The Influence of Parental Engagement and Family Resource Management on Community Development

Josephine Marie Macanas-Binayao

Capitol University, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600931

Received: 14 June 2026; Accepted: 20 June 2026; Published: 09 July 2026

ABSTRACT

Community development is a participatory process that enables families and individuals to work collectively, optimize available resources, and strengthen relationships to improve their quality of life. In many relocation communities, development challenges persist after resettlement due to limited livelihood opportunities and the need to rebuild social cohesion. This study examined how parental engagement and family resource management (FRM) influence community development (CD) in Barangay Libertad, Kauswagan, Lanao del Norte. Using a quantitative design, data were gathered from 100 randomly selected parent-respondents through a structured bilingual questionnaire rated on a five-point Likert scale. Descriptive statistics and regression analyses were employed to determine the relationships among variables. Results showed that parental engagement was generally high, indicating active parental participation in both family and community activities. FRM was rated very good, reflecting effective household resource allocation and sustainable practices despite economic constraints. CD was also rated very good, characterized by cooperation, shared responsibility, and active participation. Significant differences in FRM were found across family size, while no differences were observed across age, sex, or income. Regression analyses revealed that both parental engagement and FRM significantly influence community development, with FRM emerging as the stronger predictor. Among the sub-dimensions, only community involvement under parental engagement significantly influenced CD, while both resource use and sustainable development under FRM showed significant effects. The study recommends strengthening financial literacy, livelihood training and support, sustainability practices, and community participation to promote inclusive and sustainable development in relocation communities.

Keywords: sustainable community development, family management, community involvement, resource management, economic empowerment, community resources

INTRODUCTION

The family serves as the foundational unit through which values, work ethics, and social trust are cultivated (Putnam, 2020). When families manage resources effectively and engage meaningfully in their communities, they contribute to broader social cohesion and economic resilience (World Bank, 2021). Conversely, weakened family processes can strain public resources and undermine collective development efforts (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2020). Recent scholarship emphasizes that family-driven processes—particularly parental engagement and family resource management—are critical mechanisms for addressing contemporary socio-economic challenges, rapid urbanization, and climate vulnerability (UNICEF, 2022; OECD, 2021).

In relocation contexts, these family processes take on heightened significance. Displaced populations face disrupted social networks, economic instability, and unfamiliar environments that challenge traditional coping mechanisms (Yeoh & Lam, 2018). The Philippines, with its collectivist cultural values of **pakikisama** (cooperation) and **bayanihan** (community spirit), provides a compelling setting for examining how family-level behaviors influence community-level outcomes amid economic inequity, widespread labor migration, and

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue VI June 2026

recurrent natural disasters (National Economic and Development Authority, 2021; Philippine Statistics Authority, 2023).

Despite growing recognition that community development requires multi-stakeholder collaboration involving local government units (LGUs), private sector actors, and residents themselves (Ledwith & Springett, 2018), a critical research gap persists: **existing development plans for relocation sites focus predominantly on infrastructure and livelihood provision, yet lack empirical assessment of how family-level factors, specifically parental engagement and family resource management, directly influence community development outcomes**. This gap is particularly pronounced in contexts where vulnerable households must simultaneously secure livelihoods and participate in community-building activities (UNDP, 2022).

The present study addresses this gap by examining the influence of parental engagement (PE) and family resource management (FRM) on community development (CD) in a relocation site in Barangay Libertad, Kauswagan, Lanao del Norte. Approximately 350 families—previously internally displaced persons, informal settlers, and land tenants—were relocated between 2013 and 2017 through a Resettlement Action Plan sponsored primarily by a major coal-fired power plant. While the municipality of Kauswagan has achieved remarkable economic transformation, rising from fifth-class to first-class status through good governance and stakeholder engagement (UNHCR Philippines, 2023; Local Government Academy, 2020), no sustainable community development plan specific to the relocation site exists.

Anchored in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals 2030 framework emphasizing poverty reduction, quality education, and inclusive economic growth (United Nations, 2023), this study employs a mixed-methods design to: (1) quantitatively assess the relationships between PE, FRM, and CD among 100 randomly selected parent-respondents; and (2) qualitatively explore the lived experiences, challenges, and strategies of parents, government officials, and private sector representatives. The findings inform a concrete Sustainable Development Plan tailored to the relocation site, serving as a guide for residents, government agencies, sponsoring organizations, and other stakeholders in building resilient, sustainably developed communities.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized a mixed-methods design that integrated quantitative and qualitative data to examine the influence of parental engagement (PE) and family resource management (FRM) on community development (CD) in a relocation community. The quantitative component employed descriptive, correlational, and regression analyses to determine the predictive influence of PE and FRM on CD. The qualitative component, consisting of key informant interviews (KIIs) with parents, government officials, and sponsor company representatives, provided contextual depth and triangulated the quantitative findings (Guest et al., 2017).

Research Locale and Sampling

The study was conducted in the Barangay Libertad relocation site, Kauswagan, Lanao del Norte, where approximately 350 families were resettled between 2013 and 2017. The six-hectare site features 6×8 m concrete houses on 81 sqm lots, cemented streets, water connections, and a mini-market. By the time of data collection, 73 households had sold, transferred, or rented their homes, leaving 277 original relocatee households eligible for inclusion.

Using the Select Statistical Services online calculator, a sample size of 100 households was determined at a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error. A simple random sampling technique was employed, assigning unique identification numbers to each household through a random number generator. One parent per household was selected as respondent to ensure representativeness and minimize selection bias (Creswell, 2014; Etikan & Bala, 2017).

