

Educational and Security Synergies: Collaborative Policy Enforcement in Academic Institutions

Joar V. Uy^{1*}, Lester D. Capending¹, Guillermo G. Flores², Wennie Ann Cale³, Diana M. Bacala⁴, Archie Lanciso Cristobal⁵, Joselito Balanza Barba Jr.⁶

¹College of Criminal Justice and Sciences, Northwest Samar State University, Calbayog City, 6710

²College of Criminology and Administration, ICCT Colleges Foundation, Inc., Cainta 1900, Rizal, Philippines

³Taguig City University, Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa - Graduate School and Philippine College of Criminology, CCJ, - National Capital Region, Manila 1003, Philippines

⁴Philippine National Police – CARAGA Police Regional Office 13, Butuan City 8600, Philippines

⁵Police Regional Office 5-Philippine National Police Region, Legazpi City 4500, Philippines

⁶Philippine National Police, Taguig City University, Central Pacific Asia Colleges, Taguig City 1632, National Capital Region, Philippines

*Corresponding author: Joar V. Uy, joar.uy@nwssu.edu.ph

HOW TO CITE:

Joar V. Uy, Lester D. Capending, Guillermo G. Flores, Wennie Ann Cale, Diana M. Bacala, Archie Lanciso Cristobal, Joselito Balanza Barba Jr. (2026). Educational and Security Synergies: Collaborative Policy Enforcement in Academic Institutions. International Journal of Special Education, 41(3s), 297-308.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT:

Fostering a secure and nurturing educational atmosphere necessitates active cooperation among diverse institutional stakeholders. Although prior literature frequently examines academic discipline and campus security as isolated domains, a notable research gap persists regarding the collaborative enforcement of institutional policies between teaching staff and security teams. Consequently, this exploratory research examines the practical negotiation of duties, communication frameworks, and mutual responsibilities between these cohorts, evaluating how their partnership impacts student conduct, campus security, and the broader educational climate. Utilizing a qualitative methodology, this investigation conducted in-depth individual interviews with a purposively selected cohort comprising six educators and six security officers across multiple Philippine locales (Samar, Rizal, Butuan City, Legaspi City, and Taguig City). The gathered data underwent reflexive thematic analysis to identify distinct patterns concerning shared duties, communication protocols, and the evaluated effectiveness of this partnership on safety metrics and disciplinary outcomes. Results indicate that successful cooperation hinges upon explicit boundary-setting regarding roles; specifically, educators oversee internal classroom management while security staff address macro-level campus threats. Essential collaborative strategies identified include prompt radio dispatch, routine operational briefings, and retrospective incident debriefings. In conclusion, the findings propose that robust alliances between educational and security personnel foster a more supportive, secure, and progressively non-punitive academic setting.

Keywords: Enforcement, Education, Cooperation, Security Personnel

Introduction

Historically, school administrators and instructional staff carried the sole burden of maintaining campus discipline. However, escalating concerns regarding school violence and overall student safety have catalyzed a structural shift, prompting educational institutions to integrate guards, resource officers, and other security personnel into their operational frameworks (Trump, 2011). This integration transforms policy enforcement from an isolated educational task into a shared, multi-stakeholder responsibility (Beger, 2003; Brown, 2005; Carpio et al., 2024; Garil et al., 2024).

The success of this collaborative enforcement relies heavily on explicit role delineation. When professional boundaries are clearly established—typically with educators handling pedagogical behavior management and security teams mitigating severe, macro-level threats—policy execution becomes highly efficient, whereas role ambiguity often breeds organizational friction and inconsistent discipline (Devlin, 2011; May et al., 2016; Theriot, 2009; Weisburst, 2019). Institutional compliance and cohesive action are further strengthened when staff possess a firm grasp of their legal and professional duties (Chavez et al., 2024). Additionally, establishing robust interdepartmental communication channels, such as routine briefings and shared incident management protocols, fosters trust, mitigates operational misunderstandings, and accelerates crisis response (James & McCallion, 2013; Kupchik & Monahan, 2006; Leon et al., 2024; Theriot & Orme, 2016).

