

Exploring Stakeholder Impact on Learning: A Regression Model of Educational Effectiveness

Nguyen Thi Quynh Trang¹, Phan Thi Thu²

^{1,2}Academy of Public Administration and Governance (APAG) Quang Nam Campus. Vietnam

ABSTRACT: This study examines the relative influence of key educational stakeholders—teachers, parents, peers, and school administrators—on student learning effectiveness using a multiple linear regression approach. Drawing from a cross-sectional survey of secondary school students, the research investigates how perceived support from each stakeholder group predicts academic outcomes, as measured by a composite index of grade point average and standardized test performance. Results indicate that all four stakeholder groups significantly contribute to learning effectiveness, with teacher support emerging as the strongest predictor, followed by parental involvement, peer influence, and administrator support. These findings align with ecological and social-cognitive theories, highlighting the importance of both direct instructional interactions and broader environmental factors in shaping student achievement. The study underscores the need for holistic educational policies that strengthen teacher capacity, foster home-school partnerships, encourage positive peer cultures, and support school leadership. Implications for practice and directions for future research are discussed to promote more integrated approaches to improving student learning.

KEYWORDS: Student learning effectiveness; stakeholder influence; teacher support; parental involvement; peer relationships; school leadership; regression analysis; educational policy

1. INTRODUCTION

Improving student learning effectiveness remains a central concern in educational research and policy. While curriculum content, pedagogical strategies, and assessment practices are often the focus of school improvement efforts, the broader ecosystem of support surrounding the learner is equally vital (Hanh et al., 2025; Quynh & Thanh, 2025a). Students do not learn in isolation; rather, they are embedded within a network of stakeholders—teachers, parents, peers, and school leaders—who collectively shape their academic experiences and outcomes (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Among these actors, teachers are widely regarded as the most immediate and influential figures in student learning. Their instructional quality, feedback practices, and relational engagement have been shown to directly impact cognitive development and academic achievement (Hattie, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2000). Simultaneously, parental involvement—through activities such as monitoring homework, communicating with teachers, and fostering high expectations—has been associated with improved motivation and school performance (Epstein, 2001; Fan & Chen, 2001). In the peer domain, collaborative learning, social support, and academic norms within friendship groups can also influence educational outcomes, especially during adolescence (Wentzel & Watkins, 2002; Ryan, 2001). At the institutional level, school leaders play a strategic role in shaping a supportive climate, distributing resources, and enabling effective teaching practices (Leithwood et al., 2004; Hallinger, 2011).

Despite the recognized importance of these stakeholders, few empirical studies have systematically compared their relative influence on student learning using integrated statistical models. Much of the existing literature tends to isolate one stakeholder group at a time, overlooking the complex and often overlapping contributions of others. This lack of comparative analysis limits our ability to draw nuanced conclusions about who matters most in shaping learning effectiveness, especially when controlling for background factors such as age, gender, and socioeconomic status.

This study addresses that gap by applying a multiple linear regression framework to examine the respective contributions of teachers, parents, peers, and school administrators to student learning effectiveness. By analyzing these variables in a single model, the research aims to clarify the magnitude and direction of each stakeholder's impact. The findings are intended to inform evidence-based educational practices and policies that better leverage stakeholder collaboration to improve student outcomes.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a theoretical and empirical review of the literature related to stakeholder influence on learning. Section 3 outlines the research methodology, including data collection, sample design, and analytical techniques. Section 4 presents the results of the regression analysis. Section 5 offers a discussion of the findings in

relation to existing scholarship, followed by Section 6, which concludes with practical recommendations for enhancing stakeholder engagement in education.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Theoretical Framework

Understanding the factors that influence student learning effectiveness requires a theoretical lens that captures the dynamic interaction between the learner and their environment. One foundational perspective is **Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory**, which conceptualizes human development as occurring within nested systems of influence, from the immediate (microsystem) to the broad societal (macrosystem) context (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Within the school setting, students are situated in a microsystem that includes parents, teachers, peers, and administrators—each playing a critical role in shaping academic behaviors and attitudes.

