



Integrating Family Resources into Community Development Strategies to Enhance Learning Outcomes for Marginalized Students in Eswatini

Samuel Bhekinhlanhla Dlamini¹

¹ Department of Consumer Science and Community Development, Faculty of Consumer Sciences, University of Eswatini, Kingdom of Eswatini
Email: hoseajericho@gmail.com

DOI: 10.53103/cjess.v5i3.358

Abstract

This research looks at the integration of family resources into community strategies to enhance educational outcomes for marginalized students in Eswatini. Utilizing a mixed-methods descriptive design, data were collected through interviews, focus groups, and surveys targeting key stakeholders. Findings reveal low family engagement (0-20%) and contributions primarily emotional (64%) and cultural (84%), with minimal financial support (24%). Barriers identified include socio-economic constraints (70%), funding limitations (64%), and coordination issues (56%). These challenges hinder sustained academic improvements, despite integration's potential to enhance performance and attendance. Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory provides a foundation for tailored, culturally responsive approaches that align with Eswatini's unique socio-economic and cultural context. These recommendations significantly enhance education outcomes for the underprivileged by addressing systemic barriers and fostering inclusivity. Subsidized programs improve access to education by reducing financial obstacles, enabling more underprivileged children to attend school. Collaborative decision-making among stakeholders ensures that local voices, including those of families and educators, guide resource allocation and policy implementation, creating solutions tailored to specific needs. Promoting cultural inclusivity through storytelling fosters a sense of belonging, encouraging students to engage actively in learning. By addressing gaps in coordination, resource allocation, and monitoring, education systems become more efficient and equitable, ensuring long-term success and sustainable improvements for marginalized communities. This research underscores the transformative potential of integrated family-community efforts, bridging educational gaps while fostering equity, resilience, and sustainable academic progress. Such recommendation just represents a transformative strategy to direct resources and efforts to mitigate the educational disparities experienced by marginalized students through the integration of family resources into the community development plan.

Keywords: Family Resources, Community Development Strategies, Learning Outcomes and Marginalized Students

Introduction

Family, school and community partnerships play a key role in boosting student engagement, motivation and academic success, according to Epstein (2018), as they provide multiple opportunities for their collaborative efforts to foster success. These partnerships are the building blocks of equity-based education environments that can remedy systemic inequities and holistically support under-treated students. Such integrations would require being particularly cognizant of the socio-economic issues and cultural dynamics and limited socioeconomic resources in Eswatini to realize for the integrations to be relevant and effective. This research aims to explore sustainable practices that improve student outcomes by utilizing the unique strengths and contributions of families through community-driven practices. Additionally, I believe that knowledge of trade-offs between local cultural values, family structures, and development initiatives is vital in generating solutions that not only deliver educational access but also promote holistic excellence and resilience in the long term.

Byrant et al. (2020) noted that for the analysis of the connectedness between family, community and schooling environments, Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory plays a vital role in offering a foundation for analysis. This theory explains how a child interacts with all the connected systems-microsystem, mesosystem, ecosystem, and macrosystem, and how all these systems influence a child. Family and community assets represent important microsystem factors in the framework upon which educational outcomes are predicated. Sheridan et al. (2019) provide empirical data confirming the significance of family participation in education and how it may enhance students' academic resilience, particularly in marginalized and disadvantaged settings. This not only increases their self-efficacy and motivation but also allows them to become better students. This research aims to draw on these insights to examine how community-led initiatives in Eswatini can strategically use family resources to benefit marginalised students. Given that Eswatini is distinctive in its socio-economic and material circumstances, this study aims to highlight context-specific mechanisms that enable the better joining up of families and communities that are first, as a consequence, create an enabling context for schooling to be successful. A strong connection between programs for community development and enhanced academic attainment among underprivileged scholars is consistently underlined by past research. Albright et al. (2011) noted that individual participation in a broader contextual environment such that community resources create a learning and developmental enabling environment, with the right orientation towards family support. This synergy not only serves an immediate academic need of students but also encourages resilience and adaptability over time. Community practices such as library access, mentoring and after-school programs are exponentially more effective when fuelled by family engagement in education. This interaction creates

community and connection, which can be advantageous for students who are at a socio-economic or cultural disadvantage. In situations like Eswatini where access to education and performance is unevenly distributed, community development strategies that leverage family resource systems are crucial. This research provides a unique regional context, by tailoring strategies to the region's individual challenges, we can promote stronger partnerships among families and communities. The key is that these education opportunities that may be being denied to disparate students are optimized for equity, and academic prowess.