The operational dynamic between instructional and security staff profoundly shapes the broader campus climate. While the visible presence of security can bolster perceived safety (Na & Gottfredson, 2013), an over-reliance on punitive, security-driven

enforcement risks alienating students and exacerbating exclusionary outcomes, such as the school-to-prison pipeline (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Divinagracia, 2024; Espartero et al., 2024; Fisher & Hennessy, 2016; Hirschfield, 2008; Justice Policy Institute, 2011; Nance, 2013). Consequently, scholars heavily advocate for proactive, trauma-informed, and relationally driven safety models over strictly reactive measures (Brown, 2006; Skiba et al., 2011). Integrating positive behavioral interventions with equitable enforcement strategies not only reduces misconduct and suspensions but also enhances academic engagement and cultivates a cohesive school community (Astor et al., 2001; Broll & Howells, 2019; Bryk et al., 2010; Cornell et al., 2015; Gregory et al., 2010; Osher et al., 2010; Payne & Welch, 2015; Rumberger & Losen, 2016). Furthermore, teachers who understand their legal protections and prioritize student welfare naturally encourage a culture of vigilance, trust, and mutual cooperation (Bucoy et al., 2024; Chavez et al., 2024; Dagoy et al., 2024).

Despite the critical importance of these joint safety frameworks, empirical investigations into the day-to-day collaborative mechanics between educators and security personnel remain scarce (Calzada, 2024; Ceneciro, 2025; Fisher et al., 2019; Perumean-Chaney & Sutton, 2013). Addressing this notable literature gap, this exploratory qualitative study investigates how these two distinct professional cohorts divide responsibilities, communicate, and collaboratively influence campus discipline (Murro, 2024; Quisay & Aquino, 2024). The research evaluates fundamental variables such as interprofessional communication patterns, role clarity, enforcement strategies, and perceived school culture (Bondoc, 2023; Garil, 2024). By utilizing one-on-one interviews with a purposive sample of six educators and six

security officers, and examining the resulting data through reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019; Garil et al., 2024), this study aims to clarify the structural dynamics of educator-security partnerships. Ultimately, the insights gathered are intended to guide the creation of collaborative, trauma-informed institutional policies that foster secure, orderly, and highly supportive academic environments rather than punitive ones (Arciaga, 2025).

Methods

Research Design

To thoroughly investigate the cooperative dynamics between teaching staff and security teams during policy enforcement, this investigation utilized an exploratory qualitative framework. Because current literature on this specific intersection remains sparse, an exploratory model serves as the ideal mechanism for detailing how these professionals operate together and how their alliance impacts the educational climate, student conduct, and overall campus security.

Population and Sampling

The researchers applied a purposive sampling strategy to identify eligible participants stationed across various Philippine locations, specifically Taguig City, Legaspi City, Butuan City, Rizal, and Samar. The final cohort consisted of twelve individuals: six instructional staff members actively managing student conduct, alongside six campus security officers tasked with protocol enforcement. Selection criteria hinged on the participants' active school roles, direct experience with policy enforcement, and voluntary consent for comprehensive interviews. To guarantee a well-rounded dataset, the selected professionals possessed between two and five years of field experience and represented both private and public educational facilities.

Instrument

A customized interview guide served as the primary data collection tool, structurally mapped to the core aims of the investigation. The prompts were specifically designed to draw out comprehensive narratives and personal reflections regarding the educator-security partnership and its subsequent institutional outcomes. The explicit alignment between the overarching research objectives and the specific interview prompts is detailed in Table 1.

Table 1. Interview Guide Questions

Research Objectives	Corresponding Interview Questions
To analyze the practical collaboration dynamics between educational and security personnel regarding rule enforcement, with a specific focus on the negotiation of duties and communication methods.	1. How do you characterize the professional relationship between security staff and teachers regarding rule enforcement?
	2. How are specific duties and disciplinary tasks divided or shared between your respective roles?
	3. Which communication methods or coordination strategies do you utilize to manage safety and disciplinary events effectively?
To evaluate the resulting effects of this interprofessional partnership on campus safety metrics, student conduct, and the broader academic climate.	1. In your observation, how has this interprofessional partnership altered the overall safety profile of the campus?
	2. What specific effects has this collaborative effort had on student conduct and disciplinary metrics?
	3. How would you describe the broader influence of this working relationship on the school's communal

atmosphere and
educational
environment?

Data Gathering Procedure

Primary data extraction occurred via individual, semi-structured interviews, a format chosen to grant participants the freedom to share nuanced personal experiences while remaining anchored to the central research themes. Guided by the predetermined question set, these conversations examined role division, interdepartmental communication, and the resulting impacts on institutional safety and student behavior. Each discussion lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Following the acquisition of informed consent, all sessions were audio-recorded to guarantee transcription accuracy for the subsequent analytical phase.