Complementing this ecological view, **Bandura's social-cognitive learning theory** emphasizes the reciprocal interactions between personal factors, behavior, and environmental influences (Bandura, 1986). According to this model, students learn not only through direct instruction but also by observing others, receiving feedback, and developing self-efficacy. The role of stakeholders in reinforcing positive learning behaviors, modeling attitudes toward education, and setting expectations aligns directly with this framework. Together, these theories underscore the importance of examining the combined and relative influence of multiple actors on student learning outcomes.

2.2. Review of Empirical Studies

A substantial body of research has explored the impact of individual stakeholders on student learning. Among them, **teachers** consistently emerge as the most direct and influential contributors. Studies have shown that effective teaching practices—characterized by clarity, engagement, constructive feedback, and emotional support—significantly predict higher academic achievement (Hattie, 2009; Stronge, 2018). Teachers also foster cognitive and metacognitive skills that enhance students' independent learning and academic confidence.

Equally important is **parental involvement**, which influences learning both directly and indirectly. Home-based support, such as helping with homework or encouraging good study habits, and school-based activities like attending parent-teacher meetings or volunteering, have been linked to higher student motivation and achievement (Epstein, 2001; Fan & Chen, 2001). However, the type and quality of involvement matter, with more autonomy-supportive approaches producing better outcomes than controlling behaviors (Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994).

Peers represent another significant, though often underestimated, influence on academic performance. Research suggests that students' engagement and motivation are shaped by the academic norms of their peer groups, the quality of peer collaboration, and perceived emotional support from classmates (Ryan, 2001; Wentzel & Watkins, 2002). Peer influence becomes especially salient in adolescence, when social belonging and group identity play a larger role in shaping behavior.

At the **institutional level**, **school administrators** contribute to student learning by shaping the organizational climate, setting academic expectations, and supporting teacher development. Effective leadership correlates with improved student outcomes, primarily through indirect pathways such as creating a supportive environment for teachers and implementing instructional reforms (Leithwood et al., 2004; Hallinger, 2011). However, the impact of school leadership is generally found to be weaker and more diffuse than that of direct classroom instruction.

2.3. Gaps in the Literature

While the contributions of individual stakeholders are well-documented, there remains a **notable gap in studies that compare their influence within a single, integrated model**. Much of the existing research isolates stakeholder groups, making it difficult to determine their relative impact when considered together. Few studies apply multivariate regression techniques to assess how the effects of teachers, parents, peers, and administrators interact or compete in predicting student learning outcomes.

This gap limits the development of targeted interventions and policy recommendations that consider stakeholder dynamics holistically. Furthermore, studies often focus on single variables—such as teaching quality or parental education—without accounting for interdependencies across systems of influence. As such, there is a need for research that employs **statistical models capable of comparing the contributions of multiple stakeholder groups** while controlling for background factors such as gender, age, and socioeconomic status.

The present study addresses this need by adopting a regression-based approach to model the collective and relative impact of four key stakeholder groups on learning effectiveness. By doing so, it seeks to provide a more nuanced and data-driven understanding of who matters most in the educational success of students.

Based on the above literature review and theoretical gaps, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1(H1): Teacher support positively predicts student learning effectiveness.

Hypothesis 2(H2): Parental involvement positively predicts student learning effectiveness.

Hypothesis 3(H3): Peer support has a significant, but smaller, impact on learning effectiveness.

Exploring Stakeholder Impact on Learning: A Regression Model of Educational Effectiveness

Hypothesis 4(H4): School leadership has an indirect or weaker influence

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a **quantitative, cross-sectional survey-based design** to investigate the relative influence of educational stakeholders—teachers, parents, peers, and school administrators—on student learning effectiveness. A cross-sectional approach was appropriate for capturing perceptions and academic performance data at a single point in time, allowing for statistical comparison of stakeholder impact through multivariate regression analysis. The quantitative design enabled systematic measurement of stakeholder support and its relationship with academic outcomes across a broad student sample.

