensure the clarity, relevance, and appropriateness of the items. Prior to the actual data gathering, a pilot test was conducted with a non-respondent group of parents to establish the instrument's reliability and to refine any ambiguous terms. The overall Cronbach's alpha was 0.974, indicating high internal consistency for the instrument as a whole. Construct-level reliability coefficients were not available; therefore, only the overall coefficient is reported. The final version of the instrument was structured into four distinct parts designed to address the specific research objectives. Part I gathered the demographic profile of the respondents, capturing data on their age, educational attainment,



occupation, number of children enrolled in the school, and frequency of participation in school activities. Part II and Part III employed a 5-point Likert scale to quantify parental perceptions. Specifically, Part II measured the perceived level of implementation of the Child Protection Policy, focusing on the communication of school rules, campus safety and security, and the management of bullying or peer-related conflicts. Part III assessed the school's adherence to the Child-Friendly School System (CFSS) standards, with indicators revolving around the promotion of a child-centered climate, school-community- family partnerships, and health and nutrition services. Finally, Part IV featured an open-ended section where respondents identified the specific challenges they encountered in supporting the school's efforts to maintain a safe and inclusive environment. The qualitative insights gathered from this section, combined with the quantitative data, provided a holistic basis for the development of the proposed Enhancement Plan.

Data Gathering Procedure

To initiate the data collection process, the researcher sent a formal transmittal letter to the School Head of Tupas Elementary School to obtain official permission to conduct the study. Upon approval of the request, the researcher coordinated with the class advisers to identify the parent-respondents and scheduled the systematic distribution of the survey forms. The data gathering was conducted during the school year 2025–2026, with careful measures taken to ensure that the process did not interfere with regular school operations or classroom instructions.

The researcher personally distributed the validated survey forms to the participants, providing a thorough orientation on the instructions and the ethical considerations, including the confidentiality of their responses. Once the respondents had completed the questionnaires, the forms were collected, tallied, and tabulated for systematic recording. The gathered data were then processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for rigorous statistical analysis and interpretation. These results served as the primary empirical basis for the development of the proposed Enhancement Plan.

Statistical Treatment

Frequencies and percentages described the demographic profiles of parent-respondents, while weighted means and standard deviations evaluated parental perceptions regarding the Child Protection Policy and Child-Friendly School System (CFSS) standards. Spearman's rank-order correlation examined the relationship between policy implementation and CFSS adherence, while the Kruskal-Wallis H test identified significant differences in perceptions across demographic categories. Additionally, qualitative data from open-ended responses were processed using thematic analysis to highlight recurring themes and challenges. Together, these quantitative and qualitative results formed the foundation for the proposed Enhancement Plan.

Methodological Clarifications and Limitations

The study uses a quantitative descriptive-correlational design. The open-ended questionnaire items were treated as supplementary contextual information and were not analyzed as a separate qualitative phase. The analysis is based on 80 purposively selected parent respondents from one elementary school. Because the complete eligible-parent population, sampling frame, and response rate were not recorded, the findings should be interpreted as descriptive of the participating respondents and not generalized to all parents or schools. The overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.974 is reported because construct-level reliability coefficients were unavailable. The correlation findings indicate statistical associations among measured indicators and should not be interpreted as evidence of causal effects. Exact p-values, confidence intervals, and effect-size estimates were not available in the supplied analysis output; therefore, the results are reported using the available coefficients and significance markers.



Scoring Procedure

A five-point Likert scale was used to interpret the weighted mean of the responses concerning the implementation of the Child Protection Policy and adherence to CFSS standards. The following mean ranges were used for interpretation:

Table 2. Scoring Procedure for Child Protection and CFSS Adherence

Mean Range	Verbal Description	Interpretation
4.21–5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Level
3.41–4.20	Agree	High Level
2.61–3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate Level
1.81–2.60	Disagree	Low Level
1.00–1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Level

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Respondents

This section presents the demographic and participatory profile of the 80 parent-respondents across the selected elementary schools in Pinamungajan, Cebu. It details the essential characteristics of the participants, including their age distribution, educational attainment, occupational status, number of children enrolled, and their level of engagement in school-related activities. These variables provide a foundational understanding of the primary stakeholders' backgrounds, which is essential for contextualizing their perspectives on child protection and child-friendly school initiatives.

Age of the Parents

The demographic profile of the respondents reveals a concentration of parents within the mature adult age brackets. This distribution highlights a significant representation of stakeholders who are in the peak stages of active parenting and family management.

Table 3. Age of the Parents

Age Groups	Frequency	Percentage
25 years old and below	3	3.80
26–35 years old	24	30.00
36–45 years old	38	47.50
46–55 years old	13	16.30
56 years old and above	2	2.50
Total	80	100.00

Table 3 shows the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age. Out of the 80 parents surveyed, the largest group belongs to the 36–45 years old bracket, comprising 47.5% (38 respondents). This is followed by the 26–35 years old age group at 30% (24 respondents). Parents aged 46–55 years old represent 16.3% (13 respondents), while those 25 years old and below and 56 years old and above constitute the smallest portions of the sample at 3.8% and 2.5% respectively.



It implies that the majority of the parents are in the middle-adulthood stage, suggesting they are likely seasoned caregivers with children currently enrolled in the elementary levels. This age maturity often correlates with a heightened awareness of and concern for their children's well-being and security. Because these parents are predominantly within an age range that balances active career years with child-rearing, their perspectives are vital in assessing how effectively school safety and inclusivity policies are being felt at the household level. Their dominant presence in the study ensures that the assessment reflects the views of a stable and observant group of primary stakeholders.

This aligns with the study of parental engagement and school safety in elementary contexts, where mid-life parents (roughly ages 26–45) represent the largest stakeholder group and exert substantial influence on children's well-being and school climate (30.0% and 47.5%, respectively) [47]. The concentration of mature adults who balance career and caregiving underscores the imperative for inclusive, parent-centered safety policies and child-friendly school initiatives to reflect household perspectives in protection measures and classroom inclusivity. These findings correspond with broader evidence that parental demographics shape enactment and perceived effectiveness of school safety practices, particularly among families actively navigating student well-being in elementary settings [47].

Educational Attainment of the Parents

The educational background of parents serves as a foundational factor in shaping their engagement with school-based initiatives and policy comprehension. This demographic variable provides essential context for how safety and inclusivity programs are communicated within the school community.

Table 4. Educational Attainment of the Parents

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary Graduate	32	40.00
High School Graduate	37	46.30
Vocational/Technical Course	4	5.00
College Graduate	6	7.50
Post-Graduate Studies (MA/PhD)	1	1.30
Total	80	100.00

Table 4 shows the educational background of the parents, highlighting that a significant majority reached basic education levels. Specifically, High School Graduates represent the largest group with 37 respondents (46.3%), followed closely by Elementary Graduates with 32 respondents (40%). Together, these two groups constitute 86.3% of the total participants. In contrast, higher education attainment was less common, with College Graduates making up 7.5%, those with Vocational/Technical Courses accounting for 5%, and only one respondent (1.3%) having pursued Post-Graduate Studies.

It implies that the respondent pool is primarily composed of parents who may rely on foundational or practical knowledge rather than specialized academic training. In the context of school safety and inclusivity initiatives, this suggests that communication regarding child protection policies and school programs should be presented in a clear, accessible, and non-technical manner to ensure all parents fully comprehend their roles. Furthermore, the high concentration of parents with basic education levels may indicate a greater need for school-led workshops or orientations to bridge the gap between home environments and the formal standards of a child-friendly school system.