Data Analysis

The transcribed interview data underwent reflexive thematic analysis, adhering strictly to the methodological framework outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). This analytical progression moved through six distinct stages: an initial deep dive into the transcripts for dataset familiarization, the systemic generation of preliminary codes, the clustering of codes into potential themes, a rigorous review to ensure themes aligned with the raw data, the final defining and naming of these concepts, and the ultimate synthesis into a comprehensive narrative report. Crucially, this reflexive approach embraces the researcher's active, subjective role as a vital component of meaning-making and data interpretation, rather than treating it as an analytical flaw.

Results

Research Objective 1: To analyze the practical collaboration dynamics between educational and security personnel regarding rule enforcement, with a specific focus on the

negotiation of duties and communication methods.

Structural Delineation of Roles and Mutual Reliance

Both teaching faculty and security officers conceptualize their working relationship as a complementary partnership built on a clear division of labor. Educators assume primary responsibility for the academic and behavioral development of students within the classroom, while security teams maintain macro-level environmental order and manage escalating threats. Security personnel actively defer to the faculty's deeper understanding of student personalities, intervening decisively only when campus safety is compromised or boundaries are severely tested in common areas. This strategic overlap prevents the institution from feeling overly punitive while allowing teachers to concentrate on instruction rather than policing.

"I consider the security team our core allies. They supervise zones we cannot physically monitor, like entryways, enabling us to concentrate on instruction rather than constant behavioral policing."

"Our primary duty is to reinforce the faculty, particularly when regulations are disregarded outside the classroom. We intervene decisively during safety threats but leave pedagogical discipline entirely to the educators."

"We actively avoid making the campus feel like a correctional facility. Ideally, security acts as a supportive backbone, stepping in solely when interventions surpass classroom management capabilities."

Strategic Communication and Escalation Frameworks

The efficacy of this interprofessional collaboration relies heavily on structured, multi-tiered communication strategies. For urgent threats, immediate radio dispatch allows educators to summon rapid assistance without abandoning their classrooms, a mechanism that instantly de-escalates tension. Beyond crisis response, routine weekly briefings align both departments on policy interpretations and highlight vulnerable students requiring discrete monitoring. Furthermore, post-incident reviews between responding guards and the involved teachers ensure operational alignment, fostering mutual trust and preventing recurrent behavioral issues.

"Utilizing the campus radio network to request backup is the most efficient method to manage a volatile situation without leaving the rest of my students unattended."

"Participating in routine briefings ensures both departments interpret the rulebook identically. We can also flag struggling students early, allowing guards to observe them discreetly and preempt issues."

"Conducting post-event discussions with the reporting teacher ensures our future approaches align. It demonstrates to the faculty that our goal is collaborative problem-solving, not usurping their classroom authority."

Harmonizing Divergent Disciplinary Philosophies

Despite an overwhelmingly positive collaborative framework, occasional operational friction arises from differing philosophical approaches to discipline.

Educators generally approach behavioral infractions as developmental milestones, prioritizing the discovery of underlying triggers and turning mistakes into teachable moments. Conversely, security personnel are structurally conditioned to view misbehavior strictly as a policy violation requiring immediate, standardized consequences. Acknowledging this disparity, participants suggested that joint training initiatives could help synchronize their enforcement styles and mitigate any resulting intimidation felt by the student body.

"A philosophical disconnect sometimes exists. Faculty utilize infractions as teachable moments to guide learners, whereas security officers often execute a more rigid, consequence-based approach."

"We view behavioral correction as an extension of pedagogy—analyzing underlying triggers like domestic stress or academic hurdles. Security naturally focuses on the immediate administration of penalties."

Research Objective 2: To evaluate the resulting effects of this interprofessional partnership on campus safety metrics, student conduct, and the broader academic climate.

Cultivation of a Secure and Orderly Campus Climate

The unified operational front established by educators and security significantly elevates both perceived and actual campus safety. This partnership minimizes minor disruptions during class transitions and actively dissolves ambient tension in shared spaces, generating a highly tranquil academic atmosphere. Because students experience consistent behavioral expectations across all physical zones of the school, the collaboration

cultivates a robust institutional culture defined by accountability, fairness, and mutual respect.