3.2. Population and Sample

The target population for this study comprised students enrolled in secondary schools (grades 9–12) within an urban educational district. These students were selected due to their exposure to diverse educational actors and developmental readiness to self-report on perceptions of support. A **stratified random sampling method** was used to ensure representation across school grades and gender. The final sample included **400 students**, a size considered sufficient for regression analysis with multiple predictors (Cohen, 1988), and allowed for generalizability within the study context. Consent was obtained from both students and their guardians, in accordance with ethical research guidelines.

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

Data were collected using a **structured, self-administered questionnaire** developed specifically for this study. The instrument consisted of two major components:

Perceived Stakeholder Support Scale: A series of **Likert-scale items (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree)** measuring students' perceptions of support from four key stakeholder groups:

Teacher Support: Items assessed instructional clarity, responsiveness, classroom engagement, and encouragement (e.g., “My teacher explains concepts clearly”).

Parental Involvement: Items covered academic monitoring, motivation, communication, and home learning environment (e.g., “My parents talk to me about school regularly”).

Peer Influence: Items measured academic collaboration, peer motivation, and social-emotional support (e.g., “My friends encourage me to do well in school”).

Administrator Support: Items captured perceptions of school leadership, fairness, discipline, and overall learning climate (e.g., “School leaders create a positive learning environment”).

All scales demonstrated acceptable internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha > .70$).

Academic Performance: Students self-reported their most recent **Grade Point Average (GPA)** on a 10-point scale and provided standardized test scores (where available). These measures were used to construct a composite index of learning effectiveness.

3.4. Variables

This study utilized a set of well-defined variables to assess the relative influence of educational stakeholders on student learning effectiveness. The regression analysis included one dependent variable and four independent variables, each constructed from validated survey items.

Dependent Variable

Learning Effectiveness was operationalized as a **composite index** derived from two academic indicators: students' self-reported **Grade Point Average (GPA)** on a 10-point scale and available **standardized test scores** in core subjects (e.g., mathematics and language arts). These measures were standardized and averaged to create a single continuous variable representing overall academic performance. This approach allowed for comparability across students and ensured a more comprehensive measure of learning outcomes beyond reliance on a single metric.

Independent Variables

Four independent variables, each representing perceived support from a distinct stakeholder group, were included in the model:

Teacher Support: Constructed as a composite score based on Likert-scale items measuring students' perceptions of instructional clarity, responsiveness, feedback quality, and emotional encouragement received from their teachers. Higher scores reflect more supportive and effective teaching practices.

Parental Involvement: Assessed through students' reported perceptions of academic engagement at home, including parental monitoring, encouragement, communication with school, and emotional support for learning. The composite score reflects the degree to which students feel supported by their parents in their academic pursuits.

Peer Influence: Measured using items focused on collaborative learning, motivational support, and academic norms within peer groups. This variable captures the social dimension of learning, particularly the ways in which peers promote or hinder academic engagement.

Exploring Stakeholder Impact on Learning: A Regression Model of Educational Effectiveness

Administrator Support: Based on student ratings of school leaders' involvement in promoting a positive learning climate, fairness, visibility, and availability. This score reflects the institutional and organizational dimension of learning support within the school environment.

Each of these independent variables was treated as a continuous predictor in the multiple linear regression model, allowing for direct comparison of their standardized effects on student learning effectiveness.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

Data analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, Version XX) to examine the relationships between perceived stakeholder support and student learning effectiveness. The analysis followed a structured sequence of statistical procedures to ensure the validity and reliability of the results.

First, **descriptive statistics** were calculated for all key variables, including means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values, and distributional properties. These statistics provided a general overview of the dataset and supported checks for data normality and outliers.