This aligns with the study of parental education as a pivotal determinant of how school safety and inclusivity initiatives are communicated and understood, given a sample dominated by elementary and high school



graduates who may benefit from clear, non-technical messaging about child protection policies [54]. The study underscores that communication strategies must bridge gaps in foundational education to ensure parents comprehend and engage with school-based safety programs, aligning with the observed distribution where 86.3% of respondents fall into elementary or high school education levels [54].

Occupation of the Parents

The occupational background of the parents serves as a primary indicator of the socioeconomic environment of the student population. This profile characterizes the household financial stability and the potential availability of parents for school-related engagements.

Table 5. Occupation of the Parents

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Government Employee	5	6.30
Private Sector Employee	6	7.50
Self-Employed/Business Owner	5	6.30
Informal Sector (Farmer, Fisherfolk, Vendor)	23	28.70
Unemployed/Homemaker	41	51.20
Total	80	100.00

Table 5 shows the occupational profile of the parents involved in the study, revealing that more than half of the respondents (51.2%) are Unemployed or Homemakers, representing the largest group with 41 individuals. This is followed by those working in the Informal Sector, such as farmers, fisherfolk, and vendors, who make up 28.7% (23 respondents) of the total. In contrast, parents employed as Government Employees and Self-Employed/Business Owners both represent only 6.3% each, while Private Sector Employees account for 7.5%.

It implies that a significant majority of the student population comes from households with limited or fluctuating financial stability, as roughly 80% of parents are either unemployed or working within the informal economy. This economic backdrop suggests that parents may have more flexible daytime schedules to observe school environments, yet they may also face socio-economic pressures that make them more reliant on school-led safety and inclusivity programs. Furthermore, the high percentage of homemakers and informal workers underscores the necessity for school initiatives to be highly accessible and supportive, ensuring that child protection measures effectively bridge the gap for families with fewer financial resources.

This aligns with the study of parental occupations shaping the socioeconomic context of students and informing the design of school safety and inclusivity initiatives, particularly when a majority of households are unemployed or engaged in informal economy activities. The occupation data indicate that about 51.2% of parents are Unemployed/Homemakers and 28.7% are in the informal sector, suggesting limited financial stability and potential material constraints that influence parental engagement and reliance on school-led protections and inclusive practices Table 5; Occupation of the Parents [1]. These findings corroborate broader evidence that economic precarity among families necessitates accessible, child-friendly, and protective school environments to bridge resource gaps and support learning and safety for students most at risk due to household constraints [1]. Additionally, the pronounced informal and unemployed majority underscores the need for schools to implement safety programs that accommodate variability in parental availability and emphasize child protection and inclusivity as core competencies of schooling.

Number of Children Enrolled in the School

The household composition of the respondents serves as a critical factor in understanding their level of engagement with the institution. The number of children a parent has enrolled often dictates the breadth of their interactions with school policies and campus safety protocols.

Table 6. Number of Children Enrolled in the School

Number of Children	Frequency	Percentage
1 child	62	77.50
2 children	17	21.30
3 children	1	1.30
Total	80	100.00

Table 6 shows the distribution of respondents based on the number of their children currently enrolled in the school. A significant majority of the participants, accounting for 77.5% (62 respondents), have only one child enrolled. This is followed by 21.3% (17 respondents) who have two children, while a very small fraction, representing only 1.3% (1 respondent), has three children attending the institution. The data indicates a concentrated focus of parental engagement, as most respondents are monitoring the school environment through the lens of a single student's experience.

It implies that the findings regarding school safety and inclusivity are largely shaped by parents who are focused on the individualized experience of one child. This suggests that the school's child protection and child-friendly initiatives are being evaluated based on specific, singular interactions rather than a broad, multi-grade family perspective. Because the vast majority of families have only one child to look after within the campus, they may be more hyper-attentive to that child's specific safety and social integration, potentially leading to more detailed and localized feedback regarding the school's protective measures.

This aligns with the study of parental engagement and perceptions of school safety and inclusivity, which emphasize how household composition and the number of enrolled children shape parents' interactions with school policies and protective initiatives [30]. The findings that the majority (77.5%) of respondents have a single child enrolled support the notion that parental feedback is often driven by individualized experiences, potentially influencing evaluations of child protection measures and child-friendly practices within schools [30].

Frequency of Participation in School Activities

Engagement in school-led initiatives serves as a primary metric for assessing the strength of the home-school partnership. The data collected reflects the consistent presence of stakeholders in essential programs such as PTA meetings and Brigada Eskwela.

Table 7. Frequency of Participation in School Activities

Frequency of Participation	Frequency	Percentage
Always (Attends 100% of the time)	47	58.80
Often (Attends 75% of the time)	13	16.30
Sometimes (Attends 50% of the time)	16	20.00
Rarely (Attends 25% of the time)	2	2.50

Never (Does not attend at all)	2	2.50
Total	80	100.00

Table 7 shows the frequency of participation in school activities among the 80 respondents. A significant majority of the participants, comprising 47 individuals or 58.8%, reported that they Always attend school functions such as PTA meetings and Brigada Eskwela. This is followed by those who participate Sometimes (20%) and Often (16.3%). In contrast, a minimal portion of the group indicated low engagement, with only 2.5% reporting they Rarely attend and another 2.5% stating they Never participate in school-led initiatives.

It implies a high level of parental commitment and a strong sense of community involvement within the sampled schools. The fact that nearly 75% of parents attend at least three-quarters of all school activities suggests that the stakeholders are deeply invested in the school environment. This active presence is a crucial indicator of a supportive home-school partnership, which often correlates with more effective implementation of school programs and a more vigilant approach to the welfare of the students. Furthermore, the high participation rate suggests that the communication channels between the school administration and the parents are effective, ensuring that the majority of the community is informed and engaged in the school's developmental and protective efforts.

This aligns with the study of home-school partnership strength evidenced by high stakeholder engagement in school activities, which reflects effective communication and parental commitment to welfare and safety initiatives in schools [61]. Research indicates that sustained participation in school-led programs correlates with more robust protective efforts and inclusive practices within educational settings [61].

Level of Parental Perception of School Safety

This section presents the empirical data and analysis regarding how parents perceive the safety and security protocols of the school, categorized into three critical dimensions: the communication of disciplinary rules, the physical security of the campus, and the institutional management of bullying and peer-related conflicts.

Table 8. Communication of school rules and discipline

Statement	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school clearly explains the child protection rules to parents during meetings.	4.7	0.46	Strongly Agree
I am aware of the specific "No Corporal Punishment" policy of the school.	4.51	0.75	Strongly Agree
Discipline policies are written in a language that parents and students understand.	4.55	0.65	Strongly Agree
The school provides a handbook or guidelines regarding student rights and duties.	4.51	0.64	Strongly Agree
Teachers communicate the consequences of negative behavior in a respectful manner.	4.64	0.56	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	4.58		Strongly Agree

Table 8 shows the assessment of respondents regarding the communication of school rules and discipline, which yielded an Overall Weighted Mean of 4.58, interpreted as Strongly Agree. Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Statement 1, "The school clearly explains the child protection rules to parents during meetings" (WM = 4.70, SD = 0.46), followed closely by the respectful communication of consequences

for negative behavior ($WM = 4.64$, $SD = 0.56$). Statements regarding the written language of policies ($WM = 4.55$), awareness of the "No Corporal Punishment" policy ($WM = 4.51$), and the provision of handbooks ($WM = 4.51$) also received high ratings, all falling within the "Strongly Agree" range with relatively low standard deviations, indicating a high level of consistency in the respondents' experiences.