"Initially, I perceived guards merely as rule enforcers, but they are genuine architects of our safe academic space. Their active patrols diminish hallway anxieties and stop minor disputes from compounding."

"This integrated partnership pacifies the overall school atmosphere. Learners recognize that behavioral standards are universally upheld, whether they are seated in a lecture or navigating the corridors."

"It dramatically lowers institutional friction. Students do not feel targeted by specific individuals because they witness the exact same regulatory standards applied uniformly by all staff members."

Positive Transformations in Student Conduct and Compliance

Joint enforcement efforts drastically reduce aggressive defiance and foster cooperative student behavior. Realizing that faculty and security share identical expectations, students can no longer manipulate different staff members against one another, leading to heightened self-regulation. Furthermore, when security and teachers collaboratively articulate the rationale behind specific rules, students shift from resistant defiance to respectful inquiry, demonstrating genuine engagement with the campus moral framework rather than blind obedience.

"Learners exhibit greater self-regulation because they witness an unbroken chain of authority between the instructional and security teams, leaving no room for contradictory discipline."

"Because the student body observes our united front, my job requires far less authoritative force. The mere visibility of our interdepartmental teamwork naturally deters misconduct and hostility."

"When both a teacher and a guard take the time to deconstruct the reasoning behind a policy, the students pivot from rebellious pushback to asking constructive questions."

Strengthening Relational Trust and Proactive Intervention

Integrating teacher insights fundamentally transforms the security role from a purely punitive function to a proactively supportive one. When faculty brief security on specific student backgrounds, officers can tailor their interventions, applying contextualized guidance rather than harsh penalties. Consequently, the student body increasingly perceives security staff as approachable mentors. This heightened relational trust encourages students to seek advice and preemptively report brewing conflicts, empowering staff to mediate disputes long before they escalate into formal disciplinary crises.

"Faculty insights regarding student temperaments are invaluable. Armed with that background knowledge, we can intervene with supportive guidance and patience rather than defaulting to strict penalization."

"The student body now turns to us for mentorship, not just during disciplinary crises. They proactively report emerging disputes, empowering us to mediate issues before they trigger a serious incident."

"When teachers share the behavioral history of a student, it shifts our entire operational mandate. We move away from dispensing punishment and lean heavily into preventive intervention."

Discussion

This investigation aimed to analyze the cooperative dynamics between instructional staff and security personnel during policy enforcement, alongside the subsequent impacts on campus safety, student conduct, and the educational climate. By conducting individual interviews with twelve stakeholders—six security officers and six educators—this research captured the practical realities of maintaining institutional order. The findings reveal a multifaceted yet predominantly constructive alliance. Participants consistently indicated that their professional interactions were anchored in mutual respect, equitable responsibility, and explicit role definitions, supporting the premise that comprehending cross-departmental duties is fundamental to effective disciplinary enforcement (Devlin, 2011).

Faculty members frequently characterized security officers as indispensable allies who manage macro-level environmental order in transitional zones, such as corridors and campus perimeters. This division of labor empowers teachers to dedicate their focus entirely to pedagogical duties, trusting that broader safety protocols are actively managed. In return, security personnel acknowledged the educators' primary authority and nuanced relational dynamics with the student body. Both cohorts emphasized that optimal partnerships require well-defined, yet adaptable, professional boundaries: teachers dictate classroom behavioral norms, while security intervenes during escalated crises. This operational structure corroborates the assertion that clearly

delineated responsibilities drastically reduce institutional friction and enhance overall safety efficacy (May et al., 2016; Theriot & Orme, 2016). Furthermore, this structural clarity reinforces the concept that staff members who thoroughly understand their professional and legal mandates are significantly better equipped to execute coordinated interventions (Chavez et al., 2024).

The data further identified robust communication frameworks as a foundational element of successful interprofessional synergy. Stakeholders highlighted the use of two-way radios, routine operational briefings, and retrospective incident reviews as primary tools for maintaining alignment and executing rapid responses. These mechanisms not only facilitate immediate crisis management but also enable proactive behavioral planning, mirroring findings that established communication pathways yield highly synchronized safety responses (Kupchik & Monahan, 2006). Utilizing these practices is critical for mitigating operational misunderstandings and optimizing crisis resolution (James & McCallion, 2013). Additionally, the participants' reliance on transparent dialogue validates the perspective that communication nurtures an inclusive institutional culture (Theriot & Orme, 2016) and significantly elevates the quality of policy execution (Leon et al., 2024).