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue VI June 2026

Instrumentation

A bilingual (English–Bisaya) structured questionnaire was developed, consisting of three parts:

1. Demographic Profile: age, sex, number of children, and average monthly family income.

2. Likert-Scale Items (1 = Almost Never/Very Poor to 5 = Almost Always/Very Good):

   - Parental Engagement (PE): social capital, community involvement, role modeling
   - Family Resource Management (FRM): resource use, sustainable development
   - Community Development (CD): social cohesion, economic empowerment, education and skills development, infrastructure and resources, community engagement and participation

3. Open-Ended Questions: for qualitative insights during KIIs.

The instrument was grounded in Social Capital Theory, Ecological Systems Theory, Family Resource Management Theory, Human Capital Theory, and Asset-Based Community Development Theory, ensuring theoretical coherence between household-level and community-level constructs.

Validity and Reliability

Content Validity. Three doctoral-level experts validated the instrument for relevance, clarity, consistency, and comprehensiveness. Validators included:

- A Doctor of Management specializing in regional and rural development planning
- A Doctor of Public Administration with expertise in community development and law
- A Doctor of Philosophy specializing in social work, sustainable community development, and language

Feedback was consolidated and used to refine item wording, structure, and alignment with research objectives. The iterative validation process established strong content validity.

Reliability. A pilot test with 30 parent-respondents (excluded from the main sample) was conducted to assess internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were computed for each scale:

Variable	Cronbach's α	Interpretation
Parental Engagement	0.730	Acceptable
Family Resource Management	0.891	Good
Community Development	0.901	Excellent

Assumptions Testing. Prior to inferential analyses, assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were examined. Normality was assessed using Shapiro–Wilk tests and visual inspection of histograms and Q–Q plots. Given minor deviations from normality, non-parametric tests (Mann–Whitney U and Kruskal–Wallis) were used for group comparisons. Regression diagnostics confirmed the absence of multicollinearity (VIF < 2.0) and acceptable residual distributions.

Data Collection. Data collection occurred from late November to mid-December 2025, following approval from the Dean of the Graduate School, Capitol University, and permission from the sponsor company's Community Relations Manager. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, emphasizing voluntary participation, confidentiality, and academic use of data. Two trained community enumerators conducted face-to-face, house-to-house surveys at varied times (mornings, evenings, weekends) to maximize participation. Each survey lasted approximately 15–20 minutes.

RESULTS

Community Development. Community development was rated Very Good overall (M = 4.40, SD = 0.68), indicating strong manifestation across the five dimensions. Community engagement and participation ranked highest (M = 4.53, SD = 0.64), followed by education and skills development (M = 4.40, SD = 0.62) and infrastructure and resources (M = 4.40, SD = 0.69). Economic empowerment was lowest (M = 4.31, SD = 0.77), though still interpreted as Very Good. These results suggest that residents perceive their community as cohesive and participatory, with relatively more variability in economic opportunities.

Differences in Family Resource Management by Profile. Kruskal–Wallis and Mann–Whitney tests revealed no significant differences in FRM by age ($p = 0.105$), sex ($p = 0.963$), or income ($p = 0.147$). However, a significant difference was found by number of children ($p = 0.016$). Post hoc tests showed that families with seven or more children had significantly lower FRM levels than those with 1–2 ($p = 0.010$) and 3–4 children ($p = 0.032$). This indicates that larger families face greater challenges in managing limited resources effectively.

Differences in Community Development by Profile. No significant differences were found in CD by age ($p = 0.225$), sex ($p = 0.141$), number of children ($p = 0.838$), or income ($p = 0.181$), suggesting that perceptions of community development are consistent across demographic groups.

Regression Analyses

Parental Engagement → Community Development. Simple regression analysis showed that PE significantly influences CD ($F = 50.426$, $p < 0.001$), explaining 34.0% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.340$, adj $R^2 = 0.333$). The regression equation:

$$CD = 2.649 + 0.428(PE)$$

A one-unit increase in PE corresponds to a 0.428-unit increase in CD ($\beta = 0.583$, $t = 7.101$, $p < 0.001$).

When disaggregated, only Community Involvement significantly influenced CD ($\beta = 0.356$, $p = 0.001$), while Social Capital ($p = 0.073$) and Role Modeling ($p = 0.135$) were not significant.

Family Resource Management → Community Development. FRM exhibited a stronger influence on CD ($F = 153.641$, $p < 0.001$), explaining 61.1% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.611$, adj $R^2 = 0.607$). The regression equation:

$$CD = 0.642 + 0.866(FRM)$$

A one-unit increase in FRM leads to a 0.866-unit increase in CD ($\beta = 0.781$, $t = 12.395$, $p < 0.001$).

Both Resource Use ($\beta = 0.443$, $p < 0.001$) and Sustainable Development ($\beta = 0.433$, $p < 0.001$) significantly influenced CD, contributing almost equally to the model ($F = 76.042$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.611$).

Combined Model: PE and FRM → Community Development. When both predictors were entered simultaneously, the model remained highly significant ($F = 84.236$, $p < 0.001$), explaining 63.5% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.635$, adj $R^2 = 0.627$). The regression equation:

$$CD = 0.605 + 0.140(PE) + 0.742(FRM)$$

Both predictors were significant: PE ($\beta = 0.191$, $p = 0.013$) and FRM ($\beta = 0.670$, $p < 0.001$). FRM emerged as the stronger predictor, being 3.5 times more influential than PE. FRM's effect remained robust (only 14% reduction in β when PE was added), while PE's effect decreased by 67%, indicating that FRM accounts for a larger portion of the variation in CD.

