

Acceptance and Compliance of Community Members on the Right of the Child

Dianne Grace A. Aquitania and Jeetre D. Trinidad
STI West Negros University
Corazon Locsin Montelibano Memorial Regional Hospital
dian029@yahoo.com/trinidadjeetre@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5425-7905>
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7026-9517>

Abstract

This study investigated the level of acceptance and the extent of compliance regarding the rights of the child within a local community, specifically focusing on the categories of survival, development, protection, and participation. Using a descriptive research design, data were analyzed to determine how community characteristics—such as age, sex, and educational attainment—influence perceptions and the implementation of these rights. Findings revealed a high overall level of acceptance; however, participation rights garnered the lowest mean score among the categories. Similarly, while compliance was generally rated to a very great extent, development rights showed the lowest level of compliance. Statistical analysis indicated that demographic variables, particularly age and educational attainment, significantly influenced the level of acceptance and compliance, whereas family monthly income had no significant impact on compliance. The study concludes that while awareness is strong, significant gaps remain in fostering children’s active involvement and holistic growth. To address these deficiencies, the study proposes implementing targeted community-based initiatives: the “Boses ng Bata” awareness campaign to enhance child participation, the “Alagang Bata Development Program” to support educational and recreational needs, and the “Karapatan ng Bata Education Drive” to broaden awareness across diverse social backgrounds. Furthermore, the study emphasizes the necessity of multi-sectoral collaboration among local government units, schools, and families, supported by a robust monitoring and evaluation mechanism to ensure the long-term sustainability and responsiveness of child protection programs.

Keywords: Children’s rights, community compliance, child participation, developmental rights, descriptive research, child welfare advocacy.

Bio-Profile:

Dianne Grace A. Aquitania has built a solid and progressive career within the Philippine National Police, particularly under the PNP Anti-Kidnapping Group, where she currently serves as a TOC Officer. She has held key leadership and administrative roles, including Assistant Chief, Admin Officer, and PIO Officer, showcasing her expertise in operations, research, and public information management. Her research interests focus on children’s rights, particularly in the areas of survival, development, protection, and participation. She aims to assess community acceptance and compliance while addressing gaps through targeted programs that enhance child participation and holistic development.

Dr. Jeetre D. Trinidad is a part-time professor at STI West Negros University – School of Graduate Studies and a Research Professor at Riverside College Inc. He is also a full-time Nurse III at Corazon Locsin Montelibano Memorial Regional Hospital, Bacolod City, and currently serves as the Chairperson



of the Nursing Research Empowerment Program (NREP) of CLMMRH. He holds a Master of Arts in Nursing, major in Medical-Surgical Nursing, a Master in Public Administration, Doctor's degree in Public Administration, and a degree of Master in Hospital Administration. His research interests focus on health-related studies, particularly in nursing practice, social sciences, healthcare management, and public health.

Introduction

Rationale

Children's welfare and protection are collective responsibilities shared by governments, institutions, and communities, with the realization of children's rights largely dependent on how community members understand and uphold these rights in everyday interactions. Globally, millions of children continue to face serious challenges, including violence, child labor, and lack of access to education, often linked to limited awareness and inconsistent implementation of child protection measures. In the Philippines, legal frameworks such as Republic Act No. 7610 aim to safeguard children from abuse and exploitation while promoting their overall development and participation in society.

Despite these policies, gaps persist between their existence and actual practice at the community level. While many individuals possess general awareness of children's rights, there is often limited understanding of specific provisions, reporting mechanisms, and shared responsibilities in ensuring child protection. Factors such as access to information, educational initiatives, and community engagement further influence how these rights are recognized and applied. In highly urbanized areas of the Negros Island Region, socio-economic conditions and population dynamics may also affect awareness and compliance, yet limited localized data hinders the development of targeted and effective child protection interventions.

In response to this concern, the present study was conducted to assess the acceptance and extent of compliance of community members regarding the Rights of the Child in a highly urbanized city in the Negros Island Region. The findings aim to provide information that may assist local government units and community stakeholders in strengthening child protection programs and promoting the welfare of children.

Literature Review

Acceptance of children's rights among community members plays a crucial role in promoting children's survival and development. The right to survival is widely recognized as encompassing not only the right to life but also access to essential services such as nutrition, healthcare, sanitation, and safe living conditions (Black et al., 2021; Victora et al., 2021). Studies highlight that when communities accept these principles, they are more likely to adopt health-supportive practices such as proper nutrition, immunization, and timely medical care (Bhutta et al., 2020; Walker et al., 2022). Community norms and shared beliefs further reinforce collective responsibility, encouraging cooperation among families and institutions to meet children's basic needs (Shiffman & Shawar, 2022; Darmstadt et al., 2020). Similarly, the right to development is supported when communities value education, early learning, and social engagement, which contribute to children's cognitive and emotional growth (Daelmans et al., 2021; Bornstein, 2021). Access to stimulating environments and educational opportunities



enhances developmental outcomes and prepares children for long-term success (Rao et al., 2021; Lansford et al., 2021).

Moreover, community acceptance is essential in ensuring children's rights to protection and participation. The right to protection involves safeguarding children from abuse, neglect, and exploitation, which is strengthened when communities promote awareness and support child protection practices (Finkelhor, 2020; Wessells, 2021). Research shows that communities with strong protective norms are more likely to report abuse, create safe environments, and collaborate with institutions to uphold children's safety (Ben-Arieh et al., 2021; Berrick et al., 2021). At the same time, the right to participate recognizes children as active contributors to decisions affecting their lives. Communities that support this right foster open dialogue, empower children to express their views, and encourage involvement in social and civic activities (Shier, 2021; Checkoway & Aldana, 2022). Such inclusive environments enhance children's confidence, leadership skills, and sense of belonging, although traditional perceptions may still limit participation in some contexts (Cuevas-Parra & Tisdall, 2022; Wyness, 2022).

In the Philippine context, children's right to survival and development is closely linked to community attitudes and support systems that influence how families meet children's needs. Communities serve as primary environments where caregiving practices, health awareness, and access to services shape children's well-being. When community members recognize the importance of child health, nutrition, and safe living conditions, they are more likely to support programs and adopt practices that promote children's survival (David & Albert, 2020; Capuno et al., 2021). Similarly, acceptance of children's right to development is reflected in how communities value education and social growth, encouraging school participation, skill-building activities, and supportive environments that enhance children's cognitive and emotional development (Orbeta & Paqueo, 2020; Maligalig et al., 2021). Social support systems, including families, schools, and local organizations, further strengthen children's opportunities to grow and thrive (Reyes & Tabuga, 2021; Ballesteros et al., 2021).

Moreover, community acceptance plays a crucial role in upholding children's rights to protection and participation. In the Philippines, child protection is viewed as a shared responsibility among families, communities, and institutions, where awareness of children's rights encourages actions that prevent abuse, neglect, and violence (Ramiro et al., 2021; Bautista et al., 2021). Community norms and local structures, such as barangay programs and schools, help promote protective behaviors and strengthen cooperation in safeguarding children's welfare (Council for the Welfare of Children, 2022; Department of Social Welfare and Development, 2023). At the same time, recognition of children's right to participation fosters inclusive environments where children are encouraged to express their views and engage in social and civic activities. Supportive community attitudes enable children to develop confidence, communication skills, and a sense of responsibility, highlighting the importance of valuing children's voices in decisions that affect their lives (Bautista & Melgar, 2021; Alampay et al., 2021).

Compliance of community members plays a vital role in ensuring children's survival, as it reflects the extent to which individuals follow recommended health and safety practices. International literature highlights that adherence to behaviors such as proper nutrition, immunization, sanitation, and access to healthcare significantly improves child health outcomes



and reduces mortality rates (Victora et al., 2021; Gavi, 2022). Consistent compliance with maternal and child health guidelines—including prenatal care, breastfeeding, and routine monitoring—enhances the effectiveness of public health programs and supports children’s well-being (United Nations Inter-Agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation, 2023; Jones et al., 2022). Moreover, following nutrition and food security programs, as well as environmental health practices like safe water use and proper sanitation, contributes to healthy growth and disease prevention among children (Food and Agriculture Organization, 2023; Prüss-Ustün et al., 2023). Educational campaigns and continuous community outreach further strengthen compliance by increasing awareness and encouraging the adoption of practices that protect and sustain children’s health (Global Health Council, 2023; International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 2022).

