

Instructional Skills of Teachers and Support of Stakeholders in Relation to Performance of Learners

Leny S. España¹, Raymund L. Santiago²

¹DepEd – Bago City, Philippines

²La Carlota City College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800264>

Received: 19 August 2026; Accepted: 24 August 2026; Published: 01 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the instructional skills of teachers and stakeholders' support in relation to the academic performance of struggling learners in a selected public school in the Schools Division of Negros Island Region. Specifically, it determined the level of teachers' instructional skills in terms of differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and adaptive teaching; the extent of stakeholders' support in terms of parental involvement, school administration support, and community support; and the academic performance of learners. It also examined whether teachers' instructional skills and stakeholders' support were significantly related to learners' academic performance. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design and involved 99 qualified respondents associated with identified struggling learners. Data were gathered through validated research instruments, while learners' academic performance was based on official school records. Findings showed that teachers demonstrated a high level of instructional skills ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.36$), with differentiated instruction obtaining the highest rating ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.53$), while adaptive teaching was rated moderate ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.62$). Stakeholders' support was generally moderate ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.46$), with community support rated highest ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 0.61$) and parental involvement lowest ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.57$). Learners demonstrated varied reading performance, with 37 classified as transitioning readers and 36 reading at grade level. The findings further revealed no significant relationship between instructional skills and academic performance ($r_s = .100$, $p = .325$) and between stakeholders' support and academic performance ($r_s = .089$, $p = .381$). These findings suggest that learners' academic performance may also be associated with learner-related, family-related, and contextual factors beyond the instructional skills and stakeholder support examined in the study. Because variables such as attendance, home learning environment, prior achievement, and access to learning resources were not directly measured, their potential contribution warrants further investigation.

Keywords: Instructional Skills, Stakeholders' Support, Academic Performance, Struggling Learners, Differentiated Instruction, Adaptive Teaching, Parental Involvement

INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted to examine how teachers' instructional skills and the support provided by stakeholders, such as parents, school administrators, and the community, are related to learners' academic performance. The researcher believes that quality instruction, together with strong stakeholders' support, creates a positive learning environment that helps students achieve better educational outcomes. Through this research, it aims to provide evidence-based findings that may help schools strengthen teaching practices, encourage greater stakeholder involvement, and develop programs that will further improve learners' performance.

Improving the academic performance of learners, especially those who struggle to meet grade-level expectations, remains a persistent concern in Philippine education. Recent studies emphasize that teachers' instructional skills, such as differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and adaptive teaching, significantly influence learners' academic outcomes (Sumbilon & Valmorida, 2023; Labangon et al., 2025). Equally important is the support extended by stakeholders, particularly parents, school administrators, and the community, which reinforces learning beyond the classroom (Pepito & Sambo, 2023; Segura, Mahistrado, & Ongcachuy, 2025).

Within the Philippine setting, Republic Act No. 10533 mandates a learner-centered and inclusive curriculum, while DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022 reinforces the need to close learning gaps among struggling learners. Despite these policies, recent data from the Department of Education (2022) show that many learners continue to struggle with foundational skills such as reading and numeracy. Sumbilon and Valmorida (2023) found that effective instructional strategies combined with parental involvement significantly improve learner performance, while Pepito and Sambo (2023) reported that limited parental support contributes to low reading proficiency. Labangon et al. (2025) further emphasized that parental involvement becomes more effective when aligned with classroom instruction.

At the local level, in one school division in the Negros Island Region, preliminary interviews conducted by the researcher revealed that learners exhibited low comprehension and difficulty mastering essential competencies. This challenge is often linked to limited variation in instructional strategies and large class sizes. Parental involvement also remains inconsistent, with some parents unable to regularly monitor their children's progress due to work commitments or limited awareness. Recent action research by the Department of Education (2024) highlights the importance of targeted instructional interventions and strengthened school-home partnerships in improving learner outcomes. Despite the growing body of literature and supportive policies, most studies examine instructional skills and stakeholder support as separate factors. There is limited research investigating their individual and combined associations with learner performance, particularly in localized contexts such as the Negros Island Region. In response, this study examines the relationship between teachers' instructional skills, stakeholders' support, and the academic performance of struggling learners in one of the School Division in Negros Island Region. The ultimate goal is to generate evidence-based insights that support the implementation of DepEd policies, develop more responsive instructional practices, and cultivate stronger collaborative support systems.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to examine teachers' instructional skills and stakeholders' support in relation to the academic performance of struggling learners. The descriptive component was used to determine the level of instructional skills and the extent of stakeholders' support, while the correlational component examined the relationships of these variables with learners' academic performance. The study did not manipulate the variables but examined them as they naturally occurred in the selected school setting.