Despite the overarching cooperation, the analysis uncovered distinct philosophical divergences regarding disciplinary execution. Several educators advocated for closer operational alignment, observing that while faculty generally employ developmental and restorative approaches, security teams occasionally default to rigid, consequence-based enforcement. This discrepancy mirrors the prevalent academic debate between punitive safety measures and supportive models like Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (Bondoc, 2023; Sugai & Horner, 2009). Because

security officers are structurally inclined toward strict enforcement, the faculty's preference for developmental guidance indicates a critical need for hybrid operational models. Training security personnel in restorative, educational methodologies could effectively bridge this philosophical divide (Payne & Welch, 2015), validating the argument that security teams achieve maximum efficacy when equipped with youth development strategies rather than relying exclusively on traditional policing tactics (Brown, 2006).

Crucially, the data demonstrated that when educators transmit contextual student background information to the security team, disciplinary interventions successfully pivot from reactive penalization to preventive mentorship. This operational shift perfectly embodies trauma-informed paradigms (Arciaga, 2025), which prioritize uncovering the root causes of misconduct over administering standardized punishments. By collaboratively mitigating foundational issues—such as academic hurdles or domestic instability—this interdepartmental alliance acts as a vital protective barrier against the school-to-prison pipeline (Kupchik & Monahan, 2006; Nance, 2013). Rather than criminalizing minor behavioral infractions or cultivating a carceral atmosphere (Hirschfield, 2008), this integrated approach guarantees that campus discipline remains an educational endeavor. Consequently, these findings validate the assertion that collaborative enforcement inherently produces supportive, non-exclusionary behavioral practices (Rumberger & Losen, 2016).

Addressing the second research objective regarding broader institutional impacts, the collected evidence overwhelmingly suggests that synergistic educator-security partnerships cultivate a highly secure, well-regulated, and academically conducive environment. Participants affirmed that the

collaborative and highly visible presence of security personnel actively deters misconduct and elevates the perceived safety of the campus. This dynamic confirms that visible security measures offer substantial psychological reassurance when thoughtfully paired with educational support structures (Na & Gottfredson, 2013). Furthermore, when safety and instructional teams project a united front, students demonstrate a marked decrease in boundary-testing behavior. This unified consistency engenders a profound sense of institutional fairness, aligning with research indicating that jointly administered policies diminish behavioral infractions and boost perceived equity (Gastic, 2010). Ultimately, this partnership pacifies the academic climate; by minimizing external disruptions, classroom environments stabilize, validating the principle that orderly, secure campuses are fundamental prerequisites for robust academic engagement (Bryk et al., 2010).

Finally, this interprofessional alliance is instrumental in forging a cohesive and resilient academic community. As relational dynamics between the student body and institutional staff improve, a foundation of trust is established, prompting students to view security officers not merely as punitive enforcers, but as accessible mentors. This transformation profoundly bolsters emotional security on campus, substantiating the theory that educational cultures rooted in mutual care actively drive student cooperation (Payne & Welch, 2015). By seamlessly embedding security personnel into the broader pedagogical mission, educational institutions cultivate a unified, campus-wide dedication to student welfare. This integrated methodology ultimately confirms that cohesive, multi-disciplinary teams are the cornerstone of a thriving, positive school culture (Sugai & Horner, 2009).

Conclusion

The findings of this investigation demonstrate that robust interprofessional synergy between teaching faculty and campus guards is fundamental to sustaining institutional order and security. Participants universally identified as collaborative allies, operating within distinct yet mutually reinforcing boundaries: instructional staff prioritized pedagogical development and internal behavioral regulation, whereas security officers managed macro-level stability, particularly in transitional and common zones. Furthermore, the establishment of highly responsive communication channels—including immediate radio dispatches, routine operational meetings, and retrospective incident evaluations—proved essential for optimizing operational cohesion and cultivating interdepartmental trust. Although occasional philosophical divergences regarding behavioral correction emerged, stakeholders reached a consensus that implementing unified, cross-departmental training initiatives would significantly enhance enforcement consistency.

