

## Academic, Psychosocial, and Socioeconomic Needs of Students at Risk: Implications for School, Family, And Community-Based Interventions

**Dr. Jannie S.J. Manimtim**

University of Rizal System

**Abstract:** This qualitative documentary study analyzed the academic, psychosocial, and socioeconomic needs of students at risk documented in a previously completed University of Rizal System mixed-methods research report. The source research included 165 survey respondents with general weighted averages of 75–79 and 10 interview participants selected with averages below 75. The present study did not recruit those participants or reanalyze their individual-level data. Using a structured, deductive document-analysis matrix, reported findings were classified by needs domain and translated into potential school-, family-, and community-based responses. Academic needs concerned study routines, instructional guidance, learning environments, and resource access; psychosocial concerns included avoidance-oriented coping and academic disengagement; and socioeconomic concerns included financial barriers to learning materials and constraints on parental academic assistance. A proposed integrated intervention framework prioritizes tutorial and study-skills support, family learning guidance, teacher instructional support, coping-skills education, and resource-access partnerships. The source report does not independently establish a need for specific livelihood courses, clinical counseling, or gender-related seminars. Because the evidence derives from one historical manuscript, the framework requires stakeholder consultation, feasibility assessment, and prospective evaluation. The contribution is a transparent secondary synthesis and intervention logic, not newly measured prevalence or program effectiveness.

**Keywords:** students at risk; documentary analysis; academic needs; psychosocial needs; socioeconomic needs; school–family–community intervention

**How to cite this article:** Manimtim JSJ. Academic, Psychosocial, and Socioeconomic Needs of Students at Risk: Implications for School, Family, And Community-Based Interventions. *Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2026 Oct 17, 5(5): 70-77

**Source of support:** Nil.

**Conflict of interest:** None

**DOI:** [doi.org/10.58924/rjhss.v5.iss5.p7](https://doi.org/10.58924/rjhss.v5.iss5.p7)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### Background and Rationale

Students experiencing academic vulnerability encounter overlapping difficulties in study organization, classroom engagement, family resources, and support from teachers. These domains should be examined together rather than assumed to be independent. Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological perspective locates learning within interacting environments; Epstein's (2011) partnership model describes the roles of schools, families, and communities; and Zimmerman (2002) explains the self-regulatory demands of independent learning.

A previously completed University of Rizal System (URS) study by Aterrado and colleagues investigated learning-related factors, motivation, coping, and performance during the "new normal." Its concurrent triangulation design involved 165 survey respondents and 10 interviewees, selected under different academic-performance criteria. The source report described resource shortages, household distractions, limited parental assistance, inconsistent teacher follow-up, weak study habits, and avoidance-oriented coping. It reported statistically significant but weak correlations among selected variables and academic performance. Such associations cannot demonstrate that any one factor caused low grades (Aterrado et al., n.d.).

Received: 20-09-2026  
Revised: 22-09-2026  
Accepted: 05-10-2026  
Published: 17-10-2026



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors.  
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license  
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

The original report already discussed possible educational responses. What remains analytically useful is a systematic account of which needs are actually documented, how evidence is classified across academic, psychosocial, and socioeconomic domains, and what types of intervention follow directly or only tentatively from that evidence. This secondary documentary study addresses that narrower gap. It does not claim to be a separate historical pre-implementation needs assessment.

## Research Questions

1. What academic needs are documented in the source research?
2. What psychosocial needs are documented?
3. What socioeconomic and family-support needs are documented?
4. What school-, family-, and community-based responses are plausibly supported by those documented needs?
5. Which proposed responses lack direct evidence and require additional primary assessment?

## Objectives

To identify and categorize documented needs; distinguish empirical findings from programmatic inference; develop an explicit evidence-to-intervention matrix; and propose a provisional integrated support framework requiring later validation.

