

THE PROCESS INVOLVED IN DEVELOPING THE EXTERNAL SUPPORT ASSETS BY GRADE 11 STUDENTS OF A PRIVATE SCHOOL

Romelisa S. Tocus

Email: romelisa.sanez@deped.gov.ph

Tanza National Comprehensive High School, Tanza, Cavite, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the processes involved in developing external support assets among Grade 11 students in a private school. Recognizing the vital role of families, schools, and communities in student achievement, the research aimed to identify how students build support networks to navigate their chosen academic strands and future careers. Utilizing a descriptive-comparative research design, data was gathered through a three-part questionnaire assessing student engagement with these external factors. The findings revealed that family love and support yielded the highest engagement among respondents at 81%. Conversely, involvement in community, religious, or extracurricular activities was notably lower at 35%. Furthermore, Kruskal-Wallis analysis demonstrated a significant difference in the asset-development processes among students based on their enrolled academic strand. Overall, students “often” engage in processes to develop their external assets. The core components—support, empowerment, boundaries and expectations, and constructive use of time—were all consistently rated as “Important” by the respondents. The study recommends that stakeholders across the home, school, and community work hand-in-hand to encourage student participation in diverse asset-building activities, ensuring holistic development.

Keywords: *External support assets, Grade 11 students, School-family partnerships, Asset building, Academic strands*

How To Cite: Tocus, R. S. (2026). The Process Involved In Developing The External Support Assets By Grade 11 Students Of A Private School . IAM FAME Journal of International Education Research, 1(1), 49-55.

INTRODUCTION

“It takes a village to raise a child” is a popular proverb with a clear message: the whole community has an essential role to play in the growth and development of its young people. In addition to the vital role that parents and family members play in a child’s education, the broader community too has a responsibility to assure high-quality education for all students.

In the past, parent involvement was characterized by volunteers, mostly mothers, assisting in the classroom, chaperoning students and fund raising. Today, the old model has been replaced with a much more inclusive approach: school-family partnerships now include mothers and fathers; stepparents, foster parents, other relatives and caregivers, business leaders and community groups-all participating in goal-oriented activities at all levels, linked to student achievement and school success.

Parent, family and community involvement in education correlates with higher academic performance

and school improvement. When schools, parents, families and communities work together to support learning, students tend to earn higher grades, attend school more regularly, stay in school longer and enrol in higher level programs. Researchers cite parent-family-community involvement as a key to addressing the school dropout crisis and note that strong school-family-community partnerships foster higher educational aspirations and more motivated students. The evidence holds true for students at both the elementary and secondary, or background-and the research shows parent involvement affects minority students' academic achievement across all races.

Supporting teaching and learning requires addressing students' social service needs, as well as their academic ones, and this broad-based support is essential to closing achievement gaps. The positive impact of connecting community resources with student needs was well documented. In fact, community support of the educational process is considered one of the characteristics common to high-performing schools.

The researcher believed that significantly more emphasis must be placed on the important roles that parents, families and communities can and must play in raising student performance and closing achievement gaps. Many educational institutions advocated policies to assist and encourage parents, families and communities to become actively engaged in their public schools and become an integral part of the school improvement efforts. While schools have enacted laws and policies to encourage parent-community-school partnerships, more enforcement is needed. At the same time, promising locally developed practices should be rewarded, sustained and expanded.

The Grade 11 students had chosen the track and strand which will help them determine the degree they want to enrol in college and their future career. However, many of them were still undecided. They cannot determine their strengths and weaknesses; therefore, it is difficult also to identify the external support they need. This was the reason why this study was pursued. It aimed to determine the processes involved in developing the external support assets by Grade 11 students at a private school.

RESEARCH PROBLEMS

Specifically, the study sought to answer several research questions regarding the Grade 11 student respondents: what processes they are involved in to develop their external support assets, and whether there is a significant difference in these processes when the students are grouped according to their enrolled academic strand.

Additionally, it investigated how often the respondents engaged in these developmental processes and the degree of importance they assigned to each component of external assets—specifically in terms of support, empowerment, boundaries and expectations, and constructive use of time.