Fundamentally, this interprofessional alliance acts as a critical mechanism for transitioning campus enforcement away from strictly carceral penalties and toward proactive, developmental intervention models. By

embedding security teams directly into the pedagogical framework, educational institutions can cultivate a highly tranquil, trust-centric climate that prioritizes holistic student welfare over the criminalization of minor infractions. Subsequent scholarly inquiries must build upon these qualitative insights by integrating the student body's viewpoint and utilizing quantitative methodologies to rigorously assess the scalability and applicability of these cooperative paradigms across diverse academic environments.

Acknowledgements

The author affirms that this study was independently carried out and reflects personal academic effort and critical analysis. All concepts, interpretations, and discussions presented in this paper were carefully developed by the author throughout the research process. Any use of artificial intelligence tools was strictly limited to minor language refinement, such as improving grammar and clarity of expression. These tools were not involved in developing the research ideas, conducting the analysis, interpreting the findings, or composing the substantive sections of the manuscript. The author fully assumes responsibility for the authenticity, accuracy, and originality of the entire work, including its analyses, interpretations, and conclusions.

References

- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852–862. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.9.852>
- Arciaga, M. (2025). *Discipline is not security: Dismantling disparities should be top of mind when developing school safety policy in Georgia* [IDRA Policy Brief]. Intercultural Development Research Association.
- Astor, R. A., Guerra, N., & Van Acker, R. (2001). How can we improve school safety research? *Educational Researcher*, 30(5), 37–40. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X030005037>
- Beger, R. R. (2003). Expansion of police power in public schools and the vanishing rights of students. *Social Justice*, 30(4), 119–130.
- Bondoc, R. S., Jr. (2023). Motivation and attitudes of college varsity players towards community-based sports initiatives: Precursor to grassroots sports program. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 8(2), 1702. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v8i2.1702>

-
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>
- Broll, R., & Howells, S. (2019). Student perceptions of school resource officers: An analysis of the roles, attitudes, and interactions that shape students' experience. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 61(2), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2018-0034.r1>
- Brown, B. (2005). Controlling crime and delinquency in the schools: An exploratory study of student perceptions of school security measures. *Journal of School Violence*, 4(4), 105–125. https://doi.org/10.1300/J202v04n04_07
- Brown, B. (2006). Understanding and assessing school police officers: A conceptual and methodological comment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(6), 591–604. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.09.001>
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bucoy, R. K., Enumerabellon, K. M., Amilhamja, A. J., et al. (2024). Knowledge deficits and analysis on comprehension of teachers on their common legal rights as teachers. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9), 2559. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2559>
- Calzada, K. P. D. (2024). Anti-dependency teaching strategy for innovation in the age of AI among technology-based students. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(8), 3026. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i8.3026>
- Carpio, L. B., Caburnay, A. L. S., Nollado, S. M., et al. (2024). Technology-based teaching among nursing instructors: Confidence and apprehension in using simulation equipment for training. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(8), 2591. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i8.2591>
- Ceneciro, C. C. (2025). Characterizing workshops promoting motivated engagement and retention beyond the sessions: Experiential narratives from education, language and social science instructors. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(4), 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8373>
- Chavez, J. V., Gregorio, M. W., Araneta, A. L., & Bihag, C. D. (2024). Magna Carta for women health workers, teachers, and minimum-wage earners in the workplace: Policy awareness and organizational compliance. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(1), 1735. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i1.1735>
- Chavez, J. V., Gregorio, A. M. W., Araneta, A. L., et al. (2024). Self-initiated protection behavior based on Magna Carta of Women: Women health workers, teachers, and minimum-wage earners in the workplace. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(7), 2363. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i7.2363>
- Cornell, D., Sheras, P., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2015). A retrospective study of school safety conditions in high schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines versus alternative approaches. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 30(3), 406–419. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000091>
- Dagoy, T. H. S., Ariban, A. I., Chavez, J. V., et al. (2024). Discourse analysis on the teachers' professional interest and integrity among teachers with multiple administrative functions. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(12), 2521. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i12.2521>
- Devlin, H. (2011). The role of security officers in schools: A review of literature. *School Safety Journal*, 5(1), 45–58.
- Divinagracia, L. T. (2024). Macro and micromanagement practices of reading comprehension programs in selected grade schools in the post-pandemic. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v5i2.1664>
- Espartero, M. M., Caldaza, K. P. D., & Prado, R. T. D. (2024). Analyzing the level of interest of high school students in solving mathematical problems in modular and face-to-face learning. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(4), 2167. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i4.2167>
- Fisher, B. W., & Hennessy, E. A. (2016). School resource officers and exclusionary discipline in U.S. high schools: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 14(2), 147–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204014567449>
-