Compliance with children’s right to development is demonstrated through the consistent adherence of community members to practices and programs that support education, early learning, and overall child growth. Communities that follow school enrollment policies and participate in educational support initiatives contribute to increased learning participation and improved developmental outcomes among children (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2022; Global Partnership for Education, 2023). Adherence to early childhood development programs—including learning activities, health monitoring, and developmental screening—further enhances children’s cognitive and social readiness for formal education (UNICEF Office of Research, 2022; OECD, 2023). Moreover, compliance with inclusive education policies and family-centered programs promotes equal learning opportunities, parental involvement, and supportive environments that foster children’s academic and emotional development (UNESCO, 2023; Center on the Developing Child, Harvard University, 2023). Educational campaigns and community support systems also play a vital role in encouraging sustained participation in development-oriented initiatives, reinforcing the importance of collective compliance in promoting children’s growth and well-being (Education Commission, 2023; World Education Forum, 2022).

Compliance with children’s right to protection is reflected in how community members adhere to laws, policies, and practices that safeguard children from abuse, neglect, exploitation, and violence. Studies emphasize that when communities follow child protection regulations, reporting procedures, and safeguarding protocols, they enhance early identification and intervention in cases of harm, thereby strengthening children’s safety and welfare (United Nations Children’s Fund, 2021; United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2022). Active participation in awareness programs, monitoring systems, and preventive initiatives further supports the reduction of risks and reinforces collaboration among families, schools, social services, and law enforcement (End Violence Against Children Partnership, 2023; Child Helpline International, 2023). Additionally, adherence to institutional policies—such as safe reporting mechanisms, caregiver screening, and child protection standards in various settings—helps create protective environments for children, while training programs and community education promote consistent compliance and shared responsibility in upholding children’s safety and dignity (ECPAT International, 2023; Keeping Children Safe, 2023).

Compliance with children’s right to participation is reflected in how community members consistently implement practices that allow children to express their views and engage in



decisions affecting their lives. This includes adherence to participatory structures such as youth councils, school organizations, and community forums that encourage children's involvement in social discussions and decision-making processes (Hart, 2021; Lansdown & O'Kane, 2022). Communities that follow youth engagement frameworks and participatory policies provide opportunities for children to take part in civic activities, educational programs, and local initiatives, fostering confidence and active citizenship (Checkoway, 2021; Percy-Smith, 2022). Schools and community organizations further strengthen compliance by promoting student representation, leadership programs, and inclusive participation in social development efforts, which enhance children's communication skills and sense of responsibility (Fielding & Moss, 2022; Wong et al., 2021). Additionally, training programs and awareness campaigns help institutionalize participatory practices, ensuring that children's voices are integrated into family, school, and community decision-making processes (European Commission, 2023; United Nations Youth Office, 2022).

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is anchored on Social Norms Theory by H. Wesley Perkins and Institutional Theory by John W. Meyer and Brian Rowan, which explain how behavior is shaped by social expectations and institutional structures. Social Norms Theory posits that individuals adjust their actions based on what they perceive as acceptable within their community. When respect for children's rights is seen as a common norm, individuals are more likely to adopt such behavior; however, misperceptions of these norms may lead to inconsistent compliance.

Meanwhile, Institutional Theory emphasizes that behavior is guided by established institutions such as government agencies, schools, and legal systems, which set rules and expectations. Individuals are more likely to comply when they recognize the legitimacy of these institutions and when policies are consistently enforced. Together, these theories highlight how both community norms and institutional mechanisms influence acceptance and compliance with children's rights, particularly within urban communities in the Negros Island Region.

Objectives

This study aimed to determine the level of acceptance and extent of compliance of community members with the Rights of the Child in a highly urbanized city in Negros Island Region during the 3rd quarter of the calendar year 2025. Specifically, this study sought to determine: 1) the level of acceptance of respondents on the rights of the child according to survival, development, protection, and participation; 2) the extent of compliance of respondents with the rights of the child according to the categories; 3) if a significant difference exists between the levels of acceptance of respondents on the rights of the child when grouped and compared according to the variables; and 4) if a significant difference exists between the extents of compliance of respondents on the rights of the child when grouped and compared according to profile variables.



Methodology

This section discusses the methods used to gather and analyze data based on the specific predetermined objectives. This outline includes research design, subject-respondents, research instruments, data collection procedures, ethical considerations, data analysis, and statistical methods.

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design to determine the level of acceptance and extent of compliance of community members regarding the Rights of the Child in a highly urbanized city in the Negros Island Region. A descriptive approach is suitable for systematically examining existing conditions, attitudes, and behaviors within a population without manipulating variables, allowing researchers to present quantitative information through frequencies, percentages, and measures of central tendency (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Polit & Beck, 2021). In this context, the design enabled the researcher to identify prevailing levels of acceptance and compliance across the four domains of children’s rights, using surveys and questionnaires to capture patterns of perceptions and practices. By focusing on current conditions rather than causal relationships, the study provided empirical data on community perspectives and behaviors, offering a foundation for the development of an enhancement plan to strengthen children’s rights in the locality.

Respondents

The respondents of this study were community members residing in selected barangays of a highly urbanized city in the Negros Island Region. Out of the 61 total barangays, 25 barangays were selected as study sites. Based on available records, the total population of these selected barangays was 117,296. Using Cochran’s formula for sample size determination, a total of 399 respondents were identified to participate in the study. A stratified random sampling technique was employed to ensure proportional representation of respondents from the selected barangays. Community members who were 18 years old and above and willing to participate in the study were included as respondents. Data collection was conducted through the administration of a research-made questionnaire, which underwent validity and reliability testing prior to distribution. The respondents were selected to represent community members who could provide relevant information regarding the acceptance and extent of compliance on the Rights of the Child within their respective communities.

Instrument

A researcher-made questionnaire was used as the primary instrument to determine the level of acceptance and extent of compliance of community members regarding the Rights of the Child. The questionnaire had two parts: Part I collected respondents’ profiles, including age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, and average family monthly income, while Part II contained 40 items assessing acceptance and compliance across the domains of survival, development, protection, and participation, using a 5-point Likert scale (5-Always to 1-Almost Never). Validity was established through content and face validation by three experts—a public



administration faculty member, a senior Philippine National Police officer, and a social welfare professional—who evaluated the items for appropriateness, resulting in a validity index of 4.78 (Excellent). Reliability was assessed via pilot testing with 30 community members from the same city, using Cronbach’s Alpha, which yielded coefficients of 0.863 for acceptance and 0.891 for compliance, both interpreted as “Good,” indicating that the instrument was valid, reliable, and suitable for data collection.

Procedure for Data Collection

After establishing the validity and reliability of the instrument, the researcher secured permission from the concerned authorities and barangay officials of the selected barangays in a highly urbanized city in the Negros Island Region to conduct the study. Upon approval, the researcher coordinated with the barangay officials and community leaders to identify the respondents. The researcher personally administered the researcher-made questionnaire to the respondents. Prior to answering the questionnaire, the purpose of the study was explained, and clear instructions were given to ensure that the respondents answered the questions objectively and honestly. The researcher also assisted the respondents whenever clarification was needed during the completion of the questionnaire. After the questionnaires were completed, the researcher personally retrieved the completed forms. The respondents were assured that the information they provided would be treated with strict confidentiality and used solely for research purposes. The collected data were then organized, tabulated, and prepared for statistical treatment using SPSS for analysis.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective 1 used a descriptive analytical scheme and means to determine the level of acceptance of community members regarding the Rights of the Child in the areas of survival, development, protection, and participation. Objective 2 also used a descriptive analytical scheme and mean to determine the extent of compliance of community members regarding the Rights of the Child in the areas of survival, development, protection, and participation. Objective No. 3, which aimed to determine if there was a significant difference in the level of acceptance of community members regarding the Rights of the Child when grouped according to the specified variables, the comparative analytical scheme and Mann–Whitney U test was employed. Finally, objective 4 used the comparative analytical scheme and Mann–Whitney U test to determine if there was a significant difference in the extent of compliance of community members regarding the Rights of the Child when grouped according to the specified variables.