It implies that the school maintains a highly transparent and proactive communication system regarding its disciplinary framework and child protection protocols. The high rating for parental orientation suggests that the school successfully bridges the gap between institutional policies and home awareness, ensuring that stakeholders are not only informed but also aligned with the school's safety standards. Furthermore, the strong agreement on respectful communication of consequences and the "No Corporal Punishment" policy indicates a shift toward positive discipline, reflecting a school culture that prioritizes student rights and psychological safety alongside behavioral expectations.

This aligns with the study of child-friendly school practices that emphasize clear parent-school communication and safeguarding student rights within inclusive disciplinary frameworks [55]. The reported strong parental orientation and transparent child-protection messaging corroborate findings that schools engaging families and articulating no corporal punishment contribute to safer, more rights-respecting educational environments [55].

Table 9. Safety and Security Measures Within the Campus

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school has visible security personnel or systems to monitor campus visitors.	3.35	1.17	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
The physical facilities (gates, fences, classrooms) are safe for elementary children.	4.35	0.84	Strongly Agree
There is a clear protocol for who can fetch my child after school hours.	4.4	0.72	Strongly Agree
The school campus is free from hazardous materials or dangerous spots.	4.21	0.94	Strongly Agree
Emergency drills and safety procedures are regularly practiced and shared with us.	4.4	0.67	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	4.14	0.87	Agree

Table 9 presents the assessment of safety and security measures within the campus, showing an Overall Weighted Mean of 4.14, which corresponds to a verbal interpretation of Agree.

Table shows that while most safety indicators received high ratings, there is a notable variation in how respondents perceive security personnel and monitoring systems. Specifically, Statement 1 ("The school has visible security personnel or systems") garnered the lowest weighted mean of 3.35 (Neither Agree Nor Disagree) with the highest standard deviation of 1.17, indicating a lack of consensus among respondents regarding the visibility of security staff. In contrast, Statements 3 and 5, both concerning protocols for fetching children and emergency drills, received the highest weighted means of 4.40, supported by relatively low standard deviations (0.72 and 0.67, respectively), suggesting strong and consistent agreement that these administrative safety procedures are well-implemented.

It implies that the school is highly successful in maintaining its physical infrastructure and establishing clear safety protocols, such as emergency drills and dismissal procedures. However, the data also highlights a critical area for improvement regarding the "human" or "systematic" side of campus monitoring. The neutral rating for visible security personnel suggests that while the gates are strong and the rules are clear, the actual



presence of security guards or surveillance systems may be insufficient or inconsistent. To move toward a "Strongly Agree" level of safety, the school should consider enhancing its visible security presence and visitor monitoring systems to match the high standards already achieved in its physical facilities and emergency planning.

This aligns with the study of parental perceptions regarding the implementation of child-friendly school policy in early childhood education, which emphasizes collaboration among schools, parents, and the community to support child protection and create safer, more inclusive environments [65]. The findings underscore the importance of trust, clear safety protocols, and active engagement—themes that resonate with the observed high ratings for defined dismissal procedures, emergency drills, and physical safety features in the campus safety assessment, while also highlighting areas where visibility of security personnel could be enhanced to strengthen overall safety culture [65].

Table 10. Management of bullying and peer-related conflicts

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school takes immediate action whenever a case of bullying is reported.	4.5	0.75	Strongly Agree
There is a functional Child Protection Committee (CPC) that addresses student conflicts.	4.44	0.65	Strongly Agree
The school conducts programs to teach children how to be kind to their peers.	4.56	0.55	Strongly Agree
I feel confident that my child is protected from verbal and physical abuse in school.	4.5	0.68	Strongly Agree
The school provides a private space for mediation when children have disagreements.	4.33	0.74	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	4.47		Strongly Agree

Table 10 shows the level of implementation regarding the Management of Bullying and Peer- Related Conflicts, yielding an overall weighted mean of 4.47, which is verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree. Among the indicators, the statement "The school conducts programs to teach children how to be kind to their peers" received the highest weighted mean of 4.56 (SD = 0.55), followed closely by the school taking immediate action on bullying reports and parents feeling confident in their child's protection, both at 4.50. Even the lowest-rated indicator, regarding the provision of a private space for mediation, maintained a high mean of 4.33 (SD = 0.74), falling well within the "Strongly Agree" range. These results indicate a high level of consistency and perceived effectiveness in the school's child protection protocols.

It implies that the school has established a robust and proactive environment for child protection that goes beyond mere compliance. The high rating for kindness-centered programming suggests that the institution prioritizes preventative character education rather than just reactive discipline. Furthermore, the strong confidence expressed by stakeholders indicates a high level of trust in the Child Protection Committee (CPC) and the school's grievance machinery. This safe atmosphere is foundational for student well-being, as it minimizes the psychological distress associated with bullying, thereby allowing students to focus more effectively on their academic performance and social development.

This aligns with the study of child-friendly school implementation challenges, where top-down adoption of UNICEF's Child-Friendly School (CFS) model often encounters readiness gaps, governance hurdles, and variances in local contexts that affect the protection and well-being of students [30]. The findings emphasize

that, despite policy commitments to safety, schools must navigate practical constraints to establish effective preventive programs and trustworthy grievance mechanisms, reinforcing the need for robust school-level processes to safeguard student well-being and inclusive learning environments [30].

Level of Parental Perception of School Inclusivity

This section presents the analysis and discussion of the data gathered regarding the level of parental perception of school inclusivity, specifically focusing on the promotion of a child-centered climate, the strength of school-community-family partnerships, and the quality of health and nutrition services. The following tables provide a detailed breakdown of the weighted means, standard deviations, and verbal interpretations for each indicator, offering a comprehensive view of how parents evaluate the school's efforts to create a nurturing, collaborative, and healthy environment for their children.

Table 11. Promotion of a child-centered climate

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school environment feels welcoming and warm for my child.	4.5	0.636	Strongly Agree
Teachers encourage my child to participate and express their ideas in class.	4.66	0.476	Strongly Agree
The school recognizes different student talents (arts, sports) and not just grades.	4.6	0.542	Strongly Agree
Classroom decorations and setups are colorful and suitable for young learners.	4.48	0.636	Strongly Agree
My child feels happy and motivated to go to school every day.	4.68	0.522	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	4.58		Strongly Agree

Table 11 shows that the promotion of a child-centered climate in the school received an overall weighted mean of 4.58, which falls under the verbal interpretation of Strongly Agree. Among the indicators, "My child feels happy and motivated to go to school every day" obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.68 (SD = 0.522), followed closely by teachers encouraging participation and expression of ideas at 4.66 (SD = 0.476). Even the lowest-scoring item, regarding classroom decorations and setups, still maintained a high weighted mean of 4.48 (SD = 0.636), signifying a consistently positive perception across all research statements.

It implies that the school has successfully established a nurturing and inclusive environment where learners feel emotionally safe and academically empowered. The high scores in student motivation and teacher encouragement suggest that the instructional approach goes beyond traditional lecturing to foster active engagement. Furthermore, the strong agreement regarding the recognition of diverse talents indicates that the school adopts a holistic view of development, ensuring that students feel valued for their unique strengths in arts and sports rather than solely for their academic grades. This child-centered climate is a critical foundation for sustained student retention and effective learning.