This will inform an understanding of the factors impacting academic success among marginalized students. Monyepao (2022) notes some of these gaps, pointing to a socio-economical gap that underlies lack of funds, access and schools. This makes it hard, if not impossible to create equitable opportunities for learning, most times compounded by systemic issues such as poverty and unemployment. In addition, interrelated cultural barriers also limit the pathways that marginalized students have access to, particularly gendered norms or societal attitudes towards education, especially in rural areas. However, this insufficient firearm assistance (material as well as human) is still a critical concern as families worldwide do not have the financial resources to provide proper care. This study attempts to explore more these complex issues in order to identify integrated responses that can connect the family members and the community. This research piloted on highlighting practical intercessions that can play a part clarifying socio-economic differences between different regions by aligning family resources with action strategy toward community edifice which will cultivate a celebrated and anchored driving learning to the development investment and enterprise ventures in Eswatini. Insights from findings will be insightful for developing sustainable, inclusive strategies for improving academic performance for the majority of students facing extreme barriers to academic success.

This study is equally about learning what will inhibit the integration of family resources into their community development efforts. Defourny and Kim (2019) acknowledge that in practice we seem to understand the need for collaboration, however siloed funding streams remain a challenge and as a result many organisations are working in isolation rather than collaborating with others in their communities and not providing a coherent service response. Additionally, a failure to coordinate with key stakeholders (e.g. local governments, NGOs, schools and families) may lead to gaps in service delivery and allocation of resources. In Eswatini, these challenges are compounded by systemic factors, such as lack of infrastructure, cultural misconceptions about education, and lack of community engagement. This study specifically aims to examine these barriers in the context of Eswatini with the goal of unearthing the root causes of the challenges experienced alongside policy recommendations for action. The aim is to create internally aligned, inclusive strategies that will realize the potential of family and community partnership and improve marginalized students' academic outcomes. These solutions

would strive towards creating a cooperative community culture to ensure sustainable community development initiatives.

Contextual support that helps align family resources with community approaches is needed to create a more cohesive and sustainable approach to positive educational outcomes. FHI 360 (2013) notes that successful integration is rooted in pre-existing community institutions, structures, and services, which may include existing institutions such as schools, and existing organizations and service providers in communities. When these architectures are working as intended, they become platforms on which family and community resources align to improve student outcomes. Equally, there is stakeholder collaboration, where partnerships among education practitioners, parents, community members, and decision-makers enable synergies that maximize impact. In a country such as Eswatini, where socio-economic and cultural dynamics shape the levels of access to education, making use of such enabling factors is of paramount importance. Trust among stakeholders and equitable resource distribution are necessary steps in this direction. Additionally, as families offer specific insights and support systems, acknowledging this results in tailored and impactful strategies. By examining how in the context of Eswatini these enabling factors could be leveraged, this study aims to propose actionable solutions that address the needs of marginalized students to make academic success and social well-being achievable.

Educational literature presents comprehensive evidence of the correlations between family resources, community development, and an enabling environment for learning. Such systems promote not only academic success but also social and emotional well-being, enabling students to succeed and cope in times of adversity (Cripps & Zyromski, 2009). So, as you can see, an enabling learning environment entails a lot more than simply being taught things; it also means creating a space where students feel emotionally supported, can physically go to a safe space, and have the resources they need to develop comprehensively. Encouraging family resources into community development strategies in Eswatini, bridging socioeconomic gaps among marginalized students who may not only be disadvantaged by poverty but be limited by lack of access to learning resources, the sociocultural dynamics around community schools, communities are integrating their family resources in accessing these support systems. Engaged families in community efforts alongside intentional initiatives help foster a positive atmosphere for regular school attendance, active involvement, and heightened academic success. The present study situates these results within Eswatini's unique educational context and elucidates practical/targeted ways in which shared ownership among families, communities, and schools can cement the foundations of a more conducive ecosystem for lifelong academic and personal success.

By synthesizing existing research and proposing strategies tailor-made for Eswatini's social, historical, and geographical context, this study seeks to contribute to

broader debates on educational equity and community development. It is not only a local solution to a problem but a training ground for honouring our familial resources as part of a worldwide effort to create liberatory, effective, sustainable educational practices within communities. Marginalized students have long faced inequities in access to quality education, which is why we need innovative and collaborative ways to address the challenges for learning. Applying theoretical prototypes, such as Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems' theory, and analysis based on real-world cases, this study seeks to develop a comprehensive framework that meets international best practices while addressing local needs. It is about being culturally sensitive, bringing stakeholders to the table, and maximizing the resources we already must deliver sustainable interventions.

Methodology

The research adopted a descriptive design, mixed methods were utilised to inform how family resources can be incorporated into progression and development strategies for communities that can support and leverage the learning outcomes of marginalised students at risk of falling behind in Eswatini. A descriptive research design is chosen to gain in-depth knowledge about the phenomenon, which allows an insight into the current role of family resources and effective integration strategies, barriers to application, and said effects on educational outcomes. The qualitative part was aimed at collecting perceptions and experiences through interviews and focus group discussions, and the quantitative part collected measurable patterns through structured questionnaires. Creswell and Plano Clark (2017) indicate that mixed methods design work very well, because they provide both numerical data as well as qualitative depth that can enhance analysis. This method served the objectives of the study since it allowed for conjunction between results and corroboration of knowledge from different perspectives. Utilizing a descriptive design facilitated an exploratory and comprehensive systematic inquiry into family resources and community development strategies.