The study was conducted in a selected public school in the Schools Division of Negros Island Region. The participants consisted of teachers handling identified struggling learners, parents or guardians of the identified learners, and school administrators who were directly involved in supporting the learners. A total of 99 qualified respondents participated in the study through total enumeration. The respondents were categorized according to their roles as teachers, parents or guardians, and school administrators. The specific number of respondents in each category was determined based on the official respondent list and was reported separately to provide a clear description of the study participants. The respondents provided information on the variables relevant to their respective roles, while the academic performance of the identified struggling learners was obtained from official school records and their reading-performance classifications. The respondents consisted of teachers, parents or guardians, and school administrators who answered the stakeholder-support instrument according to their respective experiences and perceptions. Their responses were categorized according to respondent type to allow comparison among the three groups. The subgroup distribution was determined from the official respondent list used during data collection. Reporting the respondent categories separately enabled the study to examine whether perceptions of instructional skills and stakeholders' support differed across the groups.

Data were gathered using validated researcher-assembled questionnaires. The instructional skills instrument assessed differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and adaptive teaching, while the stakeholders' support instrument covered parental involvement, school administration support, and community support. The academic performance of the struggling learners was determined using their official school records and reading-performance classifications. Prior to data collection, appropriate permissions and informed consent were secured from the concerned authorities and participants. The questionnaires were administered, retrieved, checked for

completeness, and prepared for analysis while maintaining the confidentiality of the respondents and the learners' records.

The collected data were summarized and interpreted according to the objectives of the study. Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, were used to describe the respondents' characteristics, instructional skills, stakeholders' support, and learners' academic performance. The data were further disaggregated according to respondent category, specifically teachers, parents or guardians, and school administrators, to examine differences in their assessments of the variables. Where appropriate, the Kruskal–Wallis H test was used to determine whether significant differences existed among the three independent respondent groups. Spearman's rank-order correlation was used to determine the relationships between instructional skills, stakeholders' support, and learners' academic performance. All inferential analyses were evaluated using a 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents According to Respondent Category

Respondent Category	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Teachers	25	25
Parents/Guardians	55	55
School Administrators	4	4
Total	99	100

Level of Instructional Skills of Teachers

Table 2. Level of Instructional Skills in Terms of Differentiated Instruction, Formative Assessment and Adaptive Teaching.

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Differentiated Instruction	4.06	.53	High
Teacher uses different instructional strategies (group work, visual, hand on tasks).	4.00	1.04	High
Teacher adjusts the pace of instruction based on students need.	3.76	1.33	High
Teacher provides multiple ways for students to demonstrate their learning.	4.16	.93	High
Teacher Consider students learning when planning instruction.	4.20	1.23	High
Teacher assesses students' prior knowledge in introducing lessons.	4.16	.96	High
Formative Assessment	3.61	.60	High
Teacher regularly assesses students' understanding.	3.99	1.07	High
Teacher provides immediate feedback after assessment.	3.69	1.24	High
Teacher uses questioning techniques to check for understanding.	3.79	1.06	High
Teacher uses quizzes or short tasks to monitor learning progress.	3.46	1.26	High
Teacher adjusts teaching strategy based on Students' assessment results.	3.11	1.24	Moderate
Adaptive Teaching	3.17	.62	Moderate
Teacher modifies teaching strategies based on students' response.	3.09	1.30	Moderate
Teacher adjusts lesson plans when students show difficulty in understanding.	3.38	1.24	Moderate

Teacher real time feedback to guide instruction.	2.95	1.05	Moderate
Teacher changes the pace of teaching depending on students' comprehension.	3.36	1.10	Moderate
Teacher provides alternative explanations when students struggle with the concepts of the topic.	3.06	.98	Moderate
Instructional Skills as a Whole	3.61	.36	High