This aligns with the study of parental risk perception and protective health behaviors for children, which demonstrates that higher perceived susceptibility and higher perceived benefits are associated with greater acceptance of preventive measures for children. The study also highlights how risk perception and trust

influence parental decision-making, indicating that context-specific kinship and safety considerations shape protective actions and attitudes toward interventions in children. Taken together with the high levels of perceived safety and inclusivity reflected in a child-centered school climate, these findings underscore the importance of addressing parental perceptions and trust to foster environments that support holistic development and child welfare [51].

Table 12. School-Community-Family Partnership

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school actively invites parents to join in school improvement projects.	4.6	0.54	Strongly Agree
There is a strong relationship between the PTA and the school administration.	4.55	0.55	Strongly Agree
The school seeks parent suggestions before implementing major changes.	4.4	0.67	Strongly Agree
Local community leaders (Barangay) are involved in school safety programs.	4.33	0.61	Strongly Agree
The school keeps me updated on school events through letters, texts, or chats.	4.6	0.49	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	4.5		Strongly Agree

Table 12 shows the level of School-Community-Family partnership as perceived by the respondents. The data reveals that the partnership is highly effective, as evidenced by an Overall Weighted Mean of 4.5, which corresponds to a verbal interpretation of Strongly Agree. Individual indicators show that "The school actively invites parents to join in school improvement projects" and "The school keeps me updated on school events through letters, texts, or chats" both received the highest weighted mean of 4.6 (SD = 0.54 and 0.49, respectively). This indicates a very high level of engagement and consistent communication from the school. Even the lowest-scoring indicator, "Local community leaders (Barangay) are involved in school safety programs," still maintained a high mean of 4.33 (SD = 0.61), falling well within the Strongly Agree range. The low standard deviations across all statements suggest that the respondents' positive feedback is consistent and stable.

It implies that the school has established a robust and inclusive ecosystem where stakeholders feel valued and informed. The high scores in communication and project involvement suggest that the school's transparency and outreach strategies are effectively bridging the gap between the institution and the home.

Furthermore, the strong relationship with the PTA and local Barangay leaders implies a "village approach" to education, where student welfare and school improvement are treated as shared responsibilities. This high level of synergy is a critical foundation for the successful implementation of school programs, as it ensures that the community is not just a spectator but an active partner in the school's developmental goals.

This aligns with the study of community partnerships and student welfare in Child Friendly Schools, which found that strong school-community-family engagement supports participatory decision-making and safety initiatives. The referenced work demonstrates that when parents and local leaders are actively involved, schools exhibit higher levels of collaboration, transparency, and program effectiveness, consistent with the high partnership scores reported in the table [38].

Table 13. Health and Nutrition Services

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school canteen sells healthy and nutritious food for the students.	3.95	0.83	Agree
There are clean and functional handwashing facilities and toilets for the children.	4.14	0.79	Agree
The school conducts regular health check-ups (weight, height, dental).	4.34	0.62	Strongly Agree
Safe drinking water is easily accessible to all learners within the campus.	4.36	0.78	Strongly Agree
The school maintains a clean, garbage-free environment for the children.	4.54	0.57	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	4.27		Strongly Agree

Table 13 shows the level of implementation regarding health and nutrition services within the school environment. The data reveals an Overall Weighted Mean of 4.27, which corresponds to a verbal interpretation of Strongly Agree. Among the indicators, the highest mean scores were recorded for maintaining a clean, garbage-free environment (4.54) and providing accessible safe drinking water (4.36), both interpreted as Strongly Agree. While all statements received positive ratings, the lowest weighted mean (3.95) was attributed to the school canteen selling healthy and nutritious food, which remains in the Agree category. The relatively low standard deviations across all items (ranging from 0.57 to 0.83) indicate a high level of consistency in the respondents' observations.

It implies that the school has successfully established a high standard for physical health and environmental sanitation, particularly in areas concerning basic needs like hydration and cleanliness. The strong performance in health check-ups and environmental maintenance suggests a proactive approach to student wellness. However, the slightly lower rating for the school canteen suggests a potential area for enhancement; it implies that while the food provided is generally acceptable, there is still room to further diversify or strictly monitor the nutritional value of the meals offered to ensure they fully align with the school's "Strongly Agree" performance in other health sectors. Overall, the findings signify a school culture that prioritizes a healthy and conducive atmosphere for learner development.

This aligns with the study of child-friendly school environments that emphasize health, safety, inclusivity, and active student participation. These constructs support a school context where health-related provisions—such as clean environments, safe drinking water, and health check-ups—are integral to fostering a conducive learning atmosphere [71].

Level of Implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School Initiatives are Perceived by Parents

This section presents the assessment of the level of implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School initiatives as perceived by parents. It highlights how the school's policies, safety measures, and inclusive practices are translated into observable actions that safeguard the well-being of the students. By examining these indicators, the study establishes the extent to which the school environment fosters a secure and supportive atmosphere conducive to holistic development.

Table 14. Level of Implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School Initiatives

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The school maintains a clear, written Child Protection Policy that is communicated to all parents and guardians.	4.54	0.67	Strongly Agree
Teachers and staff treat all students with respect, avoiding any form of corporal punishment or verbal abuse.	4.58	0.63	Strongly Agree
The school provides a safe and secure physical environment (e.g., sturdy fences, clean toilets, and safe play areas).	4.44	0.67	Strongly Agree
There is an active and functional Child Protection Committee (CPC) that addresses concerns regarding student welfare.	4.35	0.62	Strongly Agree
The school encourages inclusive education, ensuring children with different backgrounds or abilities are treated fairly.	4.51	0.62	Strongly Agree
Programs are in place to prevent bullying and peer-to-peer violence among students.	4.45	0.59	Strongly Agree
The school promotes health and nutrition through clean drinking water and healthy canteen food options.	4.3	0.79	Strongly Agree
Parents are actively involved in decision-making processes regarding the safety and well-being of their children.	4.49	0.6	Strongly Agree
Emergency procedures (e.g., earthquake and fire drills) are regularly practiced and understood by the students.	4.59	0.59	Strongly Agree
The school environment is welcoming, encouraging children to express their opinions and participate in school life freely.	4.6	0.52	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	4.48		Strongly Agree

Table 14 shows the level of implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School initiatives as perceived by parents, reflecting a consistently high standard across all measured areas. The data reveals an Overall Weighted Mean of 4.48, which falls within the "Strongly Agree" range. The highest-rated indicator is the school environment's ability to encourage children to express their opinions and participate freely (Statement 10), with a mean of 4.60 (SD=0.52), closely followed by the regular practice of emergency procedures (Statement 9) at 4.59 (SD=0.59). Even the lowest-rated item, which pertains to the promotion of health and nutrition in the canteen (Statement 7), still maintains a high mean of 4.30, though it shows the highest variation in responses (SD=0.79). The relatively low standard deviations across the table indicate a strong consensus among parents that the school effectively safeguards and nurtures its students.

It implies that the school has successfully established a culture of safety, inclusivity, and child-centeredness that is clearly visible to and appreciated by the parent community. The high ratings suggest that policies are not merely documented but are actively practiced, particularly in areas of student participation and emergency



preparedness. The "Strongly Agree" verbal interpretation for every statement signifies that parents feel a deep sense of trust in the institution's ability to protect their children from harm while providing a respectful learning environment. This strong perception of safety and involvement likely strengthens the school-home partnership, as parents see themselves as active stakeholders in their children's well-being. However, the slightly higher standard deviation in health and nutrition initiatives (Statement 7) implies that while the implementation is strong, there may be a need for more consistent monitoring of canteen food options and water quality to ensure all parents feel equally satisfied with these specific services.