-
- Fisher, B. W., Higgins, E. M., & Homer, E. M. (2019). School resource officers and exclusionary discipline in U.S. high schools: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Adolescent Research Review*, 4, 217–233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-018-0092-2>
- Garil, B. A. (2024). Socio-cultural factors affecting reading comprehension levels and demographic-based grammatical competence of higher education students. *Forum for Linguistics Studies*, 6(3), 184–197. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i3.6465>
- Garil, B. A., Entong, M. B. M., Muarip, V. C., et al. (2024). Language delivery styles in academic trainings: Analysis of speaker's emotional connection to audience for lasting learning. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(3), 326–342. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i3.6533>
- Gastic, B. (2010). Metal detectors and feeling safe at school. *Education and Urban Society*, 42(4), 486–500. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124510361873>
- Gregory, A., Cornell, D., & Fan, X. (2010). The relationship of school structure and support to suspension rates for Black and White high school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(4), 904–934. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211398531>
- Hirschfield, P. J. (2008). Preparing for prison? The criminalization of school discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12(1), 79–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480607085795>
- James, N., & McCallion, G. (2013). *School resource officers: Law enforcement officers in schools* (CRS Report No. R43126). Congressional Research Service. <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/R43126.pdf>
- Justice Policy Institute. (2011). *Education under arrest: The case against police in schools*. <https://justicepolicy.org/research/education-under-arrest-the-case-against-police-in-schools/>
- Kupchik, A., & Monahan, T. (2006). The new American school: Preparation for post-industrial discipline. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(5), 617–631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690600958976>
- Leon, A. J. T. D., Jumalon, R. L., Chavez, J. V., et al. (2024). Analysis on the implementation of inclusive classroom: Perception on compliances and obstructions of selected public-school teachers. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9), 2537. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2537>
- May, D. C., Higgins, G. E., & Moore, C. A. (2016). School resource officers and students' feelings of safety at school. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 13(2), 124–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204014538444>
- Murro, R. A. (2024). Modular distance learning: Exploring the study habits and academic achievements of state-funded elementary school learners. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(8), 2462. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i8.2462>
- Na, C., & Gottfredson, D. C. (2013). Police officers in schools: Effects on school crime and the processing of offending behaviors. *Justice Quarterly*, 30(4), 619–650. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2011.615754>
- Nance, J. P. (2013). Students, police, and the school-to-prison pipeline. *Washington University Law Review*, 93(4), 919–987. https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol93/iss4/5
- Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Sprague, J. R., & Doyle, W. (2010). How can we improve school discipline? *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 48–58. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357618>
- Payne, A. A., & Welch, K. (2015). Restorative justice in schools: The influence of race on restorative discipline. *Youth & Society*, 47(4), 539–564. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X12473125>
- Perumean-Chaney, S. E., & Sutton, L. M. (2013). Students and perceived school safety: The impact of school resource officers. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 11(4), 301–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204012451757>
- Quisay, A. R. C., & Aquino, M. E. C. (2024). Stress levels of science teachers when delivering distance education instruction in a state college during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9), 2916. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2916>
- Rumberger, R. W., & Losen, D. J. (2016). *The high cost of harsh discipline and its disparate impact*. The Center for Civil Rights Remedies at UCLA. <https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu>
- Skiba, R. J., Arredondo, M. I., & Rausch, M. K. (2011). *New and developing research on disparities in discipline*. Equity Project at Indiana University. <https://www.indiana.edu/~equity>
-

-
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2009). Responsiveness-to-intervention and school-wide positive behavior supports: Integration of multi-tiered system approaches. *Exceptionality*, 17(4), 223–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09362830903235375>
- Theriot, M. T. (2009). School resource officers and the criminalization of student behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(3), 280–287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2009.04.008>
- Theriot, M. T., & Orme, J. G. (2016). School resource officers and students' feelings of safety at school. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 14(2), 130–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204014564472>
- Trump, K. S. (2011). *Proactive school security and emergency preparedness planning* (2nd ed.). Corwin Press.
- Weisburst, E. K. (2019). Patrolling public schools: The impact of school police on student discipline and long-term education outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 38(2), 338–365. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22116>
-