## Significance, Scope, and Delimitations

The study may assist educational researchers, school administrators, extension planners, and community partners in avoiding interventions selected without traceable evidence. Its unit of analysis is the existing research document—not students, parents, or teachers newly surveyed. No independent prevalence estimates, causal effects, program outcomes, or claims about current beneficiary priorities can be derived from this analysis. Findings relate to the pandemic-era learning context represented in the source and may not transfer unchanged to current in-person schooling.

## Review of Related Literature and Studies

### Theoretical Foundation: Ecological and Partnership Perspectives

Bronfenbrenner (1979) conceptualized development in relation to nested and interacting environments. For learners at risk, the immediate setting of home and classroom, relations between parents and teachers, and broader resource conditions may jointly shape educational opportunities. This framework is explanatory rather than an empirical demonstration that a particular local intervention works. Epstein (2011) proposed school, family, and community partnerships as overlapping spheres of influence. This supports a multi-stakeholder intervention logic: school-based instructional support, family learning routines, and community assistance with educational resources.

### Academic Needs and Self-Regulated Learning

Zimmerman (2002) described self-regulated learning as a cyclical process involving forethought, performance monitoring, and reflection. Difficulties with consistent study schedules, persistence, and task management can therefore be interpreted as potential support needs rather than solely student deficiencies. Structured study guidance and tutoring are plausible responses, but their effects must be assessed rather than presumed. In the original URS study, study habits, school-related conditions, and teacher-related conditions were characterized as “high impact” within its measurement framework. These instrument labels are not causal effect sizes (Aterrado et al., n.d.).

## **Psychosocial Needs and Coping**

Educational coping concerns may appear as avoidance, disaffection, fatigue, or difficulties sustaining motivation. The URS report described students who avoided confronting problems and struggled with independent learning tasks. This supports considering nonclinical coping-skills education and supportive school relationships. It does not constitute screening for psychiatric disorders or establish clinical treatment needs. The distinction matters because educational guidance and mental-health treatment involve different competencies, safeguards, and referral pathways.

## **Socioeconomic Needs and Equity**

OECD (2023) documented substantial socioeconomic differences in student performance across PISA 2022 education systems, while also identifying resilient disadvantaged learners. These are international associations and should not be transferred as local effect estimates. UNESCO (2020) emphasized that exclusionary barriers can overlap across poverty, location, disability, and other characteristics. Both sources support attention to resource access and equitable learning opportunities; neither proves that a specific livelihood-training course is the best intervention for the families in the URS report.

## **School–Family–Community Intervention Logic**

The combination of ecological and partnership perspectives suggests that support should not stop at remedial lessons. Parent guidance may improve the home-learning interface, teacher development may strengthen instructional contact, and community partnerships may address resource access. Yet an intervention must follow a documented problem and be proportionate to the strength of evidence. For example, limited access to gadgets justifies investigating resource lending or access support more directly than it justifies prescribing a particular income-generating activity.

## **Methodological Literature on Documentary and Thematic Analysis**

Bowen (2009) describes document analysis as a systematic procedure for reviewing and interpreting documentary material, including attention to credibility, meaning, and limitations. Braun and Clarke (2006) outline thematic analysis as a method for identifying patterns across qualitative material. The present study adapts these principles through deductive categories and an explicit extraction matrix. Because it draws on a single report, it is best understood as a structured secondary document analysis rather than a comprehensive systematic literature review.

## **Local Related Empirical Study**

Aterrado et al. (n.d.) used concurrent triangulation and reported 175 participants, consisting of 165 questionnaire respondents with grades 75–79 and 10 interviewees with grades below 75. Their study addressed demographic and parental conditions, learning modalities, motivation, coping, and performance. Reported correlations with performance were statistically significant but weak. Qualitative accounts described insufficient educational materials, home distractions, parents' limited capacity to explain lessons, and gaps in instructional follow-up. The present manuscript relies on that report's documented findings and cannot independently verify participants' responses without underlying data.