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to established ethical research standards to ensure that all participants were treated with respect, fairness, and dignity. Participation was voluntary and based on informed consent, with respondents fully informed about the study’s purpose, scope, procedures, and their right to decline or withdraw at any time without consequence. Anonymity was preserved by not collecting personal identifiers, and all responses were coded and securely stored to prevent any connection to individual participants. The questionnaire was designed to avoid



sensitive or intrusive questions, minimizing potential psychological or emotional discomfort and safeguarding participants’ well-being. Confidentiality was maintained by limiting data access to the researcher and research adviser, and findings were reported only in aggregate for academic purposes. All electronic and physical records were securely stored and properly disposed of after the study’s completion, ensuring the full protection of participants’ rights throughout the research process.

Results and Discussions

This section summarizes the study's findings, which come from careful data gathering, in-depth analysis, and thoughtful interpretation. After this, meaningful conclusions were drawn from the initial phase, offering valuable insights.

Table 1

Level of Acceptance of Respondents on the Rights of the Child in Terms of Survival

Area	Mean	Interpretation
A. Survival		
1. Right to life	4.60	Very High level
2. Right to adequate standard of living	4.46	Very High level
3. Right to health and healthcare	4.44	Very High level
4. Right to parental care and support	4.40	Very High level
5. Right to social security	4.32	Very High level
6. Right to a name	4.33	Very High level
7. Freedom from degrading treatment	4.23	High level
8. Right for special protection	4.23	High level
9. Right to work and rights at work	4.23	High level
10. Right to live in safe and healthy environment	4.33	Very High level
Over all Mean	4.36	Very High level

Table 1 shows that respondents demonstrated a very high level of acceptance of children’s rights in terms of survival, with an overall mean of 4.36, indicating strong recognition of children’s fundamental rights to life, health, adequate living conditions, and parental care. This suggests that community members are generally aware of their responsibility to ensure that children’s basic needs are met and that they are protected from threats to their well-being. Such findings are consistent with the study of Ben-Arieh et al. (2021), which emphasized that high community awareness of children’s basic needs is linked to stronger support for child welfare and health-related initiatives, reflecting a positive outlook toward safeguarding children’s survival and development.

Among the indicators, the right to life received the highest mean (4.60), highlighting its recognition as the most fundamental of all child rights and the foundation for the fulfillment of other rights. This supports the assertion of the United Nations (2021) that the right to life is central to ensuring children’s access to health services and social protection systems. Meanwhile, freedom from degrading treatment, right to special protection, and rights at work obtained the



lowest mean (4.23), though still at a high level of acceptance. This suggests that while general awareness is strong, certain protective and labor-related rights may be less emphasized, aligning with Lansdown (2020), who noted that communities often show varying levels of understanding regarding children’s protection from exploitation and harmful treatment, indicating the need for strengthened awareness and education efforts in these areas.

Table 2

Level of Acceptance of Respondents on the Rights of the Child in Terms of Development

Area	Mean	Interpretation
B. Development		
1. Right to education	4.52	Very High level
2. Right of access to appropriate information	4.23	High level
3. Right to leisure and recreation	4.23	High level
4. Right of children with disabilities	4.22	High level
5. Right of indigenous people	4.11	High level
6. Develop the child’s physical and mental abilities to the fullest.	4.20	High level
7. Protection from performing work that may interfere with his/her education.	4.24	Very High level
8. Right for proper love and support	4.27	Very High level
9. Right for cultural activities	4.19	High level
10. Right to play	4.32	Very High level
Over all Mean	4.25	Very High level

The findings reveal that respondents demonstrated a very high level of acceptance of children’s rights in terms of development, with an overall mean of 4.25, indicating strong recognition of children’s rights to education, growth, social participation, and opportunities that support their overall well-being. This suggests that community members value the importance of providing children with environments and resources that foster their physical, mental, and social development. Such a positive perspective aligns with Britto et al. (2021), who emphasized that supportive communities play a crucial role in enhancing children’s cognitive, emotional, and social growth by promoting their rights to education, play, and participation.

Among the indicators, the right to education obtained the highest mean (4.52), reflecting strong acknowledgment of its role in shaping children’s knowledge, skills, and future participation in society, consistent with UNESCO (2022), which highlights the impact of community support on improving educational outcomes. In contrast, the right of indigenous people received the lowest mean (4.11), though still interpreted as high, suggesting relatively lower awareness of the specific rights and challenges faced by indigenous children. This finding supports the observation of the United Nations Development Programme (2022) that recognition of indigenous children’s rights may vary depending on community exposure to cultural diversity and related social policies, indicating a need for increased awareness in this area.



Table 3

Level of Acceptance of Respondents on the Rights of the Child in terms of Protection

Area	Mean	Interpretation
C. Protection		
1. Right to name and nationality	4.58	Very High Level
2. Right of disabled children	4.35	Very High Level
3. Right of children in situations of armed conflict	4.35	Very High Level
4. Rights of children in conflict with the law	4.30	Very High Level
5. Freedom from violence, abuse or neglect	4.30	Very High Level
6. Freedom from economic exploitation	4.27	Very High Level
7. Freedom from drug abuse	4.24	Very High Level
8. Freedom from sexual exploitation	4.27	Very High Level
9. Right to privacy	4.29	Very High Level
10. Right to leave /enter the country to reunited with the family.	4.28	Very High Level
Over all Mean	4.32	Very High Level

The findings indicate that respondents demonstrated a very high level of acceptance of children’s rights in terms of protection, with an overall mean of 4.32, reflecting strong recognition of the need to safeguard children from abuse, exploitation, neglect, and other forms of harm. This suggests that community members value the importance of ensuring children’s safety, dignity, and welfare, and are aware of their role in creating protective environments. Such results are consistent with Wessells (2022), who emphasized that strong community awareness and acceptance of child protection rights contribute to safer environments where children are shielded from violence and exploitation.

Among the indicators, the right to name and nationality obtained the highest mean (4.58), highlighting strong recognition of the importance of legal identity in ensuring children’s access to essential services and legal protection, as supported by United Nations Children’s Fund (2022). Meanwhile, freedom from drug abuse received the lowest mean (4.24), though still at a very high level, indicating that respondents acknowledge the need to protect children from harmful substances and risky environments. This finding aligns with World Health Organization (2021), which underscores the role of community awareness and supportive environments in preventing substance abuse and promoting children’s overall well-being.

Table 4

Level of Acceptance of Respondents on the Rights of the Child in terms of Participation

Area	Mean	Interpretation
D. Participation		
1. Right of opinion and to be heard in judicial and administrative proceedings	4.30	Very High Level
2. Freedom of expression	4.20	High level
3. Freedom of thought and conscience	4.14	High level
4. Freedom of religion	4.47	Very High Level
5. Freedom of association and peaceful assembly	4.21	High level



6. Participate in community activities and have program and services for themselves.	4.22	High level
7. Right to participate in information network	4.15	High level
8. Right to participate in youth voice activities	4.19	High level
9. Right to participate in any decision making that involves him/her directly or indirectly	4.20	High level
10. Right to participate in school activities and free from isolation.	4.26	Very High Level
Over all Mean	4.24	Very High Level

Table 4 shows that respondents demonstrated a very high level of acceptance of children’s rights in terms of participation, with an overall mean of 4.24, indicating strong recognition of children’s rights to express their views, share opinions, and engage in activities that affect their lives. This suggests that community members acknowledge the importance of giving children opportunities to communicate their ideas and take part in decisions related to their welfare and development. Such findings align with Lundy (2018), who emphasized that supporting children’s participation fosters confidence, communication skills, and a sense of responsibility, highlighting the growing recognition of children as active contributors in society.