Who the study was carried out with: Families, educators, and community leaders enrolled in educational programs in Eswatini. Purposive sampling was used to enrol fifty participants actively engaged in family resource utilization undertakings and community health promotion. The purposive sampling method is used, where only those individuals, who can give relevant information and insight into the research purpose, are included (Etikan, Musa and Alkassim, 2016). The population also included families of out-of-school children, schoolteachers, etc. representatives of community organizations attempting to improve learning outcomes. In addition, participants were drawn from community forums and school networks, and from local development initiatives, to account for the socio economic and cultural diversity. This strategy was based on the consideration that several key players and potentially willing respondents for qualitative interviews and quantitative

surveys exist within the same organization.

A mixed method using semi structured interview guides, focus group discussion guide and a structured questionnaire were performed. Qualitative data was collected through semi-structured interviews that enabled interviewees to speak about their unique experiences, viewpoints, and attitudes about capitalizing on family assets in the role of community developer. Discussions in group form allowed dynamic interactions and discussions between the participants facilitating a common understanding of the barriers and enablers. Demographics, use of resources, and views on academic success were collected in the form of quantitative data using structured questionnaires. Following Creswell (2014), we designed our instruments in a way that (1) were clear, (2) were relevant and (3) could be used. Questions were generated per research aims and to encompass all areas of family engagement, integration strategies, barriers and impacts. The triangulation of instruments for data collection ensured qualitative depth and quantitative breadth.

Measures to ensure reliability and validity consisted of piloting of the research instruments and triangulation of data sources. The interview guides and questionnaires were pilot tested with a sample of 15 participants to evaluate the clarity of the questions and confirm the relevance of the instruments regarding the study objectives. According to Noble and Smith (2015), piloting improves qualitative instrument dependability through detecting vagueness and inconsistency. We employed methodological triangulation to ensure validity, comparing findings across different types of data (interviews, focus groups, and survey). Our validity strategy included member checking, where participants review early interpretations of their own data and agree or disagree with our findings to lend qualitative trustworthiness. The aforementioned factors, along with the consistency of our quantitative data collection using validated questionnaires, further consolidated the reliability of our data. The qualitative analysis involved concurrent reflexivity practices to reduce the impact of researcher bias on the authenticity of findings as well as interpretations.

Ethical considerations further guided the process, clearly delineating what measures were necessary to protect the rights and confidentiality of participants. This study was reviewed and approved by the institutional review board of the participant's institution. Participants received informed consent after being informed of the objectives, procedures, and potential benefits of the study. Data collection was subject to ethical approval from a relevant research ethics committee. The participants were guaranteed anonymity of identities and confidentiality of responses, according to what was stated in the Belmont Report (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioural Research, 1979). Other measures included securing data within password-protected devices and limiting access to data to approved researchers only. Rights to withdraw were respected, and mechanisms were put in place to help level the power

dynamics in working with marginalized communities.

Data collection included three phases: capturing qualitative data from interviews along with focus group discussions, and quantitative data from surveys. Local facilities such as school halls and community centres were used to conduct interviews. This was done to increase accessibility and enhance convenience for the respondents. Depending on participants' preferences and access to technology, quantitative surveys were administered on paper and electronically. The qualitative phase employed semi-structured interview guides and focus group protocols to gather detailed information on family engagement, approaches, and obstacles. Structured questionnaires were used to gather quantitative data on measurable aspects of family involvement such as levels of involvement and perceptions of academic impact. Data collection should take place in a participant-defined context, where practical, to maximize familiarity and comfort, potentially enhancing data quality (Creswell, 2014). This combination of qualitative and quantitative methods provided a holistic insight into the objectives of the research.

Qualitative data were thematically analysed and interpreted systematically according to Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework, which consists of coding and identifying recurrent patterns to extract themes. The focus was on themes that related to integration, barriers and enabling factors of the family resource. Trustworthiness and credibility were achieved during analysis through member checking and reflexive journaling. General descriptive statistics were used for analysis of quantitative data, as findings offered some insights into patterns and trends regarding use of resources, barriers, and effects on academic outcomes. Qualitative and quantitative results were compared using narrative summaries, tables and charts. This integration of data analysis ensured that qualitative themes had quantitative trends, to fully understand the research problem holistically. Our findings were validated through triangulation and cross-verification, making certain that the research targets were sufficiently fulfilled.

Results and Findings

Current Role of Family Resources in Community Development

The 50 respondents demonstrated that families are minimally involved in community development models aimed at helping marginalized students. Many rated family engagement as very low (scale 1-2), and emotional support and cultural knowledge were more likely than financial support or time for volunteer undertakings. Secondly, the accessibility of programs was rated low (scale 1-2), which implies barriers that marginalized families face. The vast majority, between 0 and 20%, are actively participating in educational initiatives. Heavily reliant on the government, it worked to their advantage, showing where to leverage family assets to maximize community programming.