Finally, based on the study's findings, it sought to determine what action plan could be proposed to enhance the processes involved in the development of the students' external assets.

OBJECTIVES

The study tried to find the processes involving the Grade 11 students of a private school involved in developing their external support assets.

METHODOLOGY

The present study utilized the descriptive method of research design. In a descriptive method, the study focuses on the present situation (what is). The purpose was to find new truth. The truth may have different forms such as an increased quantity of knowledge, a new generalization or new “law,” an increased insight into the factors which are operating, the discovery of new causal relationships, more problems to be solved and many others.

Descriptive researches are valuable in : (1) providing facts in which scientific judgment may be based; (2) providing essential knowledge about the nature of objects and persons; (3) for closer observation into the practices behaviour; methods and procedures; (4) playing a large part in the development of instruments for the measurements that are employed in all types of descriptive research as in data gathering instruments like questionnaires, tests, interviews, checklist, scorecards, rating scales and observation schedules; and (5) formulating of policies in the local, national or international level.

Additionally, this study adopted a descriptive-comparative approach to examine two non-manipulated variables, establishing a structured framework to compare them and determine relative outcomes.. In this study, it was utilized to determine the processes involved by the Grade 11 students in developing their external support assets. The strands where they were enrolled were taken as test factors to determine whether there was or there was no significant difference in their assessment.

The instrument used was divided into three parts. The first part was a questionnaire probing the processes the Grade 11 student respondents undergo in the development of their external assets.

The second part explored how often the respondents engaged themselves in processes to develop their external assets.

The third and last part inquired the degree of importance of each component of external assets to the respondents in terms of support, empowerment, boundaries and expectations and constructive use of time.

RESULTS

As shown in the data, the indicators are undergone by 35-81% of Grade 11 student respondents in the development of their external assets.

Also, among the 18 indicators, the one that yields the highest percentage of 81% is indicator number 1 which corresponded to the following statement: “Family life provided high levels of love and support. “On the other hand, the lowest participation rate of 35% was recorded for indicators 15, 16, and 17. These corresponded to three specific areas: spending three or more hours weekly in music, theater, or arts lessons or practice; dedicating three or more hours per week to school or community sports, clubs, or organizations; and spending at least one hour weekly participating in religious activities.

Within the range of distribution, the processes that got 80% and 70% were questions (1) one and (2) two consecutively. Question three (3) and (10) ten got over 60% of the responses. Questions five (5), six (6), eleven (11), fourteen (14) and eighteen (18) all got over 50% of the responses. Processes on the question seven (7), eight (8) and thirteen got over 40% of the responses. To finish, questions four (4), nine (9), fifteen (15), sixteen and seventeen got over 30% of the response only.

As the process in question, one involved the participation and guidance of the family, thus, the percentage of responses is high. Meanwhile, questions that go below 40% involve participation of a co-member or acquaintance only, therefore having little or no effect on developing a person's external assets. Other questions vary on people involved causing the percentage to vary too.

The next data revealed a summary of processes the student respondents undergo in the development of their external assets when grouped according to strand where they are enrolled in.

Revealed in the preceding data was the test of difference in processes the student respondents undergo in the development of their external assets when grouped according to strand where they were enrolled in using Kruskal Wallis Analysis of Variance. The calculated H-value of 371.42 was found significant as evidenced by the obtained p-value of 7.4×10^{-66} . This meant that the respondents vary in the processes they underwent in the development of their external assets when they were grouped according to strand. Further, it also meant that the null hypothesis on this account was rejected.

The next data displayed how often the respondents engaged themselves in the processes to develop their external assets.

The rest of the indicators obtain a range of 2.60 - 3.14 on their weighted mean, interpreted as "Often." In conclusion, the interpretation overall was "Often" with the general weighted average of 2.94.

The two (2) indicators that got the highest weighted mean were the indicators that had the closest involvement of the parents, but the weighted mean clearly proves that it was the closest that the student felt. Ultimately, a student "often" engages in the processes that develop their external assets.