DISCUSSION

The findings demonstrate that household-level processes—specifically parental engagement and family resource management—play a crucial role in shaping community development outcomes. The results affirm that family dynamics extend beyond the household, influencing collective well-being and local development.

Parental Engagement and Community Development

Parental engagement significantly contributes to community development, particularly through community involvement, which represents active participation in local activities and decision-making. This dimension's significance underscores that behavioral engagement, rather than relational or modeling aspects alone, drives community-level outcomes. However, the overall explanatory power of PE ($R^2 = 0.340$) suggests that while engagement matters, it operates alongside broader structural and resource factors.

Family Resource Management as the Stronger Predictor

FRM emerged as the most powerful influence on community development ($R^2 = 0.611$; $\beta = 0.781$). Both resource use and sustainable development dimensions were significant, indicating that effective management of household resources and sustainability-oriented practices directly enhance community well-being. Families that manage resources efficiently are better positioned to participate in collective initiatives, maintain stable livelihoods, and contribute to local development. This finding aligns with Family Resource Management Theory and Asset-Based Community Development Theory, which emphasize that resource optimization at the household level strengthens community resilience.

Combined Predictive Model

When PE and FRM were analyzed together, the model explained 63.5% of the variance in CD, confirming that both constructs are essential but FRM is the stronger driver ($\beta = 0.670$ vs $\beta = 0.191$). The reduction in PE's effect when FRM was controlled suggests that effective resource management enhances the capacity of parents to engage meaningfully in community life. This interplay highlights the interdependence of economic stability and social participation in sustaining community development.

Challenges in Community Development: Qualitative Insights

Key informant interviews with parents, local government officials, and the sponsor company revealed several persistent challenges that contextualize the quantitative findings.

Parents' Perspectives. Parents identified limited livelihood opportunities as the foremost challenge, with many relying on irregular informal work. This economic insecurity constrains their ability to invest in education, health, and community activities. Access to basic services, while improved, remains inadequate, particularly regarding healthcare facilities and transportation. Social cohesion, though generally strong, is occasionally strained by conflicts over resource allocation and differing expectations among relocatees from diverse backgrounds. These challenges underscore the need for targeted economic interventions and conflict resolution mechanisms. Recent studies on relocation communities in Southeast Asia report similar findings, with economic insecurity identified as the primary barrier to successful resettlement (Wilmsen et al., 2019; Tilt et al., 2019).

Government Officials' Perspectives. Local government officials highlighted budget constraints as a major barrier to providing comprehensive services to the relocation site. Limited technical capacity and coordination challenges among different agencies further hinder effective program implementation. Officials also noted that community participation, while valued, is inconsistent, with some residents remaining passive or disengaged. These insights point to the need for capacity-building support for local government units and strategies to enhance sustained community engagement. Research on decentralization in the Philippines confirms that local government units face significant fiscal and technical constraints that limit their ability to deliver services effectively (Manasan, 2017; Capuno et al., 2016).

Sponsor Company's Perspectives. The sponsor company emphasized the difficulty of balancing short-term relief with long-term development goals. While initial relocation support (housing, basic services) was provided, sustaining these interventions and transitioning to community-led development has proven challenging. The company also noted that dependency mindsets among some relocatees hinder self-reliance and entrepreneurship. This highlights the importance of designing interventions that promote agency and ownership rather than passive beneficiary roles (Idemudia, 2017; Jamali & Karam, 2018). Corporate social responsibility literature emphasizes the need for exit strategies and capacity-building approaches that foster community self-sufficiency (Visser, 2018; Muthuri & Gilbert, 2011).

Synthesis and Implications

The findings collectively demonstrate that family-level processes, particularly resource management, are critical drivers of community development in relocation settings. The strong predictive power of family resource management (61.1% of variance) suggests that household economic stability and adaptive capacity form the foundation upon which broader community progress is built. Parental engagement, while significant, plays a complementary role, primarily through role modeling and social capital formation.

The lack of significant demographic differences in family resource management and community development (except for family size) indicates that challenges and capacities are widely shared across the relocation community, reinforcing the need for universal rather than targeted interventions. However, the vulnerability of larger families should be explicitly addressed through tailored support mechanisms.

The qualitative findings reveal that despite high self-reported levels of engagement and resource management, structural barriers—limited livelihoods, inadequate infrastructure, budget constraints, and coordination gaps—continue to impede community development. This suggests that while family-level capacities are strong, enabling environmental conditions are insufficient. Policy interventions must therefore address both household capacity-building and systemic barriers.

For relocation-site development policy, these findings imply that:

1. Economic empowerment programs (livelihood training, microfinance, cooperative development) should be prioritized. Evidence from recent systematic reviews shows that integrated livelihood programs significantly improve household welfare and community outcomes (Cho & Honorati, 2014; McKenzie, 2017).

2. Financial literacy and resource management training should be integrated into community development initiatives. Meta-analyses demonstrate that financial education programs improve savings behavior, budgeting practices, and long-term planning (Kaiser & Menkhoff, 2017; Steinert et al., 2018).

3. Infrastructure investments (healthcare, transportation, markets) are essential to support household productivity. Research on rural and community development confirms that infrastructure access is a key determinant of poverty reduction and community well-being (Aggarwal, 2018; Asher & Novosad, 2020).

4. Multi-stakeholder coordination among local government units, private sector, and civil society must be strengthened. Collaborative governance models have been shown to enhance service delivery and development outcomes in resource-constrained settings (Ansell & Gash, 2018; Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015).

5. Family size-sensitive programming should ensure that larger households receive adequate support. Targeted social protection programs that account for household composition have proven effective in reducing vulnerability (Bastagli et al., 2016; Hidrobo et al., 2018).