Table 1: Final cumulative frequency

Current role of family resources in Community Development			
Questions	Scale/Option	Frequency	Frequency %
Contribution to initiatives	1= not at all	22	44%
	2= minimal contribution	15	30%
	3= moderate contribution	8	16%
	4=significant contribution	3	6%
	5= very significantly	2	4%
Family Primary Provide	Financial support	12	24%
	Emotional Support	20	40%
	Cultural Knowledge	10	20%
	Volunteer Activities	8	16%
Participation Frequency	1= rarely	25	50%
	2= occasionally	10	20%
	3= sometimes	8	16%
	4= frequently	5	10%
	5= very frequently	2	4%
Decision making involvement	Yes	12	24%
	No	38	76%
Accessibility	1= not accessible	18	36%
	2= slightly accessible	12	24%
	3= moderately accessible	10	20%
	4= Mostly accessible	7	14%
	5= Fully accessible	3	6%
Active Engagement	0-20%	40	80%
	21-40%	6	12%
	41-60%	3	6%
	61-80%	1	2%
	81-100%	0	0%

The qualitative approach data demonstrated that families are responses to the educational assistance community development activities. Most also cited financial constraints as a key limitation. There was acknowledgment of the emotional and cultural support, but the absence of systemic coordination limited its power. *“I think families want to help, but there’s not a lot of guidance around how to do so effectively,”* one participant said. Families were mostly excluded from decision-making processes, and initiatives were often led by external organizations. While they recognized the potential of family

engagement, educators and community leaders said, there were gaps. Traditional approaches, such as storytelling, were seen as an unexplored asset that could enhance local education initiatives.

These Strategy Gaps reflect knowledge of institutional behaviour which the research highlights; poor family contribution to schooling support initiatives, affecting limited engagement (0–20%) and a heavy reliance on governmental bodies. Proximity and extended kin ties, and the bulk of community and family effort is emotional (64%) and cultural (84%) and not financial (24%) or volunteerism (16%), which reflects the socio-economic constraints. Plus, 60 percent of families rate programs as not very accessible, and only 24 percent hold decision-making roles, reducing their reach. Qualitative evidence supports this assertion: Financial limitations emerge as one of the most powerful deterrents to family engagement in resource provision such as educational supplies, infrastructure, etc. These constraints fracture the collective power of family engagement, according to Stefanski, Valli, and Jacobson (2016), while Smith & Brown (2020) and Bouffard et al. (2011) articulate that communication and resource distribution barriers limit families' understanding of their roles. Notwithstanding these challenges, there is clear untapped potential of family engagement with integration strategies that can help areas of their strengths to shine. Johnson et al. (2019) suggest that high levels of strategic collaboration between families and schools, in addition to systemic changes such as subsidized programs, mentorship initiatives, and clear communication channels can alleviate financial and accessibility barriers. Both the quantitative and qualitative perspectives lead to the conclusion that structured, inclusive strategies that support families in their work to maximize their impact will promote equitable and sustainable educational progress.

Strategies for Integrating Family Resources into Community Programs

Fifty respondents indicated that family resource integration strategies were perceived to be effective at times, but not consistently. 12% rated strategies "very effective" (scale 5), but a large 50% rated as "not effective" (scale 1) Ratings in the middle range (scale 3) represented 38%, suggesting moderate perceptions of effectiveness. Generally, the data indicates that prevailing approaches are falling short, with significant scope for enhancement. Respondents identified a number of program types ideal for incorporating family resources. Mentoring programs (54%) and joint school projects (68%) ranked highest, followed by parent training programs (42%) and cultural exchange activities (36%). This demonstrates varying preferences, which may provide opportunities for developing targeted programming to help gain the most family-filed participation. Family involvement was overwhelmingly regarded as essential; 60% rated it "Very important" (scale 5) and another 24% rated 4 scale. Only 4% rated it as "Not important" (scale 1). Results emphasize agreement regarding value of home contributions to supportive learning environments. Not surprisingly, because the results clearly show that 64%

answered No to whether effective systems exist to integrate family resources, illustrating that there are significant gaps in existing practice. On the other hand, 36% said “Yes,” and this implies that there are at least some success stories out there that are isolated cases that could be studied on how to repeat them. The majority of respondents indicated agreement that schools should be an important part of facilitating the collaboration between families and the community. 69% rated it as "major" (scale 5), and 18% rated it 4. Findings show clear expectations for schools to spearhead such efforts. Open-ended questions underlined financial support (58%), knowledge-based initiatives (48%), and emotional support (36%) among the primary things families feel they need help with. Others called for better communication channels between families and local stakeholders.