Among the indicators, freedom of religion obtained the highest mean (4.47), reflecting strong acceptance of children’s right to practice and express their beliefs, which supports identity formation and respect for diversity as noted by Shier (2019). In contrast, freedom of thought and conscience received the lowest mean (4.14), though still interpreted as high, suggesting that while participation is generally supported, children’s independent thinking and decision-making may be less emphasized. This finding is consistent with Tisdall and Cuevas-Parra (2021), who noted that adult influence often shapes children’s participation, potentially limiting the full expression of their independent perspectives.

Table 5

Extent of Compliance of Respondents on the Rights of the Child in Terms of Survival

Area	Mean	Interpretation
A. Survival		
1. Right to life	4.48	Very Great Extent
2. Right to adequate standard of living	4.46	Very Great Extent
3. Right to health and healthcare	4.39	Very Great Extent
4. Right to parental care and support	4.37	Very Great Extent
5. Right to social security	4.36	Very Great Extent
6. Right to a name	4.37	Very Great Extent
7. Freedom from degrading treatment	4.33	Very Great Extent
8. Right for special protection	4.37	Very Great Extent
9. Right to work and rights at work	4.37	Very Great Extent
10. Right to live in safe and healthy environment	4.41	Very Great Extent
Over all Mean	4.39	Very Great Extent



Table 5 indicates that respondents demonstrated a very great extent of compliance with children’s rights in terms of survival, with an overall mean of 4.39, reflecting strong adherence to practices that support children’s basic needs, healthcare, parental care, and safe living environments. This suggests that community members actively fulfill their responsibilities in promoting children’s well-being and ensuring conditions necessary for healthy growth and development. Such findings are consistent with Ben-Arieh (2020), who emphasized that community involvement and responsible caregiving significantly contribute to children’s access to essential services and protective environments necessary for survival.

Among the indicators, the right to life obtained the highest mean (4.48), indicating that respondents strongly uphold behaviors that protect children’s lives and ensure their safety, aligning with Gilbert et al. (2020), who highlighted the collective role of families, communities, and institutions in safeguarding children’s survival. Meanwhile, freedom from degrading treatment received the lowest mean (4.33), though still interpreted as a very great extent, suggesting that respectful treatment of children is widely practiced within the community. This supports the findings of Featherstone et al. (2021), which emphasize that respectful and supportive environments are essential in protecting children’s dignity and promoting positive developmental outcomes.

Table 6

Extent of Compliance of Respondents on the Rights of the Child in terms of Development

Area	Mean	Interpretation
B. Development		
1. Right to education	4.50	Very Great Extent
2. Right of access to appropriate information	4.39	Very Great Extent
3. Right to leisure and recreation	4.37	Very Great Extent
4. Right of children with disabilities	4.37	Very Great Extent
5. Right of indigenous people	4.33	Very Great Extent
6. Develop the child’s physical and mental abilities to the fullest.	4.39	Very Great Extent
7. Protection from performing work that may interfere with his/her education.	4.39	Very Great Extent
8. Right for proper love and support	4.34	Very Great Extent
9. Right for cultural activities	4.33	Very Great Extent
10. Right to play	4.34	Very Great Extent
Over all Mean	4.37	Very Great Extent

Table 6 shows that respondents demonstrated a very great extent of compliance with children’s rights in terms of development, with an overall mean of 4.37, indicating that community members actively practice behaviors that support children’s access to education, information, recreation, and opportunities for personal growth. This suggests a strong community commitment to creating environments that foster children’s physical, mental, and social development. The findings are consistent with OECD (2022), which highlights the importance of



supportive community environments in providing children with access to developmental resources that enhance their overall well-being and capabilities.

Among the indicators, the right to education obtained the highest mean (4.50), reflecting strong compliance in promoting children’s access to learning opportunities, in line with UNESCO (2023), which emphasizes education as a key driver of children’s development and future success. Meanwhile, the right of indigenous people and right for cultural activities received the lowest means (4.33), though still interpreted as a very great extent, suggesting that cultural and indigenous-related rights may be slightly less emphasized. This aligns with UNESCO (2021), which underscores the importance of cultural identity and inclusion in fostering children’s sense of belonging and holistic development.

Table 7

Extent of Compliance of Respondents on the Rights of the Child in terms of Protection

Area	Mean	Interpretation
C. Protection		
1. Right to name and nationality	4.45	Very Great Extent
2. Right of disabled children	4.46	Very Great Extent
3. Right of children in situations of armed conflict	4.44	Very Great Extent
4. Rights of children in conflict with the law	4.37	Very Great Extent
5. Freedom from violence, abuse or neglect	4.35	Very Great Extent
6. Freedom from economic exploitation	4.37	Very Great Extent
7. Freedom from drug abuse	4.41	Very Great Extent
8. Freedom from sexual exploitation	4.34	Very Great Extent
9. Right to privacy	4.34	Very High Extent
10. Right to leave /enter the country to reunited with the family.	4.38	Very Great Extent
Over all Mean	4.39	Very Great Extent

Table 7 indicates that respondents demonstrated a very great extent of compliance with children’s rights in terms of protection, with an overall mean of 4.39, reflecting strong adherence to practices that safeguard children from harm, abuse, exploitation, and neglect. This suggests that community members actively promote children’s safety, dignity, and well-being, showing a commitment to creating protective environments that minimize physical, emotional, and social risks. These findings are supported by Wulczyn et al. (2021), who emphasized that active community participation and vigilance play a crucial role in preventing child abuse and ensuring safe environments for children.

Among the indicators, the right of disabled children obtained the highest mean (4.46), indicating strong compliance in providing protection, care, and support for children with special needs, consistent with Emerson et al. (2020), which highlights the importance of inclusive practices in safeguarding vulnerable children. Meanwhile, freedom from sexual exploitation and right to privacy received the lowest means (4.34), though still interpreted as a very great extent, suggesting that while these rights are generally upheld, they may require continued



reinforcement. This aligns with Finkelhor (2020), who stressed that protecting children from exploitation and respecting their privacy are essential to maintaining their dignity and ensuring comprehensive child protection.

Table 8

Extent of Compliance of Respondents on the Rights of the Child in terms of Participation

Area	Mean	Interpretation
D. Participation		
1. Right of opinion and to be heard in judicial and administrative proceedings	4.43	Very Great Extent
2. Freedom of expression	4.40	Very Great Extent
3. Freedom of thought and conscience	4.38	Very Great Extent
4. Freedom of religion	4.34	Very Great Extent
5. Freedom of association and peaceful assembly	4.36	Very Great Extent
6. Participate in community activities and have program and services for themselves.	4.40	Very Great Extent
7. Right to participate in information network	4.36	Very Great Extent
8. Right to participate in youth voice activities	4.36	Very Great Extent
9. Right to participate in any decision making that involves him/her directly or indirectly	4.34	Very Great Extent
10. Right to participate in school activities and free from isolation.	4.38	Very Great Extent
Over all Mean	4.37	Very Great Extent

The findings show that respondents demonstrated a very great extent of compliance with children’s participation rights, with an overall mean of 4.37, indicating that community members generally practice behaviors that allow children to express their opinions, engage in activities, and take part in matters affecting their lives. This suggests a strong recognition of the importance of children’s participation in fostering confidence, communication skills, and a sense of belonging within the community. These results align with Cuevas-Parra and Tisdall (2022), who emphasized that encouraging children’s participation strengthens their social engagement and sense of responsibility.

Among the indicators, the right to express opinion and be heard in judicial and administrative proceedings obtained the highest mean (4.43), reflecting strong compliance in valuing children’s voices in decision-making processes, consistent with Lundy and O’Lynn (2021), who highlighted its role in promoting inclusive and democratic environments. Meanwhile, freedom of religion and the right to participate in decision-making recorded the lowest means (4.34), though still interpreted as a very great extent, suggesting that certain aspects of participation, particularly those involving personal beliefs and direct decision-making, may be less emphasized. This supports Percy-Smith (2022), who noted that children’s actual involvement in decision-making often depends on prevailing social and cultural perspectives within the community.