## **Synthesis and Research Gap**

The reviewed conceptual and institutional literature supports examining academic, psychosocial, and socioeconomic domains jointly. The specific contribution of this study is to classify the URS report's findings, separate direct documentary support from weaker inference, and formulate a transparent proposed intervention framework. It does not fill

the distinct gap of a new multi-stakeholder needs survey. Such primary validation remains necessary before selecting or prioritizing services.

## Conceptual Framework

Documented evidence → classification into academic, psychosocial, and socioeconomic needs → assessment of strength of documentary linkage → proposed school-, family-, and community-based responses → stakeholder validation and evaluation. This is an analytical framework, not an experimentally tested causal model.

## 2. METHODS

### Research Design and Corpus

A qualitative, directed documentary analysis was conducted on one completed URS mixed-methods research manuscript: “Causal Factors, Academic Motivation, Academic Coping and Performance of Students in the ‘New Normal’: Basis for an Extension Program for Students at Risk.” The report was selected purposively because it directly addresses students at risk and includes both findings and intervention implications. The original research sample is not the sample of the present analysis. No new human subjects were recruited.

### Data Extraction Protocol

6. Read the original report’s abstract, methodology, findings, summary and conclusions, and implications and recommendations.
7. Extract each distinct statement of a reported condition, concern, or proposed response; record its document section and whether it is a finding or an author recommendation.
8. Assign one or more deductive domains: academic, psychosocial, socioeconomic, family support, or instructional support.
9. Distinguish the empirical observation from the inferred need and the potential intervention.
10. Grade the evidence-to-intervention relationship as direct (closely responsive to the reported concern), indirect (plausible but not specifically assessed), or unestablished (no adequate evidence in the source).
11. Retain counterexamples and qualifications; avoid interpreting reported correlations as causal effects.

### Analytical Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is supported by explicit category definitions, a source-to-interpretation matrix, and separation of observation from recommendation. The present report does not claim that an independent second coder, member checking, or formal intercoder reliability testing occurred. For journal submission, a dated extraction sheet and independent audit of coding decisions would strengthen dependability and confirmability.

### Ethical Considerations

This analysis uses a previously completed research manuscript and does not reproduce identifiable participant records. Authorship of the original report is acknowledged. Institutional permissions for using unpublished source materials and any required research ethics determination should be confirmed before submission. Subsequent research involving minors would require appropriate permissions, consent/assent procedures, privacy protection, and referral safeguards.

### 3. RESULTS

#### Finding 1: Academic Needs

The source describes students studying mainly before quizzes, learning in distracting household conditions, lacking adequate materials or connectivity, and sometimes receiving insufficient instructional guidance or follow-up. These statements support considering organized tutoring, study-routine coaching, resource-access support, and improved teacher contact. They do not identify which particular subject areas or grade-level competencies should receive priority; diagnostic assessment would be needed for that determination.

#### Finding 2: Psychosocial Needs

Avoidance-oriented coping, disaffection, fatigue, and difficulties sustaining academic motivation were described in the source. These findings provide a documentary rationale for coping-skills instruction, supportive check-ins, and peer-assisted learning. They do not establish rates of mental-health conditions or the need for clinical counseling.

#### Finding 3: Socioeconomic and Family Needs

The source reported constraints in obtaining gadgets and learning resources, competing household responsibilities, and parental limitations in assisting with lessons. Directly supported responses include assistance with learning materials and practical parent guidance for supporting study at home. Broader income-generation initiatives are only indirectly related to the documented financial concerns and require a separate assessment of skills, interest, markets, and feasibility.