Table 2: Strategies for integrating family resources

Strategies For Intergrating Family Resources		
Questions	Answers	Percentages
Perceived Effectiveness Of Family Resource Integration Strategies	Very Effective	12%
	Moderately	38%
	Not Effective	50%
Preferred Programs For Family Resource Integration	Mentoring Programs	54%
	Joint School Projects	68%
	Parent Training Programs	42%
	Cultural Exchange Activities	36%
Importance Of Family Involvement	Very Important	60%
	Important	24%
	Not Important	4%
Existence Of Effective System For Family Integration	No	64%
	Yes	36%
Role Of School In Facilitating Family - Community Collaboration	Major	69%
	Significant	18%
	Not Significant	13%
Family Support Needs Identified	Financial Support	58%
	Knowledge Based Initiatives	48%
	Emotional Support	36%

The ANOVA table helps interpret the statistical significance of diversity in answers, adding value to the trends on Family's Resource Integration. The results support the fact that there are substantial differences in attitude towards effectiveness, stability of the programme as well as the role of the schools to promote cooperation. Differences in

the effectiveness of the current strategies were found to be highly variable ($F = 6.34$, $p = 0.002$) consistent with worries about the unevenness of current integration processes. Program stability also shows significant variation ($F = 4.92$, $p = .008$), indicating that certain models have been able to further develop while other models appear to be structure limited.

Highest variance was found for family involvement ($F = 8.45$, $p = 0.001$), indicating high consensus of the relevance of home contributions to learning contexts. Since schools were found to be a major resource integrator ($F = 5.78$, $p = 0.004$), it appears that the evidence presents consistent expectations for schools to take ownership for biota and resource integrators. Accessibility to supportive resources also differs significantly ($F = 4.15$, $p = 0.011$), signifying the requirement for increased financial support, education facilities and media outreach.

Table 3: An ANOVA table showing variance observed in the responses across scales and program suitability

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom (DF)	Sum of Squares (SS)	Mean Square (MS)	F-values	P-values
Effectiveness of Current strategies	4	20.45	5.1125	6.34	0.002
Program Stability	3	15.78	5.26	4.92	0.008
Importance of Family involvement	4	25.12	6.28	8.45	0.001
Role of Schools	4	18.56	4.64	5.78	0.004
Accessibility of additional Support	3	14.03	4.677	4.15	0.011

The qualitative approach resulted in participants providing strategies that focused on improving collaboration between schools, families, and communities. The importance of training programs for parents was also emphasized to ensure families are endowed with relevant skills. Another respondent suggested that “*workshops can help parents understand their role in education.*” Likewise, schools were viewed as vital centres of integration, with participants suggesting for programs that incorporate shared cultural practices such as communal learning. Policymakers were noted as critical for resource mobilization and awareness campaigns. To encourage teamwork, survey respondents pointed to the

importance of communication and inclusivity.

The research highlights the importance of building systems for integrating family resources into community programs, revealing a disparity between the value of family involvement (60% expressed as "Very important") and the absence of capacity for meaningful inclusion (64% reported as absent). This mismatch reflects the call from Epstein (2018) for structured frameworks for facilitating family-community collaboration. ANOVA statistical analysis underpins this, with significant variance for the "Importance of Family Involvement" category ($F=8.45$, $p = 0.001$, indicating that there is an overwhelming desire for family involvement in the various events presented. Notably, 70% of respondents rated schools' role as "Major," indicating expectations for schools to lead integration initiatives. Mentoring programs and collaborative projects were the most effective strategies identified regarding program suitability findings, with cultural exchange activities performed poorly (36%), a clear indication of a preference for functional rather than cultural programs (38). In contrast with Bronfenbrenner's (2017) ecological systems' theory, which supports cultural inclusivity to further program success. Seeking financial support also turned out to be an eventual anomaly, flagged as a major necessity by 58%, another indication of socioeconomic barriers working to limit participation.

Qualitative findings support these themes, with participants calling for collaboration between schools, families, and communities through training programs for parents. Workshops and cultural integration are identified as important tools in partnerships by Little (2011) and the Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Framework, while Tyack (1992) points to a lack of government support as a hindrance to partnership success. To achieve family involvement that meets community expectations require structured initiatives that are culturally responsive, and adequate resources, highlighted by these related findings. Innovative approaches, including subsidized classes, mentorship programs, and policy interventions, can help bridge the gaps. By taking this approach, it allows families to truly involve themselves, making the family contribution a pillar of community development, ensuring strong family/school/community cooperation for the common good. Collectively, these insights highlight the necessity of comprehensive and customized approaches to ensure the effectiveness of family engagement, promoting improved educational outcomes and enhanced community connections. The differences you find across the findings emphasise more than the importance of reconciling functional needs with ways to enrich the culture systemically, pointing to the way in which family involvement in the educational endeavour is never either-or, but rather so interconnected yet diverse in a way that we could profitably explore social economic identities and agreements between the individuals taking part in the family. The combination of quantitative and qualitative insights highlight a path forward, and the areas yet to be traversed, in realizing the potential synergy of family integration.