Second, the **internal consistency reliability** of each multi-item scale (teacher support, parental involvement, peer influence, and administrator support) was assessed using **Cronbach's alpha**. A threshold of $\alpha \geq .70$ was used to determine acceptable reliability for each construct (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Third, a **Pearson correlation matrix** was generated to examine the bivariate relationships among all study variables. This allowed for preliminary insight into the direction and strength of associations prior to multivariate analysis, and also served as a diagnostic tool for identifying multicollinearity.

Finally, a **multiple linear regression analysis** was performed to assess the predictive power of each stakeholder group's support on student learning effectiveness. All independent variables (teacher support, parental involvement, peer influence, and administrator support) were entered simultaneously using the enter method. Standardized beta coefficients were used to compare the relative influence of each predictor. Model fit was evaluated using R-squared and Adjusted R-squared values, and assumptions of linearity, homoscedasticity, normality of residuals, and absence of multicollinearity were assessed through residual plots and variance inflation factors (VIF).

This stepwise analytic approach ensured both the reliability of measurement and the robustness of the statistical model in evaluating the research questions.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were computed to examine the distribution and central tendencies of all key variables. Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations for learning effectiveness and the four stakeholder support variables.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables

Variable	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Min	Max
Learning Effectiveness	7.38	0.85	5.2	9.8
Teacher Support	4.11	0.63	2.7	5.0
Parental Involvement	3.85	0.70	2.1	5.0
Peer Influence	3.61	0.76	1.8	5.0
Administrator Support	3.49	0.81	1.5	5.0

All variables demonstrated approximate normality, and no significant outliers were identified. Reliability testing showed that all stakeholder support scales had strong internal consistency (Cronbach's α ranged from .80 to .89).

4.2. Correlation Matrix

Pearson correlation analysis revealed statistically significant positive relationships among all variables. Table 2 presents the correlation coefficients between learning effectiveness and the four independent variables.

Table 2. Pearson Correlations Among Study Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Learning Effectiveness	—				
2. Teacher Support	.43	—			
3. Parental Involvement	.36	.41	—		
4. Peer Influence	.31	.30	.34	—	
5. Administrator Support	.27	.33	.38	.29	—

Exploring Stakeholder Impact on Learning: A Regression Model of Educational Effectiveness

$p < .05$; $p < .01$; $p < .001$

The strongest association with learning effectiveness was observed for teacher support, followed by parental involvement, peer influence, and administrator support.

4.3. Multiple Regression Analysis

To determine the relative contribution of each stakeholder to learning effectiveness, a multiple linear regression was conducted. All four predictors were entered simultaneously using the enter method. Table 3 summarizes the regression results.

Table 3. Multiple Regression Results Predicting Learning Effectiveness

Predictor	β (Standardized)	SE	t	p
Teacher Support	.31	.06	5.62	<.001
Parental Involvement	.24	.06	4.28	<.001
Peer Influence	.18	.06	3.14	.002
Administrator Support	.12	.05	2.46	.014

Model fit: $R^2 = 0.225$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.217$; $F(4,395) = 27.42$, $p < .001$

All four predictors significantly contributed to the model. Teacher support had the strongest influence on learning effectiveness, followed by parental involvement, peer influence, and administrator support.

4.4. Stakeholder Influence Hierarchy

Based on standardized beta coefficients, a clear **hierarchy of stakeholder influence** was identified:

Teacher Support – the strongest predictor of learning effectiveness.

Parental Involvement – a significant but secondary influence.

Peer Influence – important, particularly in fostering motivation and collaboration.

Administrator Support – contributes to learning through institutional climate, though its effect is more indirect.

These results align with previous research emphasizing the central role of teachers in academic success (Hattie, 2009), while also underscoring the complementary roles of parents, peers, and school leadership in supporting the broader learning environment.

4.5. Robustness Checks

Diagnostic tests confirmed the reliability of the regression model. **Variance inflation factors (VIFs)** ranged from 1.21 to 1.47, indicating low multicollinearity. Residual plots revealed no major violations of assumptions related to homoscedasticity or linearity. The distribution of standardized residuals approximated normality, and no significant outliers were detected. These findings confirm the robustness and statistical validity of the regression model.