The next data exhibited the degree of importance of each component of external assets to the respondents in terms of support.

The degree of importance of every component; family support, positive family communication, other adult relationships, caring neighbourhood, caring school climate and parent involvement in schooling were all important on the external assets of respondents in terms of support. The degree of importance resulted in the 2.99 general weighted average and has an interpretation of important overall.

The data displayed the degree of importance of each component of external assets to the respondents in terms of empowerment.

In terms of empowerment, the components still resulted in the same interpretation of "Important" overall. The weighted mean ranged from 2.85-3.04. In conclusion the degree of importance of the components: community values youth, youth as resources, service to others and safety had an interpretation of "Important" with a general weighted average of 2.96.

The data displayed the degree of importance of each component of external assets to the respondents in terms of boundaries and expectations.

With indicators in degree of importance in terms of boundaries and expectations such as : family boundaries, school boundaries, neighbourhood boundaries, adult role models, positive peer influence and high expectations, the survey resulted in "Important" interpretation overall. Their weighted mean ranged from 2.99 - 3.25. The general weighted average has a value of 3.15 and "Important" interpretation.

The next data showed the degree of importance of each component of external assets to the respondents in terms of constructed use of time.

The degree of importance of indicators in terms of constructive use of time all resulted in “Important.” The four indicators include: creative activities, youth programs, religious community and time at home. Their weighted mean varied with 2.85 - 3.15 values. The general weighted average has 2.96 with “Important” interpretation.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

As shown in the data, the indicators were undergone by 35-81% of Grade 11 student respondents in the development of their external assets.

Among the 18 indicators, the one that yielded the highest percentage of 81% was indicator number 1 which corresponded to the following statement: “Family life provides a high level of love and support.”

The indicator that yielded the lowest percentage of 35% were indicator numbers 15, 16, and 17 which corresponded to the following statements respectively. “Young person spends three or more hours per week in sports, clubs and/or organizations in school and/or community organizations,” and “Young person spends one or more in activities in a religious institution. “As the process in question one involved the participation and guidance of the family, thus, the percentage of the responses was high. Meanwhile, the questions that got the percentage below 40, involved participation of co-member or acquaintances only, therefore having little or no effect on developing a person’s external assets. Other questions vary on people involved causing the percentage to vary too.

A calculated H-value of 371.42 was found significant as evidenced by the obtained p-value of 7.4×10^{-66} which was less than 5%. Hence, that the null hypothesis on this account was rejected. This meant that there was a significant difference in the processes the student respondents underwent in the development of their external assets when grouped according to strand where they were enrolled in.

In terms of how often the respondents engaged in processes to develop their external assets, all indicators obtain a general weighted mean of 2.94 interpreted as “Often.”

Among the 18 indicators, 1 and 2 got a weighted mean of 3.26 and 3.27 interpreted as “Always.” These corresponded to the following statements respectively: “I seek family life love and support” and “I communicate with my parents.”

The rest of the indicators obtain a range of 2.60 - 3.14 on their weighted mean, interpreted as “Often.” In conclusion, the interpretation overall was “Often” with the general weighted average of 2.94.

The degree of importance of every component: family support, positive communication, other adult relationships, caring neighbourhood, caring school climate and parent involvement in schooling, are all important on the external assets of respondents in terms of support. Overall, the general weighted average of 2.99 indicates that the degree of importance assigned to these factors is interpreted as important.

In terms of empowerment, the components still resulted in the same interpretation of “Important” overall. The weighted mean ranged from 2.85 - 3.04. In conclusion, the degree of importance of the components;

community values youth, youth as resources, service to others and safety have interpretation of “Important” with a general weighted average of 2.96.

With indicators in degree of importance in terms of boundaries and expectations such as : family boundaries, school boundaries, neighbourhood boundaries, adult role models, positive peer influence and high expectations, the survey resulted in “Important” interpretation overall. Their weighted mean ranged from 2.99 3.25. The general weighted average has a value of 3.15 and “Important” interpretation.