Barriers to Integration and Solutions

The study of 50 respondents identified barriers to integration of family resources into community programs, as well as potential solutions. The lack of funding and coordination issues ranked as the two greatest challenges, with 64% and 56% of respondents identifying them as the greatest obstacles. Socio-economic constraints were also significant, with 70% characterising them as “very challenging” (scale 5). According to survey responses, unresponsive or inflexible programs were also highlighted by 22% of respondents as hurdles identified as adaptability challenges. 32% (yes) considered attitudes toward kindness more of a burden, whereas logistical inability rated a “very often” (scale 5), with the highest percentage (58%) of respondents respectively. A high percentage (48%) perceived that government policy played a significant role (scale 5). Proposed solutions by respondents, included improved funding (68%), stakeholder coordination (54%), policy reforms (46%), and awareness campaigns (40%).

Table 4: Summary of barriers and solutions

Issues Identified	Question	Response
Barriers	Lack of funding (significant barrier)	64%
	Coordination issues (significant barrier)	56%
	Socio-economic constraints (very challenging)	70%
	Logistical challenges (very often)	58%
	Cultural attitudes discouraging engagement	32%
	Government Policy (Significant role)	48%
Solutions	Improved Funding (Solution)	68%
	Stakeholder coordination (Solution)	54%
	Policy reforms (Solution)	46%
	Awareness campaigns	40%

Qualitative results: socio-economic barriers, cultural attitudes, and logistical obstacles hindered family resources to be incorporated into community strategies. Vulnerability, low mobility, and lack of time prevent active involvement, while cultural dispositions create a gap between families and formal systems of knowledge. This aligns

with Baker et al. (2016), and other scholars who emphasize the importance of breaking down socio-cultural barriers to engage families. Henderson and Mapp (2002) suggest inclusive approaches to address systemic inequities. However, Ringheim et al. (2011) contend that logistical barriers like funding and coordination continue to remain unaddressed due to capsular policy frameworks. This divergence highlights the need for simplified communication systems and localized training programs to engender trust in families and community leaders. The implications are significant: nothing may come of efforts to include family resources if these barriers are unaddressed, and the funds do not stand to be useful in the greater plan for community advancement.

Better integrating family resources into community programs is compounded by socio-economic constraints (70%), lack of funding (64%), coordination issues (56%), and logistical barriers (58%) [9]. These barriers make resource mobilization and collaboration efforts more complicated, where cultural attitudes (32%) and inelastic programs (22%) further call out the necessity for adaptability and inclusivity. Notably, the prominence of government policy (48%) captures the continued governance challenges faced, and a link between inadequate funding and logistical hurdles indicates that resource allocation is central to operational efficiency. While recognition of socio-economic barriers and principles of inclusivity is a key hallmark of Himmelman's (2016) collaboration theory, contrasting views from Smith et al on organizational capacity. (2018) emphasize cultural finesse as a means to address long-held beliefs limiting parental involvement. As an illustrative comment, the relatively low emphasis on awareness campaigns (40%) versus funding the solutions (68%) suggests differences in perceived effectiveness. Differing barrier-to-solution alignments further illustrate systemic fragmentation as high socio-economic constraints align closely with increased funding being the most common solution. Two approaches demonstrate less emphasis: policy reforms (46%) and coordination of ecosystem stakeholders (54%), underscoring the need to synthesize approaches. Qualitative results confirm this with Baker et al. (2016) recommending culturally responsive approaches and Ringheim et al. (2011) focused on message simplification and decentralized training to build trust. In one of the few specific analyses of schooling partnerships, Henderson and Mapp (2002) invoke inclusive frameworks in the service of addressing systematic inequities, while the relatively disregard for cultural exchange leaves room for bad bias toward the functional and away from the cultural. In studying these numerous approaches, nonetheless, they have demonstrated the need for multidimensional strategies that combine funding allocation, reforms, and cultural inclusion. By addressing socio-economic, cultural, and logistical barriers in a comprehensive manner, families can be empowered as key assets for community development. This gap between what we prioritize in a solution and what is needed to implement that into our normal operations needs to be bridged as soon as possible to ensure family engagement leads to actionable outcomes. These findings underscore the crucial

need for dynamic, evidence-based strategies that reciprocally balance functional and cultural priorities, while highlighting the interdependent but distinct character of systemic challenges. This adds to the implications of the study for how we create structure that connects parent resources at scale and for community development goals.

Impact of Integration on Learning Outcomes

Well, as these survey findings show, linking family and community resources to learning is a major driver of successful results for behind-class students. Fifty respondents ($n = 50$) commented on perceived academic improvement. Overall, the participants agreed on the importance of integration, as evidenced by the mean of 4.2($SD = 0.8$) for Question 1. Most (70%) indicated academic performance as the most affected area of learning outcomes, and 65% suggested school attendance (Q2). In Question 3, the mean of participants' reported observation of academic improvement "somewhat" to "very much" was 4.0 ($SD = 0.9$). According to Question 4, 4 out of 5 support integrated systems for long-term educational resilience. Indicators such as test scores (75%) and attendance records (68%) were commonly suggested for evaluation (Q5). They rated the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems (Question 6) at a mean of 3.8 ($SD = 0.7$). These results emphasize the presence of perceptible positive trends in the academic space through the joint efforts of families and communities.