Legend: (4.21-5.0)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

Table 2 presents the level of instructional skills of teachers in terms of differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and adaptive teaching. Differentiated instruction was rated High ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.53$), indicating that teachers generally considered differences in learners' learning needs when delivering instruction. The highest-rated practice was considering learners' learning needs when planning instruction ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.23$), while the lowest was adjusting the pace of instruction based on students' needs ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 1.33$). This suggests that teachers were generally able to plan lessons with learner differences in mind and provide varied learning opportunities. The finding is consistent with Gibbs and McKay (2021), who noted that differentiated instruction enables teachers to respond to differences in learners' abilities, readiness, and learning needs.

Formative assessment was also rated High ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.60$). This indicates that teachers regularly monitored students' understanding through assessment activities. The highest-rated practice was regularly assessing students' understanding ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.07$), whereas the lowest was adjusting teaching strategies based on students' assessment results ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 1.24$), which was rated Moderate. The results indicate that teachers were more consistent in checking students' learning than in using assessment information to immediately modify instruction. This supports the view of Xuan et al. (2022) that formative assessment becomes more effective when information gathered from assessment is used to improve subsequent teaching and learning.

Adaptive teaching was rated Moderate ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.62$), showing that teachers practiced instructional adjustments less consistently. The lowest-rated indicator was providing real-time feedback to guide instruction ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.05$), followed by modifying teaching strategies based on students' responses ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.30$). Although teachers adjusted lesson plans when students experienced difficulty ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.24$) and changed the pace of teaching according to students' comprehension ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.10$), these practices were still only at a Moderate level. This suggests that teachers may recognize students' difficulties but may not always respond to them immediately during the lesson. Hardy et al. (2022) emphasized that adaptive teaching involves using evidence of students' understanding to make timely instructional adjustments.

As a whole, instructional skills were rated High ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.36$). This indicates that teachers generally demonstrated effective instructional practices, particularly in differentiating instruction and conducting formative assessments. However, the lower rating for adaptive teaching points to an area that may require further strengthening. The findings imply that while teachers were generally capable of planning and assessing instruction, they needed greater consistency in responding immediately to students' learning difficulties and assessment results.

The findings imply that teachers had a good foundation in instructional practice, but professional development should place greater emphasis on adaptive and assessment-informed teaching. In particular, teachers may benefit from training on how to interpret assessment results, provide timely feedback, modify instructional strategies, and adjust lesson pacing while teaching is taking place. van der Kleij et al. (2021) emphasized that assessment information becomes more valuable when it is used to inform instructional differentiation and subsequent teaching decisions.

Schools may therefore strengthen mentoring, peer observation, demonstration teaching, and learning action cell activities that focus on responsive teaching strategies. Professional development may also provide teachers with practical classroom techniques for giving real-time feedback and modifying instruction according to students' responses. Kahmann et al. (2022) found that professional development can support teachers in improving their

knowledge and practices related to differentiated instruction. Strengthening these areas may help teachers move from simply identifying learners' needs toward responding to those needs more promptly and effectively.

Extent of Stakeholders' Support

Table 3. Stakeholders Support in Terms of Parental Involvement, School Administration and Community Engagement.

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Parental Involvement	2.84	.57	Moderate
Parents attend school meetings and activities regularly.	2.70	1.09	Moderate
Parents monitor their children academic progress.	2.59	1.03	Low
Parents assist their children with school work at home.	2.67	1.12	Moderate
Parents communicate with teachers regarding their children performance.	2.74	1.21	Moderate
Parents feel welcome to have and update their learners-performance and respected by the school.	3.54	1.10	High
School Admin	3.35	.74	Moderate
The school admin provides support for the teachers' professional growth.	3.42	1.21	High
The school admin encourages innovation and new ideas for the knowledge of the learners.	3.20	1.13	Moderate
The school admin communicates a clear vision for the academic progress of the learners.	2.83	1.21	Moderate
The school admin manages school resources effectively.	3.57	1.27	High
The school admin policies and procedures implemented properly.	3.73	1.28	High
Community Support	3.43	.61	High
Community organizations support school program involving parents.	3.47	1.29	High
Community initiates to collaborate with a good parents-school relationship	3.32	1.41	Moderate
Partnership between school and community strengthen parent engagement.	3.30	1.40	Moderate
External stakeholders provide resources for parents- related program	3.38	1.28	Moderate
Local stakeholders Such as NGO's and Brgy. officials actively support school program.	3.65	1.09	High
Stakeholders Support as a Whole	3.21	.46	Moderate