6. Parental engagement initiatives (role modeling programs, community organizing) should complement economic interventions to maximize synergistic effects. Research demonstrates that combining economic and social interventions produces greater impacts than either approach alone (Banerjee et al., 2017; Handa et al., 2018).

Proposed Sustainable Community Development Plan

Rationale and Framework

Based on the empirical findings that family resource management explains 61.1% of variance in community development outcomes, this sustainability plan prioritizes economic empowerment and livelihood development as foundational interventions. The plan addresses the structural barriers identified through qualitative data—limited livelihood opportunities, inadequate infrastructure, budget constraints, and coordination gaps—while leveraging the community's existing strengths in resource management and civic participation.

The plan adopts a phased implementation approach over three years, organized around five strategic pillars: (1) organizational capacity building, (2) human capital development, (3) economic infrastructure and livelihood support, (4) environmental sustainability and social services, and (5) monitoring and adaptive management. Each phase builds on the previous one, creating a cumulative pathway toward self-sustaining community development.

Phase 1: Organizational Foundation (Year 1, Quarter 1)

Objective: Establish formal community structures to enable collective action and resource mobilization.

Key Activities:

- Registration of Homeowners' Association (HOA) to provide legal identity and governance structure
- Formation and registration of multi-purpose cooperative to facilitate collective economic activities
- Baseline survey to establish development indicators and household profiles

Lead Stakeholders: HOA, Local Government Unit (LGU), Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)

Expected Outcomes: Legally recognized community organizations with defined leadership, membership base, and operational guidelines; baseline data for monitoring progress.

Budget Allocation: ₱100,000 (registration fees, legal documentation, survey implementation)

Performance Indicators:

- HOA and cooperative legally registered within 3 months
- At least 80% of households enrolled as HOA members
- Baseline data collected from 100% of households
- Organizational bylaws and governance structure approved

Phase 2: Capacity Building (Year 1, Quarter 2)

Objective: Strengthen household and organizational capacities in financial management, entrepreneurship, and governance.

Key Activities:

- Leadership and governance training for HOA and cooperative officers
- Financial literacy and bookkeeping workshops for households (addressing FRM capacity)
- Digital marketing and e-commerce training to expand market access
- Livelihood skills training in food processing, aquaculture, and sustainable agriculture

Lead Stakeholders: Department of Agriculture (DA), Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA), DTI, Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR), LGU, academic and private sector partners

Expected Outcomes: At least 80% of households complete financial literacy training; 50 community members trained in livelihood skills; functional cooperative management team.

Budget Allocation: ₱100,000 (training materials, facilitator fees, venue costs)

Performance Indicators:

- 80% of households complete financial literacy training
- 50+ community members receive livelihood skills certification
- 100% of HOA/cooperative officers complete governance training
- Pre- and post-training assessment shows 30% improvement in financial knowledge scores
- At least 30 households develop business plans

Phase 3: Livelihood and Infrastructure Development (Year 1, Quarters 3-4)

Objective: Establish income-generating enterprises and productive infrastructure to strengthen household economic stability.

Key Activities:

- Establishment of community-based food processing center or home-based enterprise network
- Development of waste recycling facility to generate income and address environmental concerns
- Market linkage development with Iligan City and neighboring municipalities
- Access to microfinance and cooperative credit facilities

Lead Stakeholders: LGU, DTI, Department of Science and Technology (DOST), cooperative, private sector partners

Expected Outcomes: At least one operational community enterprise generating income for 30+ households; functional waste management system; established market channels; 50% of households accessing credit facilities.

Budget Allocation: ₱1M to 5M (infrastructure construction, equipment, initial working capital; actual amount depends on enterprise model selected through participatory planning)

Funding Sources: LGU development funds, DTI Shared Service Facilities Program, DOST Community Empowerment through Science and Technology (CEST), private sector corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs, cooperative member equity contributions.

Performance Indicators:

- At least 1 community enterprise operational by end of Year 1
- 30+ households earning supplementary income from enterprise
- Average household income increase of 20% from baseline

- 50% of households access microfinance or cooperative loans
- Established supply agreements with at least 3 buyers/distributors
- Waste recycling facility diverts 40% of community waste from landfills

Phase 4: Environmental and Social Programs (Year 2)

Objective: Enhance quality of life through environmental management and expanded social services.

Key Activities:

- Community-based waste management and sanitation programs
- Eco-tourism development leveraging natural assets (if applicable)
- Educational support programs (scholarship funds, learning centers)
- Health and nutrition programs in partnership with local health units

Lead Stakeholders: Department of Education (DepEd), Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Department of Tourism (DOT), DOST, LGU

Expected Outcomes: 90% household participation in waste segregation; functional eco-tourism initiative (if feasible); 100% school-age children enrolled; improved health indicators.

Budget Allocation: ₱200,000 (program implementation, materials, promotional activities)

Performance Indicators:

- 90% of households practice waste segregation
- 100% school-age children enrolled and attending regularly
- At least 20 households participate in eco-tourism activities (if applicable)
- 50% reduction in waterborne diseases from baseline
- Community health center operational with regular services
- At least 10 students receive educational scholarships

Phase 5: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Institutionalization (Year 3 onward)

Objective: Ensure sustainability through systematic monitoring, adaptive management, and policy integration.

Key Activities:

- Annual impact assessment using baseline indicators (FRM, PE, CD levels)
- Participatory evaluation with community members and stakeholders
- Documentation of best practices and lessons learned
- Integration of successful interventions into LGU development plans and budgets
- Establishment of community-managed sustainability fund

Lead Stakeholders: LGU, DTI, DOST, cooperative, academic partners

Expected Outcomes: Documented evidence of development progress; institutionalized programs in LGU budget; self-sustaining community enterprises; replication in other relocation sites.