The degree of importance of indicators in terms of constructive use of time all resulted in “Important. “The four indicators include - creative activities, youth programs, religious community and time at home. Their weighted mean varied with 2.85 - 3.15 values. The general weighted average has 2.96 with “Important” interpretation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is important that students learn and undergo all processes to develop their external assets. Likewise, both the family and the community should be empowered to build the respondents’ assets to make them a better person.

The parents, as well as the school community, should organize a drive to encourage or motivate students to build interest in activities that will enrich their asset building capabilities.

Since the respondents consider the following components of external assets as something important to them, it was highly recommended that the home, school and community where the respondents belong to should work hand in hand in order to uphold the high school students’ asset building capabilities as the grew since camaraderie and cooperation will bring humanity to the realization of goals even though abundant financial resources is absent. Likewise, all stakeholders should realize that each has a unique role in asset building and educating the child.

REFERENCES

- Aspy, C. B., Oman, R. F., Vesely, S. K., McLeroy, K., Rodine, S., & Marshall, L. (2014). Adolescent violence: The protective effects of youth assets. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 82(1), 268–276.
- Atkins, L. A., Oman, R. F., Vesely, S. K., Aspy, C. B., & McLeroy, K. (2012). Adolescent tobacco use: The protective effects of developmental assets. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 16(1), 198–205.
- Benson, P. L., Leffert, N., Scales, P. C., & Blyth, D. A. (2012). Beyond the “village” rhetoric: Creating healthy communities for children and adolescents. *Applied Developmental Science*, 2, 138–159.
- Benson, P. L., Roehlkepartain, E. C., & Sesma, A., Jr. (2012). Tapping the power of community: Building assets to strengthen substance abuse prevention. *Search Institute’s Insights & Evidence*, 2(1), 1–11.
- Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Leffert, N., & Roehlkepartain, E. C. (2007). A fragile foundation: The state of developmental assets among American youth. Search Institute.

Edwards, O. W., Mumford, V. E., & Serra-Roldan, R. (2017). A positive youth development model for students considered at-risk. *School Psychology International*, 28(1), 29–45.

Hamilton, S. F. (2002). Relating developmental research to the practice of youth development. *Contemporary Psychology: APA Review of Books*, 47(3), 309–311.

Krueger, M. A., Galovits, L., Wilder, Q., & Pick, M. (2012). *A curriculum guide for working with youth: An interactive approach*. University Outreach Press.

Oman, R. F., Vesely, S., Aspy, C. B., McLeroy, K. R., Rodine, S., & Marshall, L. (2014). The potential protective effect of youth assets on adolescent alcohol and drug use. *American Journal of Public Health*, 94(1), 1425–1430.

Rose, H. A. (2016). Asset-based development for child and youth care. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 14(4), 236–240.

Scales, P. C. (2012). Reducing risks and building developmental assets: Essential actions for promoting adolescent health. *Journal of School Health*, 69, 113–119.

Scales, P. C., Benson, P. L., Leffert, N., & Blyth, D. A. (2012). Contribution of developmental assets to the prediction of thriving among adolescents. *Applied Developmental Science*, 4, 27–46.

Scales, P. C., Foster, K. C., Mannes, M., Horst, M. A., Pinto, K. C., & Rutherford, A. (2015). School business partnerships, developmental assets, and positive outcomes among urban high school students. *Urban Education*, 40(1), 144–189.

Scales, P. C., & Leffert, N. (2014). *Developmental assets: A synthesis of the scientific research on adolescent development* (2nd ed.). Search Institute.

Scales, P. C., & Roehlkepartain, E. C. (2013). Boosting student achievement: New research on the power of developmental assets. *Search Institute's Insights and Evidence*, 1(1), 1–10.

Search Institute. (2013). Survey ordering. <http://www.search-institute.org/content/survey-order-form>

Stevens, H., & Wilkerson, K. (2015). The developmental assets and ASCA's national standards: A crosswalk review. *Professional School Counseling*, 13(4), 227–233.

Van Roekel, D. (2016). Parent, family, community involvement in education: An NEA policy brief. National Education Association. <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/PB11ParentInvolvement08.pdf>