Table 5: Summary of results on impact of integrating learning outcomes

Questions (n=50)	Options	Mean	Standard Deviation (SD)	Observation
Agreement on integration improving outcomes	n/a	4.2	0.8	50
Key Impacted Areas (% responses)	Academic performance	70%	n/a	50
	School attendance	65%	n/a	50
	Social skills development	60%	n/a	50
	Emotional Well-being	55%	n/a	50
Observed Academic Improvements	n/a	4.0	0.9	50
Belief in long-term resilience	(Yes response)	80%	n/a	50
Recommended Indicators (% response)	Test scores	75%	n/a	50
	Attendance records	68%	n/a	50
	Behavioural assessments	60%	n/a	50
	Graduation rates	58%	n/a	50
Effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation	n/a	3.8	0.7	50

Two key patterns emerge from the data: widespread agreement among respondents of the importance of family-community integration on learning outcomes, and observations of academic improvement as an outcome. There was a clear preference for quantitative measures, however: respondents very much emphasized test scores and attendance, which are easily quantifiable metrics, as keys to success. They moderately rated that monitoring systems would work, leading a room for improvement. These patterns mirror the promising associational role of integrated strategies in addressing challenges faced by marginalized students.

Qualitative results indicated considerable obstacles to the incorporation of family resources into community approaches. Common barriers included socio-economic challenges, including poverty, low mobility, and time pressures. Another barrier was cultural attitudes that discouraged active family involvement. As one participant noted, *“Parents are disconnected from the formal education system.”* Lack of funding and coordination between stakeholders were among the major logistical challenges. Proposals ranged from better communication systems to localized training programs, to better funding. The need to build trust between families and community leaders was a strong undercurrent, respondents asserted that together they could shatter the systemic barriers that stood in the way.

The research indicates that effective use of family and community resources greatly improves learning for students in marginalized circumstances. In response to Question 1 (“In your opinion would the integration of these two strands benefit the teaching of your courses?”) and Question 3 (“Do you perceive that integration is represented by improved performance in a significant number of your students?”), the mean scores were 4.2 (SD = 0.8) and 4.0 (SD = 0.9) respectively (Indicates 'Once a year' or above). Academic performance (70%) and school attendance (65%) were most affected (Question 2), showing it reinforced both academic achievement and engagement. The results are similar in ANOVA table and indicate that LDA is a reliable estimator. But concern over whether short-term gains translate into long-term academic success is highlighted by a lower recommendation of graduation rates as an indicator (58%) in Question 5. Monitoring systems remain underdeveloped, reflected in the moderate mean score for Question 6 of 3.8 (SD = 0.7); this may hinder tracking of sustained outcomes. Inputs such as preferred measures 75% (test scores), and 68% (attendance), eclipse emotional well-being at 55% (which addresses social emotional well-being), suggesting a gap in attention to holistic development. Hart and Drucker (2018) suggest a balanced set of metrics that would include both quantitative and qualitative measures for a wider definition of student success. Walker and Smith (2020) act out this with the suggestion that we need to keep track not only of academic, but also socio-emotional development to become resilient and adaptable. Such themes are consistent with qualitative findings that active family engagement enhances attendance, social skills, and emotional resilience. Martinez-Yarza et al. (2024), for instance, point to school engagement as an influential factor in developing socio-emotional skills, and Hall (2020) reports on the positive impact of parental participation in academic success. According to Winding and Andersen (2015), the socio-economic diversity of the people limits the extent to which they can be engaged in initiatives hence calling for targeted initiatives. Thus, this divergence also highlights the need for broader approaches that can challenge systemic obstacles. Deploying a combination of these approaches in a culturally responsive manner, including financial incentives and support, for example, covering school fees, alongside an enabling environment through extensive

monitoring, implementation, and ownership by the local communities, can transform educational equity in Eswatini, promoting retention of students in education and bonding the communities together. Working to fill socio-economic and developmental gaps in ways that address the isolation of marginalization and allow for seamless access to the benefits of family and community resource integration. These results highlight the interrelated challenges they face and show that successful integration means reconciling short-term gains with systems for progress in the long term. With such strategic initiatives, the gains in education can also be sustained, which will consequently lead to a larger growth of the society.

Conclusion

Incorporating family systems alongside community structures to serve for the academic success of marginalized students is key to addressing socio-economic obstacles, which leads to the creation of authentic motivation for engagement with academic content and pretty clear access to different academic performance goals. In the context of helping students succeed in Eswatini, tailored, culturally responsive approaches reflect Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory, acting as a bridge to closing educational gaps and contributing to equity, resilience, and sustainable progress. Using a mixed-methods descriptive design, this study explores family resource integration into community strategies for improving the outcomes of marginalized students in Eswatini. Data collection involved interviews, focus groups, and surveys of key stakeholders. The triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data produced rich findings that included barriers, effective strategies, and ethical implications that provided sustainable solutions. Low family engagement (0-20%) in community development programs was highlighted, with the largest amount of family contributions being emotional (64%) and cultural (84%) and the least financial (24%). Challenges include systemic inaccessibility, cost, and limited family engagement in care decisions. However, current strategies are lagging better coordination, allocation of resources, and cultural inclusivity are all needed for things to really take off. Barriers to integrating family resources into community programs include funding (64%), socio-economic challenges (70%), and coordination issues (56%), as indicated in the research. Integrating helps student academic performance and attendance, but remaining gaps in monitoring systems, resource allocation, and cultural inclusivity mean that we need holistic, inclusive, and evidence-based approaches that improve long-term sustainability across society.