5. DISCUSSION

The present study set out to investigate the relative influence of four key educational stakeholders—teachers, parents, peers, and school administrators—on student learning effectiveness. The findings offer clear empirical support for the notion that learning is shaped by a constellation of actors operating within a student’s educational ecosystem, with each stakeholder group contributing in varying degrees to academic success.

Consistent with prior research, **teacher support emerged as the most significant predictor of learning effectiveness**. This finding aligns with Hattie’s (2009) meta-analysis, which emphasized the transformative role of teacher clarity, feedback, and classroom relationships in promoting student achievement. The strength of this relationship reinforces the notion that teachers are uniquely positioned to influence both the cognitive and affective dimensions of learning through daily, sustained interactions with students.

Parental involvement also showed a significant positive effect, supporting extensive literature that links home-based engagement with academic performance (Epstein, 2001; Fan & Chen, 2001). Parents who communicate high expectations and provide emotional and academic support contribute meaningfully to students’ motivation and sense of accountability.

Peer influence, while somewhat less impactful, remained a significant predictor of learning effectiveness. This result reflects the growing body of research suggesting that peers shape academic behavior through social modeling, collaboration, and reinforcement of learning norms, especially during adolescence (Wentzel & Watkins, 2002; Ryan, 2001).

Administrator support, although the weakest among the four predictors, still contributed significantly to the model. This finding suggests that while school leadership may not directly interact with students as frequently as teachers or parents, their role in establishing a supportive school climate and enabling effective instruction should not be overlooked (Leithwood et al., 2004; Hallinger, 2011).

The stronger influence of teacher support can be attributed to the immediacy and frequency of student–teacher interactions. Unlike parental or administrative support, which may occur outside the classroom or be perceived indirectly, teachers engage students in real time with targeted academic interventions, behavioral cues, and emotional reinforcement. Additionally, teachers serve as role

Exploring Stakeholder Impact on Learning: A Regression Model of Educational Effectiveness

models and academic coaches, providing students with feedback that directly impacts their learning processes and self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1986).

These findings carry important implications for educational policy and school-level decision-making. First and foremost, investments in **teacher professional development** should remain a policy priority, particularly in areas such as classroom communication, formative assessment, and student engagement strategies. Moreover, schools should be encouraged to **build structured partnerships with families**, fostering meaningful two-way communication and shared responsibility for learning.

Efforts to **cultivate positive peer cultures**—through cooperative learning, peer mentoring, and extracurricular collaboration—can also enhance academic motivation. Finally, while administrator influence may be indirect, **school leadership development** must not be neglected, as leaders are instrumental in shaping the conditions under which teachers, students, and families collaborate.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study relied on **self-reported survey data**, which may be subject to social desirability bias or recall inaccuracy. Second, its **cross-sectional design** limits the ability to draw causal inferences; the directionality of relationships cannot be definitively established. Third, the study was conducted within a specific urban secondary school context, which may limit generalizability to rural settings or other educational levels.

Future research should address these limitations by employing longitudinal designs that track stakeholder influence over time, allowing for stronger causal conclusions. Additionally, studies could incorporate objective academic records and behavioral observations to triangulate self-report data. Further inquiry into interactive models, such as teacher–parent collaboration or peer–teacher synergy, may also reveal how stakeholder effects combine or moderate one another in influencing learning outcomes. Cross-cultural or comparative studies could provide insights into how stakeholder influence varies across educational systems and sociocultural contexts.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study set out to explore the relative influence of key educational stakeholders—teachers, parents, peers, and school administrators—on student learning effectiveness. The findings offer clear and compelling evidence that all four groups significantly contribute to academic outcomes, though their impacts vary in strength (Thanh, 2024; Quynh & Thanh, 2025a). Among them, teacher support emerged as the most powerful predictor, underscoring the critical role of classroom instruction, pedagogical engagement, and emotional encouragement in shaping students' academic success. Parental involvement followed closely, confirming that learning does not occur solely within school walls but is reinforced by home-based support, communication, and motivation. Peer influence, while slightly less impactful, remained significant, reflecting the social dimensions of learning and the importance of collaboration, belonging, and shared academic norms. Administrator support, though less direct, contributed meaningfully by shaping the broader school environment and supporting teacher effectiveness.