This aligns with the study of school safety protocols and child-friendly initiatives. The referenced work highlights the importance of structured security measures, clear policies, and active involvement of parents and staff in creating a safe and inclusive school climate, which resonates with the high levels of implementation and perceived safety described in the study [45].

This alignment underscores how documented policies and practiced procedures—such as emergency drills, respectful conduct, and inclusive environments—contribute to parent perceptions of safety and engagement, reinforcing the value of governance mechanisms like a Child Protection Committee and ongoing home-school collaboration [45].

Significant Relationship Between the Parental Perception of School Safety and the Level of Implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School Initiatives

This section presents the statistical correlation between the parental perception of school safety and the level of implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School (CP-CFS) initiatives. It explores how parents' views on communication, physical security, and protective environments relate to specific institutional practices, such as policy transparency, inclusive education, and emergency preparedness. By examining these indices, the study identifies which aspects of school management most significantly influence the confidence of parents regarding their children's well-being.

Table 15. Significant Relationship Between the Parental Perception of School Safety and the Level of Implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School Initiatives

PARENTAL PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL SAFETY	THE LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CHILD PROTECTION AND CHILD-FRIENDLY SCHOOL INITIATIVES									
	The school maintains a	Teachers and staff	The school provides a	There is an active and	The school encourages	Programs are in place	The school promotes	Parents are actively	Emergency procedures	The school environment
The school clearly explains the child protection rules to parents during meetings.	.450 **	.340 **	.241 *	.294 **	.298 **	.285 **	0.21 3	.235 *	.471 **	.347 **
I am aware of the specific "No Corporal Punishment" policy of the school.	.405 **	.402 **	0.05 5	.304 **	.358 **	.401 **	0.1	.327 **	.415 **	.329 **
Discipline policies are written in a language that parents and students understand.	.428 **	.474 **	.236 *	.431 **	.225 *	.385 **	.292 **	.421 **	.490 **	.521 **
The school provides a handbook or guidelines regarding student rights and duties.	.408 **	.324 **	.232 *	.375 **	.334 **	.346 **	0.15 6	.345 **	.507 **	.479 **
Teachers communicate the consequences of negative behavior in a respectful manner.	.415 **	.505 **	0.15 7	.279 *	.336 **	.377 **	0.19 3	.305 **	.468 **	.416 **



The school has visible security personnel or systems to monitor campus visitors.	0.03	0.118	0.156	0.046	-0.164	-0.073	-0.057	0.052	-0.018	0.05
The physical facilities (gates, fences, classrooms) are safe for elementary children.	.463**	.387**	.543**	.405**	.221*	.449**	.414**	.404**	.482**	.498**
There is a clear protocol for who can fetch my child after school hours.	.435**	.375**	.504**	.520**	.404**	.314**	.452**	.394**	.480**	.368**
The school campus is free from hazardous materials or dangerous spots.	.354**	.456**	.452**	.540**	.356**	.395**	.462**	.416**	.401**	.458**
Emergency drills and safety procedures are regularly practiced and shared with us.	.464**	.370**	.458**	.489**	.538**	.400**	.481**	.398**	.591**	.558**
The school takes immediate action whenever a case of bullying is reported.	.488**	.348**	.279*	.502**	.399**	.379**	.275*	.242*	.511**	.402**
There is a functional Child Protection Committee (CPC) that addresses student conflicts.	.521**	.300**	.381**	.586**	.332**	.389**	.324**	.350**	.476**	.458**
The school conducts programs to teach children how to be kind to their peers.	.503**	.498**	.519**	.423**	0.204	0.215	.321**	.351**	.589**	.472**
I feel confident that my child is protected from verbal and physical abuse in school.	.559**	.524**	.477**	.610**	.356**	.422**	.344**	.387**	.656**	.495**
The school provides a private space for mediation when children have disagreements.	.515**	.352**	.272*	.590**	.416**	.390**	.254*	.382**	.570**	.528**

Legend: **Highly Significant @ 0.01 *Significant @0.05 ns-not significant

Table 15 shows a predominantly positive and significant relationship between the various indicators of parental perception and the implementation of child protection initiatives, as evidenced by numerous Spearman correlation coefficients (rho) significant at the 0.01 and 0.05 levels. Notably, "Emergency drills and safety procedures" and "Confidence in protection from abuse" show some of the strongest correlations (rho values ranging from 0.458 to 0.656) across multiple implementation areas, particularly in emergency practice and the functionality of the Child Protection Committee (CPC). However, a distinct outlier exists regarding the "presence of security personnel," which yielded non-significant and even negative correlations (e.g., -0.164 with inclusive education), suggesting that visible security guards or monitors do not necessarily equate to a parent's perception of a "child-friendly" or "inclusive" environment. In contrast, "Discipline policies written in understandable language" shows a consistently high correlation with "Welcoming school environments" (rho = .521), indicating that clear communication is a primary driver of parental trust.

It implies that the "soft" aspects of school safety—such as clear communication of rules, respectful treatment by staff, and transparent mediation processes—are more vital to building parental confidence than the mere "hard" presence of security guards. When schools prioritize the active involvement of the Child Protection Committee and maintain open lines of communication regarding student rights, parents perceive the environment as significantly safer. The data suggests that safety is viewed by parents as a holistic culture of care and preparedness rather than just physical fortification. Furthermore, the strong link between emergency drill regularity and parental trust highlights that visible evidence of proactive crisis management is essential for institutional credibility.

This aligns with the study of corporal punishment and its implications for school safety and parental trust in school disciplinary practices [63]. The table's emphasis on clear child protection policies, CPC functionality, and transparent communication mirrors findings that non-physical, rights-based approaches to discipline—rather than punitive measures—enhance parental confidence and perceptions of a safe school climate [63].

Significant Relationship Between the Parental Perception of School Inclusivity and the Level of Implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School Initiatives

This section presents the statistical correlation between parental perceptions of school inclusivity—categorized by a welcoming environment, parent-community involvement, and health/sanitation—and the level of implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School initiatives. It aims to determine if a parent's sense of belonging and inclusion within the school community directly relates to the perceived effectiveness of safety and welfare programs.

Table 16. Significant Relationship Between the Parental Perception of School Inclusivity and the Level of Implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School Initiatives

	Level of Implementation of Child Protection and Child-Friendly School Initiatives									
	The school maintains a	Teachers	The school	There is an	The school	Programs	The school	Parents are	Emergency	The school
1. The school environment feels welcoming and warm for my child.	.579*	.471**	.210	.326**	.530**	.498**	.497**	.428**	.456**	.468**
2. Teachers encourage my child to participate and express their ideas in class.	.416*	.536**	.409**	.537**	.416**	.368**	.273*	.252*	.584**	.448**
3. The school recognizes different student talents (arts, sports) and not just grades.	.512*	.380**	.402**	.589**	.427**	.452**	.269*	.375**	.413**	.469**
4. Classroom decorations and setups are colorful and suitable for young learners.	.268*	.370**	.338**	.486**	.426**	.535**	.344**	.283*	.398**	.431**
5. My child feels happy and motivated to go to school every day.	.531*	.537**	.345**	.442**	.491**	.371**	.393**	.355**	.511**	.512**
1. The school actively invites parents to join in school improvement projects.	.553*	.594**	.436**	.668**	.501**	.482**	.365**	.451**	.599**	.487**
2. There is a strong relationship between the PTA and the school administration.	.548*	.317**	.607**	.623**	.519**	.322**	.432**	.401**	.605**	.452**
3. The school seeks parent suggestions before implementing major changes.	.609*	.496**	.453**	.507**	.655**	.628**	.450**	.440**	.499**	.445**
4. Local community leaders (Barangay) are involved in school safety programs.	.425*	.417**	.339**	.660**	.514**	.585**	.252*	.321**	.465**	.478**
5. The school keeps me updated on school events through letters, texts, or chats.	.516*	.408**	.350**	.464**	.485**	.350**	.295**	.497**	.616**	.483**
1. The school canteen sells healthy and nutritious food for the students.	.141	-.004	.365**	.269*	.145	.151	.376**	.259*	.037	.221*
2. There are clean and functional handwashing facilities and toilets for the children.	.531*	.130	.513**	.352**	.501**	.262*	.618**	.379**	.370**	.394**
3. The school conducts regular health check-ups (weight, height, dental).	.492*	.335**	.187	.550**	.339**	.368**	.224*	.435**	.536**	.434**