Budget Allocation: ₱100,000 annually (monitoring activities, evaluation studies, documentation)

Performance Indicators:

- Annual impact assessment completed with community participation
- Community development score increases by 25% from baseline by Year 3
- At least 2 successful interventions integrated into LGU annual budget
- Community sustainability fund reaches ₱500,000 by Year 3
- Best practices documented and shared with at least 2 other relocation sites

Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

A. Monitoring System

1. Input Monitoring

- **Financial resources:** Quarterly budget utilization reports tracking expenditures against planned allocations
- **Human resources:** Attendance records for training sessions, volunteer hours contributed
- **Material resources:** Inventory of equipment, facilities, and materials procured
- **Stakeholder engagement:** Meeting attendance logs, partnership agreements signed

2. Process Monitoring

- **Activity implementation:** Monthly progress reports documenting activities completed vs. planned
- **Timeline adherence:** Gantt chart updates showing delays or accelerations
- **Quality assurance:** Training evaluation forms, facility inspection checklists
- **Participation rates:** Household enrollment and engagement tracking by demographic group

3. Output Monitoring

- **Immediate deliverables:** Number of trainings conducted, enterprises established, infrastructure completed
- **Beneficiary reach:** Number and profile of households/individuals served
- **Service delivery:** Volume of products sold, loans disbursed, services provided
- **Organizational development:** HOA/cooperative membership growth, meeting frequency

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue VI June 2026

B. Evaluation Design

1. Baseline Assessment (Phase 1)

- **Household survey:** Replicate study instruments measuring FRM, PE, and CD levels
- **Economic indicators:** Income, savings, debt levels, employment status
- **Social indicators:** Community participation rates, organizational membership, social networks
- **Infrastructure inventory:** Housing conditions, access to utilities, public facilities
- **Health and education:** School enrollment, health service utilization, nutritional status

2. Midterm Evaluation (End of Year 2)

- **Outcome assessment:** Changes in FRM, PE, and CD scores from baseline
- **Economic impact:** Income changes, enterprise profitability, employment generation
- **Capacity development:** Knowledge and skills assessment, organizational functionality
- **Process evaluation:** Implementation fidelity, stakeholder satisfaction, challenges encountered
- **Adaptive management:** Identification of necessary adjustments based on findings

3. Endline Evaluation (End of Year 3)

- **Impact assessment:** Long-term changes in community development outcomes
- **Sustainability analysis:** Financial viability of enterprises, institutional embedding, community ownership
- **Cost-effectiveness:** Return on investment, cost per beneficiary, efficiency analysis
- **Replication potential:** Transferability of model, scalability considerations
- **Comparative analysis:** Comparison with control communities or national benchmarks

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Economic Indicators:

- Average household monthly income (target: 30% increase from baseline by Year 3)
- Household savings rate (target: 50% of households save regularly)
- Community enterprise revenue (target: ₱500,000 annually by Year 3)
- Employment generation (target: 50 full-time equivalent jobs created)
- Poverty incidence (target: 20% reduction from baseline)

Social Indicators:

- Community participation rate (target: 80% of households active in community activities)
- HOA/cooperative membership (target: 90% of households)

- Social capital index (target: 25% increase from baseline)
- Educational attainment (target: 100% elementary completion rate)
- Health outcomes (target: 50% reduction in preventable diseases)

Environmental Indicators:

- Waste diversion rate (target: 60% of waste recycled or composted)
- Sanitation coverage (target: 100% of households with proper facilities)
- Environmental compliance (target: zero violations of environmental regulations)
- Green space development (target: 10% of community area designated for parks/gardens)

Governance Indicators:

- Organizational functionality score (target: 80% on governance assessment tool)
- Financial transparency (target: 100% of financial reports publicly disclosed)
- Member satisfaction (target: 85% satisfaction rate)
- Policy integration (target: 100% of successful interventions in LGU plans)

D. Data Collection Methods

Quantitative Methods:

- **Household surveys:** Annual administration of FRM, PE, and CD instruments
- **Enterprise records:** Monthly financial statements, sales reports, employment data
- **Administrative data:** LGU records, school enrollment, health facility statistics
- **Observational checklists:** Infrastructure condition assessments, facility utilization counts

Qualitative Methods:

- **Focus group discussions:** Semi-annual sessions with different household segments (by family size, income level)
- **Key informant interviews:** Annual interviews with HOA/cooperative leaders, LGU officials, partner agencies
- **Case studies:** In-depth documentation of 10 households tracking development trajectories
- **Participatory evaluation:** Community workshops using Most Significant Change technique

Mixed Methods:

- **Participatory rural appraisal:** Community mapping, seasonal calendars, wealth ranking
- **Outcome harvesting:** Documentation of unexpected outcomes and emergent impacts
- **Social network analysis:** Mapping of community relationships and information flows

Data Management and Reporting

Data Management:

- Centralized database maintained by LGU Planning Office with cooperative access
- Data quality assurance protocols including validation checks and audit trails
- Confidentiality and ethical standards following Data Privacy Act compliance
- Regular data backups and secure storage systems

Reporting Schedule:

- **Monthly:** Activity progress reports from implementing partners
- **Quarterly:** Consolidated progress reports to LGU and funding partners
- **Semi-annually:** Community feedback sessions presenting progress and challenges
- **Annually:** Comprehensive evaluation reports with recommendations
- **End of program:** Final impact assessment and sustainability analysis

Reporting Formats:

- Executive summaries for policymakers and funders (2-3 pages)
- Technical reports for implementing partners and researchers (20-30 pages)
- Community-friendly infographics and visual presentations
- Academic publications in peer-reviewed journals
- Policy briefs for replication in other sites