Table 9

Difference in the Level of Acceptance of Respondent on Rights of the Child in Terms of Survival according to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Mann Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	4.43	16910	.024		Significant
	Older	4.26				
Sex	Male	4.29	15660	.690		Not Significant
	Female	4.38				
Civil Status	Single	4.42	17340	.060	0.05	Not Significant
	Married	4.27				
Average Income	Lower	4.30	16060	.002		Significant
	Higher	4.40				
Educational Attainment	High School	4.15	14170	.000		Significant
	College	4.53				

Table 9 reveals that significant differences in the level of acceptance of children’s survival rights exist when respondents are grouped by certain variables. In terms of age, younger respondents (mean = 4.43) showed significantly higher acceptance than older respondents (mean = 4.26), supported by a p-value of .024, suggesting that younger individuals tend to be more supportive of children’s survival rights, consistent with Mason and Danby (2019). Similarly, significant differences were found in average family monthly income ($p = .002$), where higher-income respondents demonstrated greater acceptance, aligning with OECD (2020), and in educational attainment ($p = .000$), where college-educated respondents (mean = 4.53) showed higher acceptance than those with only high school education (mean = 4.15), supporting Quennerstedt (2020) on the role of education in promoting human rights awareness.

On the other hand, no significant differences were observed when respondents were grouped according to sex ($p = .690$) and civil status ($p = .060$), indicating that both male and female respondents, as well as single and married individuals, share similar levels of acceptance of children’s survival rights. This suggests that awareness of children’s fundamental needs—such as health, safety, and proper care—is widely recognized across these groups, consistent with Freeman (2021) and Lundy, Kilkelly, and Byrne (2022), who noted that support for children’s welfare is commonly shared regardless of gender or family structure.

Table 10

Difference in the Level of Acceptance of Respondent on Rights of the Child in Terms of Development according to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Mann Whitney U Test	p- value	Sig level	Interpretation
----------	----------	------	------------------------------	-------------	--------------	----------------



Age	Younger	4.33	17353	.062	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	4.15				
Sex	Male	4.21	15758	.760	0.05	Not Significant
	Female	4.27				
Civil Status	Single	4.32	17502	.083	0.05	Not Significant
	Married	4.17				
Average Income	Lower	4.23	18819	.506	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	4.27				
Educational Attainment	High School	4.04	13692	.000	0.05	Significant
	College	4.44				

Table 10 shows that respondents generally exhibit similar levels of acceptance of children’s developmental rights across most demographic variables. No significant differences were observed in terms of age ($p = .062$), sex ($p = .760$), civil status ($p = .083$), or average family monthly income ($p = .506$), indicating that awareness of children’s rights to education, recreation, and opportunities for cognitive and social growth is widely shared across these groups. These findings align with Ben-Arieh & Casas (2021), Desmet, Vandenhole, Reynaert, & Lembrechts (2022), Reynaert, Bouverne-De Bie, & Vandeveld (2021), and Roelen & Notten (2022), who emphasized that recognition of children’s developmental needs is consistently valued across age, gender, marital status, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

However, a significant difference was found based on educational attainment ($p = .000$), with college-educated respondents (mean = 4.44) demonstrating greater acceptance of children’s developmental rights compared to those with only high school education (mean = 4.04). This suggests that higher education enhances awareness and understanding of children’s rights, particularly regarding access to learning, developmental opportunities, and holistic growth. These results are consistent with UNESCO (2021), which highlights the role of education in promoting comprehensive recognition of children’s rights and supporting their full potential within communities.

Table 11

Difference in the Level of Acceptance of Respondents on Rights of the Child in Terms of Protection according to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Mann Whitney U Test	p- value	Sig level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	4.39	17496	.082	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	4.23				
Sex	Male	4.31	15630	.491	0.05	Not Significant
	Female	4.33				
Civil Status	Single	4.35	19076	.731	0.05	Not Significant
	Married	4.28				



Average	Lower	4.30	17232.5	.039	Significant
Income	Higher	4.34			
Educational	High School	4.09	12682	.000	Significant
Attainment	College	4.52			

Table 11 shows that respondents generally share similar levels of acceptance of children’s protection rights across most demographic variables. No significant differences were observed in terms of age ($p = .082$), sex ($p = .491$), or civil status ($p = .731$), suggesting that awareness of children’s rights to protection from violence, abuse, exploitation, and neglect is consistently recognized across these groups. These findings are supported by Fang et al. (2021), UNICEF (2022), and Wessells (2021), which emphasize that safeguarding children is a collective responsibility widely shared across age, gender, and marital status within communities.

However, significant differences were observed in average family monthly income ($p = .039$) and educational attainment ($p = .000$), with higher-income respondents (mean = 4.34) and college-educated respondents (mean = 4.52) demonstrating greater acceptance of children’s protection rights. This suggests that socioeconomic status and education influence awareness and understanding of child protection policies and practices, consistent with Cuartas, McCoy, & Yoshikawa (2020) and Taylor & Francis (2020), who highlight the role of education and access to information in strengthening knowledge and attitudes toward safeguarding children’s welfare.

Table 12

Difference in the Level of Acceptance of Respondent on Rights of the Child in Terms of Participation according to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Mann Whitney U Test	p- value	Sig level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	4.32	16445	.008		Significant
	Older	4.13				
Sex	Male	4.17	14753	.201		Not Significant
	Female	4.26				
Civil Status	Single	4.29	17248	.073	0.05	Not Significant
	Married	4.17				
Average Income	Lower	4.21	17452.5	.062		Not Significant
	Higher	4.25				
Educational Attainment	High School	4.04	14193	.000		Significant
	College	4.41				

Table 12 shows that respondents generally demonstrate similar levels of acceptance of children’s participation rights across most demographic variables, with significant differences observed only in age and educational attainment. Younger respondents (mean = 4.32) showed significantly higher acceptance than older respondents (mean = 4.13, $p = .008$), suggesting that younger individuals are more receptive to contemporary perspectives that emphasize children’s



voices and involvement in decision-making. No significant differences were found in terms of sex ($p = .201$), civil status ($p = .073$), or average family monthly income ($p = .062$), indicating that acceptance of children’s participation rights is generally shared across gender, marital status, and economic background. These findings are supported by Cuevas-Parra & Tisdall (2019), Shier (2021), Lundy (2020), and Checkoway (2020), who note that community support for children’s engagement in social and civic activities is widely recognized across diverse groups.

However, educational attainment showed a significant difference ($p = .000$), with college-educated respondents (mean = 4.41) demonstrating greater acceptance than those with high school education (mean = 4.04). This suggests that higher education enhances awareness and understanding of children’s participatory rights, particularly regarding involvement in decision-making and community activities. Literature highlights that education fosters respect for democratic values and strengthens recognition of children as active contributors to social and community processes (Quennerstedt, 2020).

Table 13

Difference in the Extent of Compliance of Respondent on Rights of the Child in terms of Survival according to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Mann Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	4.52	15870	.001		Significant
	Older	4.22				
Sex	Male	4.27	13880	.008		Significant
	Female	4.44				
Civil Status	Single	4.55	14200	.000	0.05	Significant
	Married	4.18				
Average Income	Lower	4.38	1828	.238		Not Significant
	Higher	4.40				
Educational Attainment	High School	4.22	15880	.000		Significant
	College	4.54				

Table 13 shows that the extent of compliance with children’s survival rights varies significantly across age, sex, civil status, and educational attainment, but not across income levels. Younger respondents (mean = 4.52) demonstrated higher compliance than older respondents (mean = 4.22, $p = .001$), suggesting greater engagement in practices that support children’s health, safety, and well-being, consistent with findings on generational differences in child welfare attitudes (Betancourt, Meyers-Ohki, Charrow, & Tol, 2020). Female respondents (mean = 4.44) showed significantly higher compliance than males (mean = 4.27, $p = .008$), reflecting women’s central role in caregiving and child welfare (Bornstein, 2022). Single respondents (mean = 4.55) also demonstrated greater compliance than married respondents (mean = 4.18, $p = .000$), which may relate to differences in lifestyle responsibilities and social engagement (Ben-Arieh & Casas, 2021).