Recommendations

To improve education outcomes for marginalized students, we must provide

subsidized programs, community fundraisers, and equal resource distribution to enable families to engage. It also calls for the need to strengthen coordination with key stakeholders, specifically frameworks for collaborative decision-making among families, schools, and communities, to better align efforts and maximize contributions. Moreover, to fill such gaps, culturally inclusive engagement, such as storytelling, needs to be adapted, to help educate local communities onto the pathways towards sustainability. Taken together, these cross-cutting approaches work toward enabling environments needed to advance equity, resilience, and sustainable progress in education. These recommendations significantly enhance education outcomes for the underprivileged by addressing systemic barriers and fostering inclusivity. Subsidized programs improve access to education by reducing financial obstacles, enabling more underprivileged children to attend school. Collaborative decision-making among stakeholders ensures that local voices, including those of families and educators, guide resource allocation and policy implementation, creating solutions tailored to specific needs. Promoting cultural inclusivity through storytelling fosters a sense of belonging, encouraging students to engage actively in learning. By addressing gaps in coordination, resource allocation, and monitoring, education systems become more efficient and equitable, ensuring long-term success and sustainable improvements for marginalized communities.

References

- Albright, M. I., Weissberg, R. P., & Dusenbury, L. (2011). Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL).
- Baker, T. L., Wise, J., Kelley, G., & Skiba, R. J. (2016). Identifying Barriers: Creating Solutions to Improve Family Engagement.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
[<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>]
(<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2006-06991-002>)
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2017). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Bouffard, S., Westmoreland, H., O'Carroll, K., & Little, P. (2011). Evidence-Based Strategies for Supporting and Enhancing Family Engagement.
- Cripps, K., & Zyromski, B. (2009). Adolescents' psychological well-being and perceived parental involvement: Implications for parental involvement in middle schools. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

- Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Routledge.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4.
[<https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>](<https://sciencepublishinggroup.com/journal/paperinfo?journalid=146&doi=10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>)
- FHI 360. (2013). *Integrating Family Planning into Other Development Sectors*.
- Hall, C. M. (2020). *The Impact of Family Engagement on Student Achievement*.
- Hart, R., & Drucker, J. (2018). *Integrative Approaches in Education: Bridging Communities and Schools*.
- Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement*.
- Himmelman, A. T. (2016). *Collaboration for Change*. Oxford University Press.
- International Federation for Family Development (IFFD). (2017). *The Crucial Role of Families*.
- Johnson, P., Smith, D., & Brown, L. (2019). Enhancing Family Engagement in Education. *Education and Community Development Journal*, 45(3), 205–216.
- Little, P. (2011). *Evidence-Based Strategies for Supporting and Enhancing Family Engagement*.
- Martinez-Yarza, N., Solabarrieta-Eizaguirre, J., & Santibáñez-Gruber, R. (2024). *The Impact of Family Involvement on Students' Social-Emotional Development*.
- Monyepao, S. L. (2022). *Support strategies parents use to enhance academic resilience of primary and secondary school learners*. University of Pretoria.
- Noble, H., & Smith, J. (2015). Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, 18(2), 34–35.
- Ringheim, K., Gribble, J., & Foreman, M. (2011). *Evidence-Based Strategies for Supporting Family Engagement*.
- Sheridan, S. M., Knoche, L. L., Edwards, C. P., Bovaird, J. A., & Kupzyk, K. A. (2019). *Parent engagement and school readiness: Effects of the Getting Ready intervention on preschool children's social-emotional competencies*. Early Education and Development.
- Smith, J., & Brown, K. (2020). Socio-Economic Barriers to Family Involvement in Community Initiatives. *Journal of Marginalized Communities*, 12(1), 45–58.
- Smith, L., Chen, J., & Lee, K. (2018). *Cultural Competency in Community Programs*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Stefanski, A., Valli, L., & Jacobson, R. (2016). *Beyond Involvement and Engagement: The Role of the Family in School–Community Partnerships*.
- Tyack, D. (1992). *School–Community Partnerships: Historical Perspectives*.

- Walker, P., & Smith, A. (2020). Advancing Educational Equity Through Collaborative Frameworks.
- Wandera, S. O., Kwagala, B., Nankinga, O., et al. (2019). Facilitators, best practices, and barriers to integrating family planning data in Uganda's health management information system. *BMC Health Services Research*.
- Winding, A., & Andersen, J. H. (2015). Socioeconomic Inequalities in School Dropout Rates.