F. Utilization of Evaluation Findings

Adaptive Management:

- Quarterly review meetings to discuss monitoring data and adjust implementation
- Rapid response protocols for addressing emerging challenges
- Flexible budget reallocation based on performance and needs

Accountability:

- Public disclosure of evaluation findings through community assemblies
- Transparent reporting to funding partners and oversight bodies
- Grievance mechanisms for community members to raise concerns

Learning and Knowledge Management:

- Documentation of lessons learned and best practices

- Peer learning exchanges with other relocation communities
- Contribution to evidence base on resettlement and community development

Policy Influence:

- Presentation of findings to LGU council for policy integration
- Engagement with national agencies (HUDCC, DSWD) for policy advocacy
- Dissemination through academic and practitioner networks

Success Indicators and Sustainability Mechanisms

The plan's effectiveness will be measured through the comprehensive KPI framework outlined above, with particular emphasis on:

- **Economic self-sufficiency:** Household income growth and enterprise profitability
- **Social cohesion:** Community participation rates and organizational strength
- **Environmental stewardship:** Waste management and sanitation improvements
- **Institutional capacity:** Governance functionality and policy integration

Sustainability will be ensured through:

- **Economic self-sufficiency:** Revenue-generating enterprises reduce dependence on external funding
- **Institutional embedding:** Integration into LGU plans ensures continued support beyond project duration
- **Community ownership:** Participatory planning and management build local commitment and accountability
- **Multi-stakeholder partnerships:** Diversified support base reduces vulnerability to single-source funding changes
- **Capacity building:** Skills and knowledge remain within the community, creating lasting human capital
- **Sustainability fund:** Community-managed fund provides resources for maintenance and future initiatives

Risk Mitigation

Potential challenges and mitigation strategies include:

Limited initial capital: Phased implementation allows for incremental resource mobilization; multiple funding sources reduce dependency; cooperative member equity contributions ensure shared investment.

Coordination challenges: Establishment of multi-stakeholder coordinating committee with clear roles, regular meetings, and memoranda of agreement; designated program coordinator to facilitate inter-agency collaboration.

Market risks for enterprises: Feasibility studies and market research precede major investments; diversified product/service portfolio reduces dependence on single market; long-term supply agreements with institutional buyers.

Leadership turnover: Succession planning and institutional memory through documentation; training of multiple leaders at different levels; term limits with staggered elections to ensure continuity.

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue VI June 2026

External shocks (economic, environmental): Diversified livelihood base reduces vulnerability; emergency fund establishment through sustainability fund; insurance mechanisms for enterprises and critical infrastructure; climate-resilient infrastructure design.

Low community participation: Inclusive consultation processes ensuring all demographic groups represented; flexible scheduling of activities to accommodate work schedules; incentive structures recognizing volunteer contributions; transparent communication of benefits and progress.

Monitoring and evaluation capacity gaps: Partnership with academic institutions for technical support; training of community members as citizen monitors; use of simple, user-friendly data collection tools; external evaluation for credibility and objectivity.

Proposed Implementation Plan for Sustainable Community Development

Phase & Timeline	Key Objectives & Activities	Lead Stakeholders	Key Performance Indicators
Phase 1: Organizational Foundation Timeline: Year 1, Q1Budget: ₱100,000	Objective: Establish formal community structures Activities:• HOA registration• Cooperative formation• Baseline survey	• HOA• LGU• DTI	• 80% household HOA membership• Baseline data from 100% households• Organizations registered within 3 months
Phase 2: Capacity Building Timeline: Year 1, Q2Budget: ₱100,000	Objective: Strengthen household and organizational capacities Activities:• Financial literacy training• Livelihood skills training• Leadership development• Digital marketing training	• DA• BFAR• TESDA• DTI• BIR• LGU• Academic partners	• 80% complete financial literacy training• 50+ receive livelihood certification• 100% officers complete governance training• 30% improvement in knowledge scores• 30 households develop business plans
Phase 3: Livelihood & Infrastructure Development Timeline: Year 1, Q3-Q4Budget: ₱1M–5M	Objective: Establish income-generating enterprises Activities:• Food processing center or home-based enterprises• Waste recycling facility• Market linkage development• Microfinance access	• LGU• DTI• DOST• Cooperative• Private sector partners	• 1+ operational community enterprise• 30+ households earning supplementary income• 20% average household income increase• 50% of households access credit• Supply agreements with 3+ buyers• 40% waste diversion rate
Phase 4: Environmental & Social Programs Timeline: Year 2Budget: ₱200,000	Objective: Enhance quality of life and environmental sustainability Activities:• Community-based waste management• Eco-tourism development• Educational support programs• Health and nutrition programs	• DepEd• DENR• DOT• DOST• LGU	• 90% practice waste segregation• 100% school-age children enrolled• 20+ households in eco-tourism activities• 50% reduction in waterborne diseases• 10 students receive scholarships
Phase 5: Monitoring & Institutionalization Timeline: Year 3 onward Budget: ₱100,000/year	Objective: Ensure sustainability and policy integration Activities:• Annual impact assessment• Participatory evaluation• Best practice documentation• LGU budget integration• Sustainability fund establishment	• LGU• DTI• DOST• Cooperative• Academic partners	• 25% increase in CD score from baseline• 2+ interventions integrated in LGU budget• Sustainability fund reaches ₱500,000• Best practices shared with 2+ sites• Annual evaluation completed

Note: HOA = Homeowners' Association; LGU = Local Government Unit; DTI = Department of Trade and Industry; DA = Department of Agriculture; BFAR = Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources; TESDA = Technical Education and Skills Development Authority; BIR = Bureau of Internal Revenue; DOST = Department of Science and Technology; DepEd = Department of Education; DENR = Department of Environment and Natural Resources; DOT = Department of Tourism; CD = Community Development.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the influence of parental engagement and family resource management on community development in a post-relocation settlement in Libertad, Kauswagan, Lanao del Norte, Philippines. Findings demonstrate that both household-level processes significantly predict community development outcomes, with family resource management emerging as the stronger predictor compared to parental engagement. Among parental engagement dimensions, community involvement was the most influential, while resource use and sustainable development practices were equally critical within family resource management. Family size was identified as a significant moderator, with larger households perceiving lower community development outcomes, likely due to increased resource strain and competing demands.