Legend: (4.21-5.0)-Very High; (3.41 – 4.20)-High; (2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low; (1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

Table 3 presents the level of stakeholders' support in terms of parental involvement, school administration, and community support. Parental involvement was rated Moderate ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.57$), indicating that parents were involved in school-related activities and in supporting their children's learning, but their participation was not yet consistent. The highest-rated indicator was that parents felt welcome to receive updates about their learners' performance and were respected by the school ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.10$), which was rated High. In contrast, assisting children with school work at home obtained the lowest mean ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 1.03$), interpreted as Low. This suggests that although schools generally created a welcoming environment for parents, direct parental support for learning at home remained limited. This finding is consistent with Garbacz et al. (2020), who

emphasized that effective family–school partnerships require meaningful and sustained opportunities for parents to participate in their children’s education.

School administration was rated Moderate ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.74$). The results indicate that school administrators provided some level of support for teachers and learners, although several administrative practices could still be strengthened. The highest-rated indicator was the proper implementation of school policies and procedures ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.28$), followed by effective management of school resources ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.27$), both interpreted as High. However, communicating a clear vision for learners’ academic progress received the lowest mean ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.21$), interpreted as Moderate. This indicates that while administrative systems and policies were generally implemented, communicating a clear and shared direction for academic improvement may require greater attention. Kraft et al. (2020) highlighted that school leadership and supportive organizational conditions play an important role in creating environments that enable teachers and schools to improve student outcomes.

Community support was rated High ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 0.61$), suggesting that the community generally contributed positively to school programs and activities. The highest-rated indicator was the active support provided by local stakeholders, such as nongovernmental organizations and barangay officials ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.09$), followed by support from community organizations for school programs involving parents ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.29$). However, partnership between the school and community in strengthening parent engagement obtained a Moderate rating ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.40$). This suggests that community stakeholders were willing to support school activities, but their involvement could be further directed toward strengthening parent participation and school–community partnerships. Epstein (2021) noted that stronger school, family, and community partnerships can create broader support systems for learners and contribute to their educational development.

As a whole, stakeholders’ support was rated Moderate ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.46$). This indicates that stakeholders provided a fair level of support to the school and learners, but their involvement was not equally strong across the different areas. Community support was the strongest dimension, followed by school administration, while parental involvement obtained the lowest overall mean. The results particularly point to the need to strengthen parents’ direct participation in learning activities, especially in monitoring academic progress and assisting children with school work at home.

The findings imply that schools may need to establish stronger and more consistent mechanisms for parental engagement, particularly in supporting learning beyond the classroom. Since parental involvement received the lowest mean among the three dimensions, schools could provide parents with practical guidance on how to monitor academic progress, assist with schoolwork, communicate with teachers, and participate in learning-related activities without requiring extensive time or resources. Such efforts are important because family engagement is more effective when schools provide accessible and meaningful ways for parents to participate (Garbacz et al., 2020).

The moderate rating for school administration also suggests the need for administrators to strengthen communication regarding the school’s academic goals and involve stakeholders more actively in planning and decision-making. At the same time, the high-rating for-community support provides a useful foundation for expanding partnerships. Schools could maximize existing relationships with barangay officials, community organizations, and other local stakeholders to develop programs that specifically encourage parent participation. Strengthening the connection among parents, school administrators, teachers, and community stakeholders may create a more coordinated support system for learners and help improve the overall effectiveness of stakeholder involvement.

Level of Academic Performance of Struggling Learners

Table 4. Level of Performance of Struggling Learners.

Level of Academic Performance	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
-------------------------------	---	------	----------------	----------------

Low Emerging Level	6	3.97	1.07	Transitioning Reader
High Emerging Reader	1			
Developing Reader	19			
Transitioning Reader	37			
Reading at Grade Level	36			
Overall	99			

Legend: (4.50-5.0) Reading At Grade Level;(3.50-4.499)-Transitioning Reader; (2.50-3.499)-Developing Reader; (1.5-2.499) High Emerging Level; (1.0-1.499) Low Emerging Level.