No significant difference was observed in compliance between lower- and higher-income respondents ($p = .238$), indicating that protective practices are consistently observed across economic groups, likely due to shared community values regarding children’s welfare (Roelen & Notten, 2022). Educational attainment showed a significant effect, with college-educated respondents (mean = 4.54) exhibiting higher compliance than those with high school education (mean = 4.22, $p = .000$), highlighting the role of education in increasing awareness and practices that support children’s health, safety, and basic needs (Magnuson & Duncan, 2019).

Table 14

Difference in the Extent of Compliance of Respondent on Rights of the Child in terms of Development according to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Mann Whitney U Test	p- value	Sig level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	4.51	16010.5	.000		Significant
	Older	4.20				
Sex	Male	4.21	13277	.007		Significant
	Female	4.44				
Civil Status	Single	4.52	14699	.000	0.05	Significant
	Married	4.18				
Average Income	Lower	4.42	19565	.315		Not Significant
	Higher	4.34				
Educational Attainment	High School	4.19	15469	.000		Significant
	College	4.54				

Table 14 shows that the extent of compliance with children’s developmental rights differs significantly across age, sex, civil status, and educational attainment, but not across income levels. Younger respondents (mean = 4.51) showed higher compliance than older respondents (mean = 4.20, $p = .000$), suggesting greater responsiveness to initiatives supporting children’s access to education, recreation, and developmental opportunities, consistent with research on generational influences on child development (Britto et al., 2017). Female respondents (mean = 4.44) demonstrated higher compliance than males (mean = 4.21, $p = .007$), reflecting women’s central role in caregiving and educational support (Jeong, Franchett, Ramos de Oliveira, Rehmani, & Yousafzai, 2021). Single respondents (mean = 4.52) also showed greater compliance than married respondents (mean = 4.18, $p = .000$), which may relate to differences in social roles and responsibilities (Ben-Arieh & Casas, 2021).

No significant difference was observed between lower- and higher-income respondents ($p = .315$), indicating that supportive practices for children’s development are generally consistent across economic groups, likely due to shared community values (Roelen & Notten, 2022). Educational attainment had a significant effect, with college-educated respondents (mean = 4.54) showing higher compliance than those with high school education (mean = 4.19, $p = .000$). This



underscores the role of education in enhancing awareness of children’s learning needs, developmental opportunities, and rights to access educational and social resources (Hanushek & Woessmann, 2020).

Table 15

Difference in the Extent of Compliance of Respondent on Rights of the Child in terms of Protection according to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Mann Whitney U Test	p- value	Sig level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	4.51	16208	.003		Significant
	Older	4.22				
Sex	Male	4.26	13869.5	.026		Significant
	Female	4.44				
Civil Status	Single	4.54	13974	.000	0.05	Significant
	Married	4.19				
Average Income	Lower	4.41	19440	.902		Not Significant
	Higher	4.37				
Educational Attainment	High School	4.22	16234	.001		Significant
	College	4.54				

Table 15 shows that the extent of compliance with children’s protection rights varies significantly across age, sex, civil status, and educational attainment, but not across income levels. Younger respondents (mean = 4.51) demonstrated higher compliance than older respondents (mean = 4.22, $p = .003$), indicating greater responsiveness to advocacy programs and awareness campaigns on safeguarding children (UNICEF, 2021). Female respondents (mean = 4.44) showed higher compliance than males (mean = 4.26, $p = .026$), reflecting women’s central role in caregiving and child supervision (World Health Organization, 2020). Single respondents (mean = 4.54) also displayed greater compliance than married respondents (mean = 4.19, $p = .000$), suggesting that differences in responsibilities and social roles may influence participation in child protection practices (Fang et al., 2017).

No significant difference was observed between lower- and higher-income respondents ($p = .902$), indicating that compliance with protection rights is generally practiced across economic levels, likely due to shared community awareness and values (UNICEF, 2021). Educational attainment had a significant effect, with college-educated respondents (mean = 4.54) showing higher compliance than those with high school education (mean = 4.22, $p = .001$). This emphasizes that education enhances knowledge of legal protections and promotes responsible actions that safeguard children from abuse, exploitation, and neglect (Lansford & Deater-Deckard, 2019).



Conclusion

Based on the analyzed data, the study found that community characteristics—such as a predominance of younger respondents, males, single individuals, college-educated members, and families with higher monthly income—may influence perceptions, acceptance, and compliance with programs promoting children’s rights. Overall, respondents demonstrated a high level of acceptance and a very great extent of compliance across the four rights categories, though participation and development consistently recorded the lowest means. When examined by demographic variables, lower acceptance and compliance were observed among high school-educated respondents and married respondents, particularly in development and participation. Significant differences in acceptance were linked to age, educational attainment, and family income, while compliance differences were associated with age, sex, civil status, and educational attainment, but not income. These findings highlight the need to strengthen initiatives that promote children’s participation and development, expand awareness and education across diverse social and educational groups, and foster family and community involvement. Collaboration among families, schools, and local institutions remains essential to sustain programs that protect and advance the welfare and rights of children. The findings imply the need for coordinated, well-funded, and continuously monitored multi-sectoral programs among local governments, schools, and community organizations to strengthen children’s rights, participation, and holistic development through sustained family and community engagement.

Acknowledgement

The researcher expresses heartfelt gratitude to all individuals who generously shared their knowledge, time, and support in the successful completion of this study. Sincere appreciation is extended to the dissertation advisers for their unwavering guidance, motivation, and invaluable insights, as well as to the panel members for their constructive comments and suggestions that greatly enhanced the quality of the research. Gratitude is also given to the academic leadership for their encouragement and support in completing this endeavor. Special thanks are conveyed to the researcher’s family for their constant inspiration and understanding throughout this journey. Above all, the researcher offers this work to Almighty God for the wisdom, strength, good health, peace of mind, and abundant grace bestowed in bringing this study to completion.

Authorship Contribution Statement

Aquitania: Concept and design, literature review, data collection, analysis, interpretation and editing. **Trinidad:** Reviewing, supervision, and material support.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest related to the conduct, authorship, and publication of this research. All procedures and interpretations were performed independently, and no financial, professional, or personal relationships influenced the results of this study.



References

- Alampay, L. P., Jocson, R. M., & Abarquez, J. L. (2021). Youth civic engagement and participation in Philippine communities. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 54(2), 175–195.
- Albert, J. R. G., Vizmanos, J. F., & Santos, A. G. (2021). Child poverty and well-being in the Philippines. Philippine Institute for Development Studies Discussion Paper Series.
- Ansell, N. (2021). *Children, youth and development* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Asian Development Bank. (2023). *Strengthening child protection systems in the Philippines*. Asian Development Bank.
- Asian Development Bank. (2024). *Youth engagement and participation in community development in the Philippines*. Asian Development Bank.
- Ballesteros, M. M., & Llanto, G. M. (2021). *Social participation and youth development in the Philippines*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Ballesteros, M. M., Llanto, G. M., & Paqueo, V. (2021). *Education and social development programs in the Philippines*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Bautista, V. A., & Melgar, A. M. (2021). Children's participation in community development initiatives in the Philippines. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(3), 55–66.
- Bautista, V. A., Roldan, M. D., & Garces-Bacsal, R. M. (2021). Child protection and community-based responses in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Social Development*, 14(1), 25–41.
- Ben-Arieh, A. (2020). Child well-being indicators and the study of children's lives. *Child Indicators Research*, 13(4), 1247–1265.
- Ben-Arieh, A., & Casas, F. (2021). Child well-being and development: Toward a more comprehensive understanding. *Child Indicators Research*, 14(1), 1–8.
- Ben-Arieh, A., Casas, F., Frønes, I., & Korbin, J. (2021). Multifaceted concept of child well-being. *Handbook of Child Well-Being*. Springer.
- Ben-Arieh, A., Casas, F., Frønes, I., & Korbin, J. E. (2020). Multifaceted concept of child well-being. *Child Indicators Research*, 13(1), 1–27.
- Berrick, J. D., Dickens, J., Pösö, T., & Skivenes, M. (2021). A cross-country comparison of child welfare systems and their responses to child maltreatment. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 122, 105861.
- Betancourt, T. S., Meyers-Ohki, S. E., Charrow, A., & Tol, W. A. (2020). Interventions for children affected by war: An ecological perspective on psychosocial support and mental health care. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 28(3), 148–159.
- Bhutta, Z. A., Das, J. K., Rizvi, A., et al. (2020). Evidence-based interventions for improving maternal and child health. *The Lancet Global Health*, 8(2), e182–e197. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(19\)30428-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30428-1)
- Black, M. M., Behrman, J. R., Daelmans, B., Dua, T., McCoy, D. C., & Richter, L. M. (2021). Early childhood development coming of age: Science through the life course. *The Lancet*, 398(10312), 160–171.