These findings underscore the primacy of economic stability and resource capacity in enabling community participation and development in resettlement contexts. The qualitative data from key informants corroborated these patterns, revealing that despite strong household-level capacities, structural barriers—limited livelihood opportunities, inadequate infrastructure, budget constraints, and inter-agency coordination gaps—continue to impede progress. This suggests that while family-level resilience is high, enabling environmental conditions remain insufficient.

The proposed sustainability plan addresses these priorities through integrated interventions combining economic empowerment, infrastructure development, and participatory governance. Policymakers and development practitioners should prioritize livelihood support, financial literacy programs, and infrastructure investments that strengthen household resource management capacity. Complementary interventions that foster parental engagement—particularly through community organizing and participatory decision-making—can amplify these effects and build social capital.

The study's cross-sectional design limits causal inference; longitudinal research is needed to track how household resource management and parental engagement evolve over time and influence long-term community resilience. Future studies should also explore the mechanisms through which family size affects development perceptions and test integrated interventions combining economic empowerment with social capital strengthening in diverse relocation contexts. Additionally, comparative research across multiple relocation sites would enhance the generalizability of findings and identify context-specific adaptation strategies.

Ultimately, this research affirms that sustainable community development in relocation sites must be built on a foundation of household economic stability, complemented by active civic participation and supportive institutional frameworks. The integration of quantitative and qualitative evidence provides a robust empirical basis for policy formulation and program design in resettlement contexts, contributing to both scholarly understanding and practical application in community development practice.

REFERENCES

1. Aggarwal, S. (2018). Do rural roads create pathways out of poverty? Evidence from India. Journal of Development Economics, 133, 375–395. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2018.01.004
2. Aldrich, D. P. (2017). The importance of social capital in building community resilience. In W. Yan & W. Galloway (Eds.), Rethinking resilience, adaptation and transformation in a time of change (pp. 357–364). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50171-0_23
3. Aldrich, D. P., & Kyota, E. (2017). Creating community resilience through elder-led physical and social infrastructure. Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness, 11(1), 120–126. https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2016.65
4. Alkire, S., Roche, J. M., & Vaz, A. (2017). Changes over time in multidimensional poverty: Methodology and results for 34 countries. World Development, 94, 232–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.01.011
5. Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2018). Collaborative platforms as a governance strategy. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 28(1), 16–32. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mux030

6. Asher, S., & Novosad, P. (2020). Rural roads and local economic development. American Economic Review, 110(3), 797–823. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20180268
7. Asian Development Bank. (2022). Asian Development Outlook 2022: Mobilizing taxes for development. https://www.adb.org/publications/asian-development-outlook-2022
8. Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., & Sharma, G. (2017). Long-term effects of the targeting the ultra poor program (NBER Working Paper No. 23743). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w23743
9. Bastagli, F., Hagen-Zanker, J., Harman, L., Barca, V., Sturge, G., Schmidt, T., & Pellerano, L. (2016). Cash transfers: What does the evidence say? A rigorous review of programme impact and of the role of design and implementation features. Overseas Development Institute. https://odi.org/en/publications/cash-transfers-what-does-the-evidence-say/
10. Bernardo, A. B., Clemente, J. A., & Nalipay, M. J. (2018). Social axioms as social foundations of locus-of-hope: A study in three Asian cultural groups. Personality and Individual Differences, 135, 197–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.07.026
11. Buvinic, M., & Furst-Nichols, R. (2016). Promoting women's economic empowerment: What works? World Bank Research Observer, 31(1), 59–101. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkv019
12. Capuno, J. J., Kraft, A. D., & Tan, C. A., Jr. (2016). Measuring local government unit performance: Challenges and opportunities. Philippine Review of Economics, 53(1–2), 139–165. https://doi.org/10.37907/3ERP0202J
13. Cernea, M. M., & Maldonado, J. K. (2018). Challenging the prevailing paradigm of displacement and resettlement: Risks, impoverishment, legacies, solutions. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315107547
14. Cho, Y., & Honorati, M. (2014). Entrepreneurship programs in developing countries: A meta regression analysis. Labour Economics, 28, 110–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2014.03.011
15. Christens, B. D., Collura, J. J., & Tahir, F. (2016). Critical hopefulness: A person-centered analysis of the intersection of cognitive and emotional empowerment. American Journal of Community Psychology, 58(1–2), 170–184. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12047
16. David, E. J. R., & Macaranas, M. A. (2022). Filipino American psychology: Historical foundations, current trends, and future directions. Asian American Journal of Psychology, 13(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/aap0000251
17. Deaton, A. (2018). The analysis of household surveys: A microeconometric approach to development policy (Reissue ed.). World Bank Publications. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1331-3
18. Emerson, K., & Nabatchi, T. (2015). Collaborative governance regimes. Georgetown University Press.
19. Handa, S., Natali, L., Seidenfeld, D., Tembo, G., & Davis, B. (2018). Can unconditional cash transfers raise long-term living standards? Evidence from Zambia. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 10(1), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20160548
20. Hidrobo, M., Hoddinott, J., Kumar, N., & Olivier, M. (2018). Social protection, food security, and asset formation. World Development, 101, 88–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.08.014
21. Idemudia, U. (2017). Environmental business–NGO partnerships in Nigeria: Issues and prospects. Business Strategy and the Environment, 26(2), 265–276. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.1919
22. Jamali, D., & Karam, C. (2018). Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study. International Journal of Management Reviews, 20(1), 32–61. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12112
23. Jeynes, W. (2018). A practical model for school leaders to encourage parental involvement and parental engagement. School Leadership & Management, 38(2), 147–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2018.1434767
24. Kaiser, T., & Menkhoff, L. (2017). Does financial education impact financial literacy and financial behavior, and if so, when? The World Bank Economic Review, 31(3), 611–630. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhx018
25. Krishna, A. (2017). The broken ladder: The paradox and potential of India's one-billion. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316848319