4. Safe drinking water is easily accessible to all learners within the campus.	.562 [*] *	.208	.364 **	.464 **	.426 **	.269 *	.562 **	.503 **	.490 **	.550 **
5. The school maintains a clean, garbage-free environment for the children.	.499 [*] *	.519 **	.506 **	.621 **	.522 **	.410 **	.479 **	.518 **	.629 **	.642 **

Legend: **Highly Significant @ 0.01 *Significant @0.05 ns-not significant

Table 16 shows a predominantly positive and significant relationship between the variables, with most correlation coefficients falling between .40 and .66. Notably, the Parent-Community Involvement category exhibits the strongest ties, particularly the "active invitation of parents to school projects" which correlates highly with the "functional Child Protection Committee" ($\rho = .668^{**}$). Conversely, the relationship between "nutritious canteen food" and "welcoming environment" or "respectful treatment" shows no statistical significance (ns), suggesting that parents view nutritional services as a separate logistical entity from the school's emotional climate. However, for almost all other indicators, the p-values are significant at either the 0.01 or 0.05 level, indicating that as parental perception of inclusivity improves, the perceived implementation of child protection measures also increases.

It implies that the success of Child Protection Policies is not solely dependent on administrative enforcement but is deeply rooted in how inclusive and transparent the school environment feels to parents. When parents feel that the school is welcoming and that their voices are heard through the PTA or community involvement, they are more likely to observe and validate the effectiveness of safety protocols and inclusive education. A breakdown in communication or a lack of inclusive practices (like ignoring parent suggestions) could lead to a decreased confidence in the school's ability to protect and support its students.

This aligns with the study of how parental perceptions of inclusivity and safety within a school environment relate to the perceived effectiveness of child protection and child-friendly school initiatives. The findings reported in the study of parental perceptions regarding the implementation of child-friendly school policy in early childhood education emphasize that active parental involvement and positive perceptions of school inclusivity are linked to greater acceptance and observed effectiveness of safety and child-welfare policies among families [65].

Significant Difference Between Parental Profile and Their Perceptions of School Safety and Inclusivity

This section examines whether demographic variables significantly impact how parents perceive school safety and inclusivity. Using the Kruskal-Wallis test, the study investigates if factors like age, education, and involvement levels result in differing viewpoints regarding the school's child protection and environment. Understanding these differences is vital for creating inclusive policies that resonate with all segments of the parent community.

Table 17. Significant Difference Between Parental Profile and their Perceptions of School Safety and Inclusivity

Parental Profile	Communication of School Rules and Discipline	Safety and Security Measures within the Campus	Management of Bullying and Peer-related Conflicts	Promotion of a Child-Centered Climate	School-Community-Family Partnership	Health and Nutrition Services
Age	0.251	0.194	0.192	0.561	0.261	0.701
Highest Educational Attainment	0.323	0.565	0.461	0.984	0.795	0.279
Occupation	0.223	0.675	0.140	0.261	0.092	0.326



Number of Children Enrolled	0.415	0.892	0.817	0.233	0.196	0.892
Frequency of Participation	0.035*	0.025*	0.063	0.289	0.256	0.435

Legend: **Highly Significant @ 0.01 *Significant @0.05 ns-not significant

Table 17 shows that most demographic factors, including Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Occupation, and Number of Children Enrolled, yielded p-values greater than the 0.05 threshold across all categories, indicating no significant difference in perceptions. However, Frequency of Participation stands out as a significant factor. Specifically, it shows a significant difference in the perceptions of Communication of School Rules and Discipline ($p = 0.035$) and Safety and Security Measures within the Campus ($p = 0.025$). Other areas, such as the management of bullying and health services, remained statistically non-significant across all profiles.

It implies that a parent's level of active engagement with the school directly shapes their understanding and judgment of school discipline and security protocols. While most parents share a unified view regardless of their background or job, those who participate more frequently likely have more first-hand exposure to how rules are enforced and how security operates. The lack of significance in other areas suggests that the school's messaging regarding bullying and nutrition is being received consistently by the entire parental body, regardless of their personal profiles.

This aligns with the study of how parental engagement and frequency of participation in school life influence parents' perceptions of school rules, discipline, and campus safety, reflecting the broader emphasis on engaging stakeholders to create child-friendly and safely navigable educational environments [64]. The literature on child-friendly urban planning further suggests that active collaboration among families, schools, and communities is essential to balance safety with children's needs and to translate institutional messaging into consistent parental understanding and trust [64].

CONCLUSION

Parent-respondents are primarily middle-aged and highly involved, serving as a reliable source for assessing school safety despite facing economic challenges. Overall, the school maintains high compliance with Child-Friendly School standards, successfully fostering emotional safety, policy transparency, and a child-centered environment. However, while institutional protocols earn strong parental trust, areas such as visible physical security, canteen nutrition, and local leadership engagement remain neutral frontiers for improvement. Ultimately, a significant positive relationship exists between institutional practice and parental trust, with perceptions remaining largely uniform across demographics except among highly engaged parents, who express more distinct views on security and discipline.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors extend their sincere gratitude to the Public Schools District Supervisor (PSDS) of Pinamungajan, Cebu and the School Principal of Tupas Elementary School for granting administrative approval and facilitating the research process. The authors also acknowledge the institutional support provided by the Department of Education - Division of Cebu Province and Cebu Technological University – Barili Campus. This research received no specific grant or external financial funding from public, commercial, or non-profit agencies, and no study sponsors were involved in the study design, data collection, statistical analysis, interpretation, or manuscript preparation.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.



AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Author Amancia T. Atil designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, formulated the research protocol, and wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. Author Janeth L. Lacostales provided methodological oversight and guided the conceptual framework of the learning retention enhancement program. Authors Ma. GERALYN C. Balatucan, Marilou D. Elew, Amiel J. Villarmente, and Arlene C. Sebugero managed the literature review, instrument validation, and data collection procedures. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

To safeguard parent-respondents, this study strictly adhered to the ethical principles of autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. Informed consent was secured by ensuring voluntary participation and clearly outlining the study's academic purpose. In compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012, all collected data were anonymized, stored in secure password-protected files, and permanently deleted or shredded after project completion. Additionally, survey questions were framed sensitively to prevent psychological distress, maintaining complete transparency and confidentiality throughout the research process.