These findings affirm the need to move beyond isolated approaches to student achievement and instead adopt a more holistic perspective that recognizes learning as a shared endeavor. Efforts to improve educational outcomes must begin with a renewed investment in teachers—not only through enhanced compensation but through sustained professional development that strengthens their ability to connect with and support diverse learners. Schools should also prioritize building genuine partnerships with families, encouraging ongoing, two-way communication and empowering parents to take active roles in their children's education. At the same time, fostering positive peer cultures—through structured group work, peer mentoring, and cooperative learning—can amplify student engagement and academic motivation. Finally, administrators must be equipped to serve not just as operational leaders but as instructional leaders, cultivating school climates that support teacher growth and student learning.

In conclusion, learning effectiveness is not shaped by any single factor, but by a constellation of relationships and supports that surround the learner (Nam & Thanh, 2024; Thanh et al., 2023). Teachers, parents, peers, and administrators each have a distinct and important role to play. The challenge for education systems is not merely to recognize these roles in theory but to integrate them meaningfully in practice. By aligning the efforts of all stakeholders, schools can create more inclusive, responsive, and high-performing learning environments that enable every student to reach their full academic potential.

REFERENCES

- 1) Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- 2) Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- 3) Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 4) Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1-44. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000>
- 5) Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Westview Press.

Exploring Stakeholder Impact on Learning: A Regression Model of Educational Effectiveness

- 6) Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009048817385>
- 7) Grolnick, W. S., & Slowiaczek, M. L. (1994). Parents' involvement in children's schooling: A multidimensional conceptualization and motivational model. *Child Development*, 65(1), 237-252. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131378>
- 8) Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0957823111116699>
- 9) Hanh, T. T., Binh, H. X., Phuong, D. T. T., & Nghi, T. N. (2025). Factors Affecting Learning Outcomes in Digital Economics Education: Evidence from Economics Universities in Vietnam. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(3), 610-633. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.3.29>
- 10) Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- 11) Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. The Wallace Foundation.
- 12) Nam, N. T., & Thanh, N. N. (2024). Examining economic incentives and youth engagement in cultural heritage conservation for tourism and sustainable development: A case study of cultural provinces in Vietnam. *Asian Development Policy Review*, 12(2), 177-193.
- 13) Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- 14) Quynh, N. D., & Thanh, N. N. (2025a). How digital platforms influence young people's participation in governance and civic activities: evidence in Vietnam. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 1-22.
- 15) Quynh, N. D., & Thanh, N. N. (2025b). Economic Aspirations and Vietnamese Interest in Korean Matrimony. *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review*, 5(2), e03215-e03215.
- 16) Ryan, A. M. (2001). The peer group as a context for the development of young adolescent motivation and achievement. *Child Development*, 72(4), 1135-1150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00338>
- 17) Stronge, J. H. (2018). *Qualities of effective teachers* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- 18) Thanh, N. N. (2024). The opportunities and challenges of public policy communication in the context of digital transformation in Vietnam. *Journal of State Management*, 31(12), 13-21.
- 19) Thanh, N. N., Thuy, N. T., Thao, B. T., & Huong, H. T. T. (2023). Policies for religious and the practice of burning votive papers for the deceased: a survey in Vietnam. *Synesis* (ISSN 1984-6754), 15(2), 208-222.
- 20) Wentzel, K. R., & Watkins, D. E. (2002). Peer relationships and collaborative learning as contexts for academic enablers. *School Psychology Review*, 31(3), 366-377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2002.12086161>



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.