26. Lawson, D. W., Schaffnit, S. B., Hassan, A., Ngadaya, E., Ngowi, B., Mfinanga, S. G., James, S., & Urassa, M. (2017). Father absence and child survival in rural Tanzania. Evolution and Human Behavior, 38(6), 734–744. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2017.07.003
27. Ledwith, M. (2020). Community development: A critical and radical approach (3rd ed.). Policy Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvs32rqb
28. Ma, X., Shen, J., Krenn, H. Y., Hu, S., & Yuan, J. (2016). A meta-analysis of the relationship between learning outcomes and parental involvement during early childhood education and early elementary education. Educational Psychology Review, 28(4), 771–801. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9351-1
29. Macapagal, M. E. J., Galang, A. J. R., & Bigornia-Vitug, N. (2020). Pakikipagkapwa and prosocial behavior: Examining the link between Filipino relational values and helping behavior. Philippine Journal of Psychology, 53(1), 1–24.
30. Manasan, R. G. (2017). Analyzing the fiscal performance of local government units: The case of provinces (PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2017-02). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://www.pids.gov.ph/publication/discussion-papers/analyzing-the-fiscal-performance-of-local-government-units-the-case-of-provinces
31. McKenzie, D. (2017). How effective are active labor market policies in developing countries? A critical review of recent evidence. The World Bank Research Observer, 32(2), 127–154. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkx001
32. Muthuri, J. N., & Gilbert, V. (2011). An institutional analysis of corporate social responsibility in Kenya. Journal of Business Ethics, 98(3), 467–483. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0588-9
33. Narayan, D., Pritchett, L., & Kapoor, S. (2018). Moving out of poverty: Success from the bottom up. World Bank Publications. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-7216-6
34. OECD. (2019). Education at a Glance 2019: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/f8d7880d-en
35. Patel, V., Burns, J. K., Dhingra, M., Tarver, L., Kohrt, B. A., & Lund, C. (2018). Income inequality and depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the association and a scoping review of mechanisms. World Psychiatry, 17(1), 76–89. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20492
36. Philippine Statistics Authority. (2023). 2021 Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES): Final report. https://psa.gov.ph/content/2021-family-income-and-expenditure-survey-fies-final-report
37. Ridley, M., Rao, G., Schilbach, F., & Patel, V. (2020). Poverty, depression, and anxiety: Causal evidence and mechanisms. Science, 370(6522), Article eaay0214. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay0214
38. Schilbach, F., Schofield, H., & Mullainathan, S. (2016). The psychological lives of the poor. American Economic Review, 106(5), 435–440. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20161101
39. Sear, R., Sheppard, P., & Coall, D. A. (2019). Cross-cultural evidence does not support universal acceleration of puberty in father-absent households. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 374(1770), Article 20180124. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0124
40. Speer, P. W., Christens, B. D., Peterson, N. A., & Reid, R. J. (2019). Can community organizing increase political efficacy? A longitudinal field experiment. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 29(3), 248–258. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2398
41. Steinert, J. I., Zenker, J., Filipiak, U., Movsisyan, A., Cluver, L. D., & Shenderovich, Y. (2018). Do saving promotion interventions increase household savings, consumption, and investments in Sub-Saharan Africa? A systematic review and meta-analysis. World Development, 104, 238–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.12.009
42. Tilt, B., Braun, Y., & He, D. (2019). Social impacts of large dam projects: A comparison of international case studies and implications for best practice. Journal of Environmental Management, 249, Article 109400. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109400
43. United Nations Development Programme. (2022). Human Development Report 2021-22: Uncertain times, unsettled lives. https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2021-22
44. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. (2021). Asia and the Pacific SDG Progress Report 2021. https://www.unescap.org/kp/2021/asia-and-pacific-sdg-progress-report-2021

45. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2020). Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and education. UNESCO Publishing. https://doi.org/10.54676/UZQV8501
46. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2020). Global trends: Forced displacement in 2019. https://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2019/
47. Visser, W. (2018). Sustainable frontiers: Unlocking change through business, leadership and innovation. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351285803
48. Westoby, P., & Shevellar, L. (2020). A guide to community development: Connecting communities and creating change. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429279713
49. Wilmsen, B., Adjartey, D., & van Hulten, A. (2019). Challenging the risks-based model of involuntary resettlement using evidence from the Bui Dam, Ghana. International Journal of Water Resources Development, 35(4), 682–700. https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2018.1471390
50. World Bank. (2018). Women, Business and the Law 2018. World Bank Group. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1252-1
51. World Bank. (2020). Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2020: Reversals of fortune. World Bank Group. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1602-4