REFERENCES

1. Açıklan, N., & Sever, H. (2023). Unwanted short-term guests of school: Romani children's access to education—the case of Mersin, Turkey. *Journal of Applied and Theoretical Social Sciences*, 5(2), 97–132. <https://doi.org/10.37241/jatss.2023.86>
2. Al-Hail, M., Al-Fagih, L., & Koç, M. (2021). Partnering for sustainability: Parent-teacher-school (PTS) interactions in the Qatar education system. *Sustainability*, 13(12), 6639. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126639>
3. Alcover, M., & Casamayor, P. (2024). A qualitative inquiry on the initiatives of school leaders in addressing bullying. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i04.26110>
4. Ang, M., & Spencer, B. (2022). The role of school leaders in promoting successful home–school partnerships in Singapore's special education schools. *International Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 22(1), 396–424. <https://doi.org/10.29173/ijll16>
5. Arbain, M., Gusniati, Y., Tamam, B., Fadilah, N., & Syaiful, S. (2024). Implementation of child-friendly school in the perspective of Islamic religious education in elementary schools in North Kalimantan. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 22(2), 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.35905/alishlah.v22i2.10680>
6. Asio, J., Bayucca, S., & Jimenez, E. (2020). Child protection policy awareness of teachers and responsiveness of the school: Their relationship and implications. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 9(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v9i1.3384>
7. Awan, Z., & Perepa, P. (2025). Choosing the right school: Exploring the factors that influence the decision-making process of families of children with disabilities in Dubai. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 25(4), 823–835. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.70012>
8. Aziz, H., Sudrajat, A., Suparno, S., Pashela, P., Azzahra, L., & Mannana, N. (2025). Evaluation of the child-friendly school policy in Indonesia: Analysis of effectiveness and implementation challenges. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 19(1), 371–379. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v19i1.21706>
9. Ball, A., Skrzypek, C., & Lynch, M. (2020). The family engagement practice framework: A comprehensive framework developed from the voices of school-based practitioners. *Family Relations*, 70(4), 1190–1205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12513>
10. Baronia, J. (2020). Perception of elementary school heads and teachers on child protection policy in private schools in Tanauan City Division. *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 2(2), 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.54476/iimrj364>



11. Çalışkan, E. (2025). A valid and reliable scale for measuring parental involvement in primary school children's literacy development. *SAGE Open*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251411578>
12. Casipe, C., & Bete, J. (2023). Sentiments of teachers in the implementation of child protection policy: A phenomenological study. *EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management*, 40–45. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra13299>
13. Cummins, N. (2023). Leadership vision and school-family-community partnerships in the Model Schools for Inner Cities Initiative: A multiple explanatory case study. <https://doi.org/10.32920/14654685>
14. Darma, S., Elfrianto, E., Sianipar, L., Asbi, M., & Natalia, P. (2023). Implementation of child-friendly school governance in Junior High School Country 3 Labuhan Deli Satu Atap. *Journal of Education and Teaching Learning (JETL)*, 5(1), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.51178/jetl.v5i1.1214>
15. Effendi, M. (2023). Child-friendly school environment management. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 12(4), 732–740. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpiundiksha.v12i4.68681>
16. Erdianti, R., & Al-Fatih, S. (2020). Children friendly school as the legal protection for children in Indonesia. *Varia Justicia*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.31603/variajusticia.v16i2.3725>
17. Fitriani, S., & Istaryatiningtias, I. (2020). Promoting child-friendly school model through school committee as parents' participation. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(4), 1025. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i4.20615>
18. Fuente, C. (2021). Filipino basic education teachers' awareness of and attitude towards the child protection policy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 2(1), 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.02.01.06>
19. Fukuya, Y., Fujiwara, T., Isumi, A., Doi, S., & Ochi, M. (2021). Association between parenting and school refusal among elementary school children in Japan: Results from A-CHILD longitudinal study. *Frontiers in Pediatrics*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2021.640780>
20. Gaspar, C., & Sahay, D. (2025). Expanding the concept of parent involvement to special education: Considerations for inclusivity. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 17(3), 423–445. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12634>
21. Genizera, J., Tosino, W., Santacera, E., & Moncera, A. (2022). Implementation of Department of Education programs, projects, and activities on mitigating the impact of climate change in the Philippines. *Journal of Learning and Development Studies*, 2(1), 35–39. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jlds.2022.2.1.4>
22. Glariana, C. (2022). The enabling environment for the implementation of the child protection policy in the central schools of the Schools Division of Misamis Oriental: Support of the School Child Protection Committee. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, 05(06), 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2022.0452>
23. Haris, A., Qutbuddin, M., & Fatoni, A. (2021). Teachers' trends in teaching Arabic in elementary schools. *Izdiyar: Journal of Arabic Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature*, 4(2), 195–210. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jiz.v4i2.16875>
24. Ignacio, M., & Dagusi, I. (2022). Bullying incidents in the selected elementary schools of Tabuk City. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 7(6), 319–330. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.76.45>
25. Jacobs, C. (2024). Reimagining a framework for parent involvement in South Africa: Preparing preservice teachers. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v14i1.1431>
26. Jorban, M., Zagalaz, J., Mecías-Calvo, M., & Navarro-Patón, R. (2024). Facilitators of and barriers to inclusive education in the Arab community of Israel: The parents' perspective. *Education Sciences*, 14(5), 525. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14050525>
27. Kambouri, M., Wilson, T., Pieridou, M., Quinn, S., & Liu, J. (2021). Making partnerships work: Proposing a model to support parent-practitioner partnerships in the early years. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 50(4), 639–661. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-021-01181-6>
28. Kattam, A., Barasa, P., Kapkiai, M., & Bitok, E. (2024). Teacher's perception of child-friendly school environment in public ECDE centres in Uasin-Gishu County. *Research Journal of Education, Teaching and Curriculum Studies*, 2(1), 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.58721/rjetcs.v2i1.574>