- Black, R. E., Walker, S. P., Fernald, L. C., Andersen, C. T., DiGirolamo, A. M., Lu, C., McCoy, D. C., Fink, G., Shawar, Y. R., Shiffman, J., Devercelli, A. E., Wodon, Q. T., Vargas-Barón, E., & Grantham-McGregor, S. (2021). Early childhood development coming of age: Science through the life course. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 77–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)31389-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31389-7)
- Black, R. E., Walker, S. P., Fernald, L. C., et al. (2021). Early childhood development coming of age: Science through the life course. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 77–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)31389-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31389-7)
- Bornstein, M. H. (2021). Parenting, child development, and the social environment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 109–132.
- Bornstein, M. H. (2022). Parenting and child development: A relational perspective. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology*, 4, 1–23.
- Britto, P. R., Lye, S. J., Proulx, K., et al. (2021). Nurturing care: Promoting early childhood development. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 91–102. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)31390-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31390-3)
- Britto, P. R., Lye, S. J., Proulx, K., Yousafzai, A. K., Matthews, S. G., & Vaivada, T. (2021). Nurturing care: Promoting early childhood development. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 91–102.
- Britto, P. R., Lye, S. J., Proulx, K., Yousafzai, A. K., Matthews, S. G., Vaivada, T., & Bhutta, Z. A. (2017). Nurturing care: Promoting early childhood development. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 91–102.
- Capuno, J. J., Kraft, A., Quimbo, S., Tan, C. R., & Wagstaff, A. (2021). Health outcomes and access to health services in the Philippines. *Health Policy and Planning*, 36(5), 690–701.
- Center on the Developing Child, Harvard University. (2023). Early childhood development and lifelong learning report. Harvard University.
- Checkoway, B. (2020). Youth participation and community change. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119, 105571.
- Checkoway, B., & Aldana, A. (2022). Youth participation and community change. *Community Development Journal*, 57(1), 1–17.
- Checkoway, B., & Richards-Schuster, K. (2020). Youth participation for educational reform in the United States. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 108, 104563.
- Council for the Welfare of Children. (2022). State of the Filipino children report. Council for the Welfare of Children.
- Cuartas, J., McCoy, D., & Yoshikawa, H. (2020). Child protection and family support interventions in low- and middle-income countries. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 103, 104431.
- Cuevas-Parra, P. (2021). Thirty years after the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: Advancing children’s participation in decision-making. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 43(1), 30–48.
- Cuevas-Parra, P., & Tisdall, E. K. M. (2019). Child-led research and children’s participation rights. *Social Sciences*, 8(2), 44.
- Cuevas-Parra, P., & Tisdall, E. K. M. (2022). Child-led research and participation: Contemporary debates. *Childhood*, 29(2), 145–160.



- Daelmans, B., Darmstadt, G. L., Lombardi, J., Black, M. M., Britto, P., Lye, S., Dua, T., Bhutta, Z. A., & Richter, L. (2021). Early childhood development: The foundation of sustainable development. *The Lancet Global Health*, 9(2), e146–e147.
- Darmstadt, G. L., Bhutta, Z. A., Cousens, S., Adam, T., Walker, N., & de Bernis, L. (2020). Evidence-based, cost-effective interventions: How many newborn babies can we save? *The Lancet*, 365(9463), 977–988.
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2023). Child protection services and programs in the Philippines. DSWD.
- Desmet, E., Vandenhole, W., Reynaert, D., & Lembrechts, S. (2022). Children’s rights education and awareness in communities. *The International Journal of Children’s Rights*, 30(1), 102–120.
- Emerson, E., Fortune, N., Llewellyn, G., & Stancliffe, R. (2021). Loneliness, social support, social isolation and wellbeing among working age adults with and without disability: Cross-sectional study. *Disability and Health Journal*, 14(1), 100965.
- Emerson, E., Hatton, C., Robertson, J., & Baines, S. (2020). The health and well-being of children with disabilities. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 46(2), 149–158.
- End Violence Against Children Partnership. (2023). Global progress report on ending violence against children. EVAC.
- European Commission. (2023). EU strategy on the rights of the child and youth participation. European Commission.
- Fang, X., Fry, D. A., Brown, D. S., Mercy, J. A., Dunne, M. P., Butchart, A. R., & Corso, P. S. (2017). The burden of child maltreatment in the East Asia and Pacific region. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 42, 146–162.
- Fang, X., Fry, D., Brown, D., Mercy, J., Dunne, M., Butchart, A., & Corso, P. (2021). The burden of child maltreatment in the East Asia and Pacific region. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 114, 104959.
- Featherstone, B., Gupta, A., Morris, K., & Warner, J. (2021). Let’s stop feeding the risk monster: Towards a social model of child protection. *Families, Relationships and Societies*, 10(2), 225–242.
- Fielding, M., & Moss, P. (2022). *Radical education and the common school: A democratic alternative*. Routledge.
- Finkelhor, D. (2020). Trends in adverse childhood experiences in the United States. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 108, 104641.
- Food and Agriculture Organization. (2023). The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2023. FAO.
- Gilbert, N., Parton, N., & Skivenes, M. (2020). *Child protection systems: International trends and orientations*. Oxford University Press.
- Gilbert, R., Widom, C. S., Browne, K., Fergusson, D., Webb, E., & Janson, S. (2022). Burden and consequences of child maltreatment in high-income countries. *The Lancet*, 373(9657), 68–81.
- Global Education Monitoring Report. (2022). *Non-state actors in education: Who chooses? Who loses?* UNESCO Publishing.



- Global Partnership for Education. (2023). Global education monitoring report. Global Partnership for Education.
- Grantham-McGregor, S., Fernald, L., Kagawa, R., & Walker, S. (2020). Effects of early childhood development interventions. *The Lancet Global Health*, 8(3), e323–e324.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2020). Education, knowledge capital, and economic growth. *The Economics of Education*, 1–19.
- Hart, R. (2021). *Children’s participation: The theory and practice of involving young citizens in community development*. Routledge.
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. (2022). *Community health and survival programs report*. IFRC.
- Jeong, J., Franchett, E., Ramos de Oliveira, C., Rehmani, K., & Yousafzai, A. (2021). Parenting interventions to promote early child development. *PLoS Medicine*, 18(5), e1003602.
- Jones, G., Steketee, R., Black, R., Bhutta, Z., & Morris, S. (2022). How many child deaths can we prevent this year? *The Lancet Global Health*, 10(4), e472–e473.
- Keeping Children Safe. (2023). *Global safeguarding report*. Keeping Children Safe.
- Kilkelly, U. (2020). *Children’s rights in international and European law*. Routledge.
- Lansdown, G. (2020). *The evolving capacities of the child*. United Nations Children’s Fund. <https://www.unicef.org>
- Lansdown, G., & O’Kane, C. (2022). *A toolkit for monitoring and evaluating children’s participation*. Child Rights International Network.
- Lansford, J. E., & Deater-Deckard, K. (2019). Childrearing discipline and violence in developing countries. *Child Development*, 83(1), 62–75.
- Lansford, J. E., Godwin, J., Uribe Tirado, L. M., Zelli, A., Al-Hassan, S., Bacchini, D., Bornstein, M., Chang, L., Deater-Deckard, K., Dodge, K., & Pastorelli, C. (2021). Parenting and child development across cultures. *Child Development*, 92(5), 1805–1821.
- Lundy, L. (2018). In defence of tokenism? Implementing children’s right to participate in collective decision-making. *Childhood*, 25(3), 340–354.
- Lundy, L. (2020). The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and children’s participation. *Childhood*, 27(4), 455–468.
- Lundy, L., & Byrne, B. (2020). Children’s rights-based approaches in practice. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 24(7), 1013–1030.
- Lundy, L., & O’Lynn, P. (2021). Children’s rights and participation in decision-making. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 25(1), 6–24.
- Lundy, L., Kilkelly, U., & Byrne, B. (2022). Incorporating children’s rights in social policy and community practice. *International Journal of Children’s Rights*, 30(2), 289–308.
- Magnuson, K., & Duncan, G. J. (2019). Can early childhood interventions decrease inequality of economic opportunity? *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 5(2), 123–141.
- Maligalig, D., Caoli-Rodriguez, R., Martinez, A., & Cuevas, S. (2021). Education outcomes and development indicators in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 95(2), 1–15.
- Mason, J., & Danby, S. (2019). Children’s participation in decision-making: Age-related perspectives. *Childhood*, 26(1), 45–60.