**Table 1. Evidence-to-intervention analytical matrix**

| Source finding (paraphrased)                             | Interpreted need                       | Potential response                                | Link                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Studying mainly before quizzes; weak routines            | Study planning and monitoring          | Study-skills coaching; tutorial schedules         | Direct                  |
| Teacher follow-up or guidance sometimes lacking          | Accessible instructional support       | Teacher follow-up protocols; tutorial guidance    | Direct                  |
| Learning materials, devices, or connectivity unavailable | Access to learning resources           | Resource lending and access partnerships          | Direct                  |
| Avoidance-oriented academic coping                       | Educational coping support             | Nonclinical coping-skills sessions                | Direct                  |
| Parents unable to explain lessons consistently           | Family learning guidance               | Parent orientation and home-study supports        | Direct                  |
| Financial difficulty in households                       | Resource affordability                 | Assess assistance and livelihood feasibility      | Indirect for livelihood |
| No mental-health diagnostic assessment                   | Clinical treatment need unknown        | Referral pathway only when individually indicated | Not established         |
| No gender-related needs inventory                        | Specific GAD training priority unknown | Conduct separate gender needs assessment          | Not established         |

#### Interpretation of Evidence Strength

“Direct” means the proposed response is logically close to a documented concern; it does not mean effectiveness has been demonstrated. “Indirect” means the response might



address an underlying condition but is not uniquely indicated by the available evidence. “Not established” means the source does not supply the specific information needed to prioritize that activity. These judgments are analytic classifications, not quantitative scores.

Table 2. Proposed integrated school–family–community framework

| Level         | Proposed support                                     | Intended outcome indicator                    | Validation needed                        |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| School        | Tutorials, study routines, instructional follow-up   | Attendance, diagnostic progress, engagement   | Learning gaps; teacher capacity          |
| Family        | Home-study guidance and parent–teacher communication | Parent participation; feasible study routines | Parent preferences; time constraints     |
| Community     | Learning-resource access and referrals               | Resource uptake; access barriers reduced      | Partner capacity; beneficiary priorities |
| Cross-cutting | Coping-skills education and child safeguards         | Participation and appropriate referrals       | Age-appropriate content; safeguards      |

4. DISCUSSION

The framework is consistent with the ecological view that academic vulnerability spans multiple contexts (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), the partnership approach to family–school relationships (Epstein, 2011), and self-regulated learning principles (Zimmerman, 2002). The international equity literature provides contextual support for attending to socioeconomic barriers (OECD, 2023; UNESCO, 2020). None of these sources can independently establish which local activity will be effective. The original URS study’s weak correlations further caution against assigning causal responsibility to parents, teachers, or poverty on the basis of associations alone.

A further limitation concerns the “new normal” setting: online and modular-learning barriers may have changed as schools returned to other delivery arrangements. The proposed framework should therefore be treated as a starting hypothesis for stakeholder validation, not a current ranked list of beneficiary needs.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. The source supports considering structured academic assistance, educational coping-skills support, parent guidance, teacher instructional support, and learning-resource access.
2. The source does not independently establish priority demand for specific livelihood training, clinical counseling, or gender-related seminars.
3. A proposed integrated framework can be derived transparently from existing evidence, but neither need prevalence nor intervention effectiveness is established by this documentary analysis.
4. A separate primary needs assessment and prospective evaluation remain necessary before treating the framework as validated.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Conduct a current multi-stakeholder needs assessment involving students, parents, teachers, and community partners, with appropriate protections for minors.
2. Use diagnostic learning measures and locally relevant resource-access questions to prioritize academic and socioeconomic assistance.

3. Assess psychosocial concerns with age-appropriate, ethically administered instruments and establish qualified referral arrangements where necessary.
4. Before adopting livelihood or specialized training, assess beneficiary demand, feasibility, resources, and expected benefits.
5. Pilot selected interventions and prospectively track participation, learner progress, acceptability, and unintended effects; use comparison designs when feasible.
6. Preserve dated research and planning records so later research-utilization claims can be independently verified.

## References

1. Aterrado, J. SJ., Aterrado, J. R., Manimtim, J. SJ., San Juan, J. A., &Dejarlo, J. O. (n.d.). Causal factors, academic motivation, academic coping and performance of students in the “new normal”: Basis for an extension program for students at risk [Unpublished research manuscript]. University of Rizal System. [Publication year and author initials require confirmation against the original record.]
2. Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
3. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
4. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
5. Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Westview Press.
6. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *PISA 2022 results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>
7. UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373718>
8. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2)

\*\*\*