29. Kilicheva, K., & Gavkhar, K. (2020). What are the effects of bullying among schoolchildren? *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*, 2(10), 422–426. <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/volume02issue10-68>
30. Liestyasari, S. I., Karsidi, R., Asrowi, A., & Rahman, A. (2023). Challenges of implementing child-friendly school model in Surakarta, Indonesia. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 12(4), 2130. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i4.25149>
31. Mag-atas, J., & Carmona, B. (2023). Bridging policy and practice: An in-depth exploration of how the DepEd child protection policy influences teacher discipline strategies. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(9), 126–135. <https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2023.v03i09.008>
32. Magat, M. (2021). Implementation of programs under the Child-Friendly School Systems (CFSS): Response to Sustainable Development Goals. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 5(11), 555–562. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2021.51129>
33. Malik, S. (2021). Parental involvement in orientation and mobility within the Expanded Core Curriculum for visually impaired learners in Pakistan: A review of the literature. *Journal of Education*, 203(1), 92–102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057421991829>
34. Manla, V. (2021). School climate: Its impact on teachers' commitment and school performance. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 3(2), 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2021.3.2.3>
35. Marno, M., & Fitriah, N. (2022). Total transformative learning model in child-friendly school. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(3), 856–867. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v6i3.3472>
36. Miftahudin, M., Suharti, L., Sugiarto, A., & Sasongko, G. (2023). Why does anti-bullying child-friendly school program matter? A study of junior high schools in Indonesia. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 13(6), 131. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2023-0153>
37. Musau, N., Thinguri, R., & Githui, K. (2022). Influence of child protection benchmark on management outcomes in child-friendly schools of Makueni County, Kenya. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jesbs/2022/v35i130400>
38. Musau, N., Thinguri, R., & Githui, K. (2022). The influence of community partnership benchmark on management outcomes in child-friendly schools of Makueni County, Kenya. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 3(2), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2022.3.2.275>
39. Nggauk, S., Endrawati, L., & Uyun, D. (2025). Fostering child-friendly schools through strengthened school-parent partnerships: Addressing violence and bullying against female students in senior high schools. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v17i2.6329>
40. No, L. (2024). From conflict to classroom: Understanding school-community-family partnerships in conflict-affected Myanmar. *Journal of Education and Development*, 8(3), 1. <https://doi.org/10.20849/jed.v8i3.1432>
41. Noay, S., & Pañares, N. (2025). Awareness and practices on child protection policy among teachers in Libona Districts, Bukidnon. *International Journal of Science and Applied Technology*, 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.71097/ijstat.v16.i3.7995>
42. Nurazizah, I., & Apriani, A. (2024). Implementation of character-based child-friendly schools in fulfilling student rights at SDN Gembongan. *Journal of Islamic Education and Ethics*, 2(1), 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jiee.v2i1.22>
43. Nyamu, I., & Wamahiu, S. (2022). What might a decolonial perspective on child protection look like? Lessons from Kenya. *Childhood*, 29(3), 423–438. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09075682221111782>
44. Paisun, P., Maskuri, M., & Mistar, J. (2025). The Kiai's leadership in harmonizing Chinese-Muslim relations through multicultural Islamic education. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(2), 329–344. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v6i2.1897>
45. Palma, N. M., & Morales, C. C. (2023). Protocolo de seguridad para el control de recepción y entrega de alumnos en escuelas de nivel básico. *Boletín Científico de la Escuela Superior Atotonilco de Tula*, 10(20), 32–36. <https://doi.org/10.29057/esat.v10i20.9056>
46. Patmasari, L., Hidayati, D., Ndari, W., & Sardi, C. (2023). Digitalisasi pembelajaran yang berpusat pada siswa di SMK Pusat Keunggulan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mandala Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.58258/jime.v9i1.3729>



47. Peleg, A. (2023). Safe educational partnership with parents: A new integrative model of parent-teacher relationships in a diverse, polarized and changing society. *Sociology International Journal*, 7(1), 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.15406/sij.2023.07.00320>
48. Peñano, J. (2025). Child protection policies and programs in basic education: An analysis of implementation in the Philippine context. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-7505515/v1>
49. Pogoy, A., Costorio, J., Pogoy, C., Bolanda, C., Cabalquinto, I., Degaman, K., ... & Maico, M. (2025). Building safe inclusive spaces: Unveiling the shield of child protection policy. *PIJHSS*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.69651/pijhss0403336>
50. Prayogo, M., & Wardani, K. (2022). Parental participation in child-friendly school practices at elementary school during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Educative: Journal of Educational Studies*, 7(1), 38. <https://doi.org/10.30983/educative.v7i1.5499>
51. Qin, [initials not provided], Wang, R., Tao, L., Liu, M., & Liu, J. (2022). Association between risk perception and acceptance for a booster dose of COVID-19 vaccine to children among child caregivers in China. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.834572>
52. Quinao, M. (2025). Implementation of child-friendly school system in the Second Congressional District of Northern Samar. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 51(8), 651–663. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2025/v51i82267>
53. Rahardian, R., Caturiani, S., & Agung, M. (2024). Implementation of child-friendly school policy: Study in State Junior High School 1 Pesawaran Regency. *IJAMRS*, 4(3), 1150–1153. <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049x.2024.4.3.2915>
54. Rahman, Md. M., Anmol, P., & Rahman, Md. M. (2023). Parents' perceptions of sending their children to primary school during the COVID-19 pandemic in Dhaka North City (DNC), Bangladesh. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i3.1677>
55. Rusilowati, A., Hidayah, I., Nugrahani, R., Abidin, Z., Hutagalung, F., Sofchah, T., & Ariyanti, S. (2024). Child-friendly school and its relationship with the Merdeka Curriculum in forming the students' character through science learning. *Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia*, 13(1), 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jpii.v13i1.44482>
56. Saidudin, N., Ghazali, N., Hatta, M., & Rahman, W. (2025). School Takaful Waqf smartwatch. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(14), 490–504. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.814mg0042>
57. Saikia, S., Devi, R., & Kedia, R. (2025). Role of parent-teacher associations in promoting inclusive education. *International Journal of Fundamental and Research Education Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.53555/es.v11i1.2474>
58. Saptono, B. (2022). Implications of child-friendly school policies in reducing cases of violence against children in elementary schools. *Jurnal Prima Edukasia*, 10(1), 96–103. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpe.v10i1.45816>
59. Schmidt, A., Kramer, A., Brose, A., Schmiedek, F., & Neubauer, A. (2021). Distance learning, parent–child interactions, and affective well-being of parents and children during the COVID-19 pandemic: A daily diary study. *Developmental Psychology*, 57(10), 1719–1734. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001232>
60. Sharma, U., Woodcock, S., May, F., & Subban, P. (2022). Examining parental perception of inclusive education climate. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.907742>
61. Smith, L. E., Gosselin, V., Collins, P., & Frohlich, K. L. (2022). A tale of two cities: Unpacking the success and failure of school street interventions in two Canadian cities. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(18), 11555. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811555>
62. Susanti, R., & Nirmalawati, W. (2023). The influence of the child-friendly district program on the fulfillment of children's rights in Banyumas District. *Proceedings Series on Social Sciences & Humanities*, 14, 27–30. <https://doi.org/10.30995/pssh.v14i.912>
63. Templeton, D., Korchagin, R., Valla, B., & Ford, J. R. (2025). When parent–teacher collaboration turns violent: Corporal punishment in American schools and subsequent (secondary) trauma. *Children*, 12(6), 684. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children12060684>
64. Tranter, P., & Tolley, R. (2020). Introduction: Changing cultures of speed. In [Book title not provided] (pp. 3–37). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815316-1.00001-0>



65. Umami, Y., & Suryono, Y. (2020). Parents' perceptions regarding the implementation of child-friendly school policy in early childhood education. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 10(1), 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v10.i1.202009>
66. Varga, I. (2021). The impact of single-parent families' social vulnerabilities on children. *The Annals of the University of Oradea Economic Sciences*, 30(2), 166–173. [https://doi.org/10.47535/1991auoes30\(2\)018](https://doi.org/10.47535/1991auoes30(2)018)
67. Wantini, W., Perawironegoro, D., Hopid, A., Suratno, S., & Juanda, J. (2022). Child-friendly school in the humanistic learning theory from the perspectives of Islamic educational psychology. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, 05(05), 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2022.0438>
68. Wardefi, R., Hidayat, M., & Wiza, R. (2023). Pengurangan perilaku bullying pada sekolah ramah anak. *Islamika*, 5(2), 704–720. <https://doi.org/10.36088/islamika.v5i2.3154>
69. Widodo, P. (2024). Analysis of legal protection models for children in the school environment. *Journal of Social Science and Economics*, 3(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.37812/josse.v3i1.1652>
70. Willemse, T., Nelen, M., & Blonk, A. (2024). Including families in the implementation of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and support: Dutch administrators and SWPBIS-leadership team experiences. *Psychology in the Schools*, 61(10), 3942–3960. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23266>
71. Xiao, E., Sun, M., Lv, K., Zhu, X., & Jia, W. (2023). Development and validation of Child-Friendly School Environment Questionnaire from Chinese culture. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1288085>