- Orbeta, A. C., & Paqueo, V. B. (2020). Education and human capital development in the Philippines. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Orbeta, A. C., Paqueo, V. B., & Albert, J. R. G. (2022). Youth engagement and development in the Philippines. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Orbeta, A. C., Paqueo, V., & Albert, J. R. G. (2022). Social protection programs and child welfare outcomes in the Philippines. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Percy-Smith, B. (2022). Rethinking participation: Youth engagement in changing contexts. *Youth & Society*, 54(5), 747–764.
- Perkins, H. W., & Berkowitz, A. D. (1986). Perceiving the community norms of alcohol use among students: Some research implications for campus alcohol education programming. *International Journal of the Addictions*, 21(9–10), 961–976. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826088609077249>
- Prüss-Ustün, A., Wolf, J., & Bartram, J. (2023). Burden of disease from unsafe water, sanitation and hygiene. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 131(2).
- Quennerstedt, A. (2020). Children’s rights research moving into the future: Challenges on the way forward. *The International Journal of Children’s Rights*, 28(2), 320–335.
- Quennerstedt, A. (2020). Children’s rights research moving into the future: Challenges and opportunities. *The International Journal of Children’s Rights*, 28(3), 661–679.
- Ramiro, L., Madrid, B., & Brown, D. (2021). Child protection systems in the Philippines: Challenges and opportunities. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 110, 104802.
- Rao, N., Sun, J., Chen, E., & Ip, P. (2021). Effectiveness of early childhood education programs. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 54, 21–34.
- Reyes, C. M., & Tabuga, A. D. (2021). Child poverty and deprivation in the Philippines. Philippine Institute for Development Studies Discussion Paper.
- Reynaert, D., Bouverne-De Bie, M., & Vandeveld, S. (2021). A review of children’s rights literature since the adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Childhood*, 28(1), 1–17.
- Reynaert, D., Bouverne-De Bie, M., & Vandeveld, S. (2021). Children’s rights and community responsibility. *Childhood*, 28(3), 311–325.
- Roelen, K., & Notten, G. (2022). Child poverty and well-being: Understanding the role of socioeconomic context. *Social Indicators Research*, 160(2), 527–545.
- Shawar, Y. R., & Shiffman, J. (2022). Generation of global political priority for early childhood development: The challenges of framing and governance. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 119–124.
- Shawar, Y. R., & Shiffman, J. (2022). Global health networks and child health priorities. *Health Policy and Planning*, 37(2), 183–192.
- Shier, H. (2019). Children’s participation in decision-making: Theoretical perspectives and practical implications. *Children & Society*, 33(1), 16–28.
- Shier, H. (2019). Pathways to participation: Opening opportunities for children and young people in decision-making. *Children & Society*, 33(3), 270–281.
- Shier, H. (2021). Children’s rights and participation in decision-making processes. *Children & Society*, 35(4), 485–497.
- Taylor & Francis. (2020). Handbook of child protection systems. Routledge.



- Tisdall, E. K. M. (2021). Children and young people's participation: A critical consideration of Article 12. *Childhood*, 28(2), 173–186. An interdisciplinary approach. Routledge.
- Tisdall, E. K. M. (2021). Children's participation and children's rights: Challenges and opportunities. *Childhood*, 28(2), 165–172.
- Tisdall, E. K. M., & Cuevas-Parra, P. (2021). Beyond the familiar challenges for children and young people's participation rights: The potential of activism. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 25(1), 7–27.
- Tisdall, E. K. M., & Punch, S. (2022). Conceptualizing children's participation in decision-making. *Childhood*, 29(2), 203–218.
- UNESCO. (2021). Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2021). International standard classification of education (ISCED 2011). UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- UNESCO. (2021). Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2022). Global education monitoring report: Non-state actors in education. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- UNESCO. 2022. Transforming education for inclusive and sustainable futures. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- UNICEF Office of Research. (2022). Early childhood development global report. UNICEF.
- UNICEF. (2021). Child protection strategy: Preventing and responding to violence, exploitation and abuse. United Nations Children's Fund.
- UNICEF. (2022). Child protection strategy: Preventing and responding to violence against children. UNICEF.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2021). The state of the world's children 2021: On my mind – Promoting, protecting and caring for children's mental health. UNICEF.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2023). Education and child development in the Philippines. UNICEF Philippines.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2023). The state of the world's children 2023: For every child, every right. UNICEF. <https://www.unicef.org/reports/state-of-worlds-children-2023>
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2023). The state of the world's children 2023: For every child, every right. UNICEF.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2022). Human development report: Cultural inclusion and development. UNDP.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023. UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education. UNESCO.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2022). Global study on violence against children. UNODC.



- United Nations Youth Office. (2022). Youth engagement and participation in global development. United Nations.
- United Nations. (2020). Convention on the Rights of the Child: General comment on children's participation. United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child.
- United Nations. (2021). Convention on the Rights of the Child: General comment on the right to life, survival and development. United Nations.
- United Nations. (2021). The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: General principles and implementation. United Nations.
- United Nations. (2022). World population prospects 2022. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- United Nations. (2022). World population prospects 2022: Summary of results. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. <https://population.un.org>
- United Nations. 2021. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: General principles and implementation. United Nations.
- Vandenhoe, W. (2021). Children's rights and sustainable development. Routledge.
- Vandenhoe, W., Desmet, E., Reynaert, D., & Lembrechts, S. (2019). Routledge international handbook of children's rights studies. Routledge.
- Victora, C. G., Christian, P., Vaidaletti, L. P., Gatica-Dominguez, G., Menon, P., & Black, R. E. (2021). Revisiting maternal and child undernutrition in low- and middle-income countries. *The Lancet*, 397(10282), 1385–1396.
- Victora, C. G., Christian, P., Vaidaletti, L. P., Gatica-Dominguez, G., Menon, P., & Black, R. E. (2021). Revisiting maternal and child undernutrition in low- and middle-income countries. *The Lancet*, 397(10282), 1385–1396.
- Walker, S. P., Wachs, T. D., Gardner, J. M., Lozoff, B., Wasserman, G., Pollitt, E., Carter, J. A., & International Child Development Steering Group. (2022). Child development: Risk factors for adverse outcomes in developing countries. *The Lancet Global Health*, 369(9556), 145–157.
- Wessells, M. (2021). Strengthening community-based child protection systems. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 110, 104787.
- Wessells, M. (2022). Child protection and community-based approaches. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 128, 105623.
- Wessells, M. (2022). Strengthening child protection systems in humanitarian contexts. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 124, 105432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2021.105432>
- World Health Organization. (2021). Preventing substance use among children and adolescents. WHO
- World Health Organization. (2022). Improving child health and survival: Global strategies and community participation. WHO.
- World Health Organization. (2022). World report on child and adolescent health. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int>
- Wulczyn, F., Daro, D., Fluke, J., Feldman, S., Glodek, C., & Lifanda, K. (2021). Adapting a systems approach to child protection: Key concepts and considerations. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 110, 104789.



Wyness, M. (2022). Childhood and participation: Revisiting theories of child agency. *Sociology Compass*, 16(2), e12968.

Yoshikawa, H., Wuermli, A., Raikes, A., & Kim, S. (2020). Effects of poverty on early childhood development. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology*, 2, 175–199.