Table 4 presents the distribution and descriptive statistics of learners according to their level of academic performance in reading. Of the 99 learners included in the study, 37 were classified as Transitioning Readers, representing the largest group, followed by 36 learners who were Reading at Grade Level. Meanwhile, 19 learners were classified as Developing Readers, 6 as Low Emerging Readers, and 1 as a High Emerging Reader. The distribution indicates considerable variation in learners' reading performance, with some learners already demonstrating grade-level reading proficiency while others continued to require varying levels of instructional support. The overall mean academic performance was 3.97 (SD = 1.07), corresponding to the Transitioning Reader category. The subgroup means and standard deviations further provide a more detailed description of performance within each reader classification and should be interpreted alongside the corresponding group sizes.

The relatively large number of learners classified as Transitioning Readers suggests that many learners had acquired basic reading skills but still needed continued practice to achieve greater fluency, comprehension, and independence. The 36 learners who were already reading at grade level, however, indicate that a substantial portion of the group had attained the expected level of reading performance. These findings highlight the importance of providing differentiated reading activities based on learners' current abilities rather than using the same intervention for all learners.

The findings imply that reading instruction should be responsive to the varying academic needs of learners. Learners in the Low Emerging and Developing Reader categories may require more intensive and structured intervention, including guided reading, vocabulary development, phonics-related activities, and frequent individual monitoring. Transitioning Readers may benefit from activities that strengthen fluency and comprehension so they can progress toward grade-level performance.

For learners who are already reading at grade level, teachers may provide enrichment activities that develop higher-order comprehension, critical reading, and independent learning skills. Overall, the distribution suggests that a one-size-fits-all approach may not be sufficient. Differentiated reading instruction and continuous progress monitoring can help ensure that struggling learners receive appropriate support while learners who are performing well continue to advance. This is consistent with the emphasis of recent literacy research on providing instruction that responds to learners' different levels of reading development and learning needs.

Relationship Between Instructional Skills and Academic Performance

Table 5. Relationship Between Instructional Skills and Academic Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r^s)	P-value	Decision for Ho	Interpretation
Instructional Skills Vs Academic Performance	.100	.325	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Table 5 presents the relationship between teachers' instructional skills and learners' academic performance. The analysis yielded a weak positive correlation ($\rho = .100$, $p = .325$). Since the p-value exceeded the .05 level of

significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Thus, there was no statistically significant relationship between teachers' instructional skills and learners' academic performance in the present study.

Although teachers demonstrated a high level of instructional skills, the result indicates that higher ratings of instructional skills were not necessarily associated with higher academic performance among the learners. This finding should be interpreted within the broader context of learner achievement, which may be influenced by multiple interacting factors. Variables such as learner attendance, motivation, prior knowledge, home learning environment, socioeconomic conditions, access to learning resources, and participation in intervention activities may contribute to academic performance but were not directly measured in the present study. Consequently, these variables cannot be identified as causes of the non-significant relationship; rather, they represent plausible contextual factors that future research may examine.

The finding suggests that strengthening teachers' instructional skills should be complemented by interventions addressing learner and environmental conditions. Schools may continue to enhance differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and adaptive teaching while simultaneously strengthening attendance monitoring, home-school collaboration, individualized reading interventions, and access to appropriate learning resources. A more comprehensive approach may provide better opportunities for struggling learners to improve their academic performance. Recent educational research emphasizes that learner achievement is shaped by multiple interacting learner, teacher, family, and school factors rather than by a single classroom factor (Kraft, 2020; OECD, 2023).

The result implies that improving teachers' instructional skills alone may not be sufficient to substantially improve learners' academic performance. While maintaining effective instructional practices remains important, schools may need to consider a more comprehensive approach that addresses learner-related and environmental factors affecting achievement. Teachers may continue strengthening differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and adaptive teaching while also working with parents and school administrators to provide learners with consistent academic support.

The non-significant relationship also suggests that future interventions should not focus exclusively on teacher instructional practices. Programs may incorporate learner motivation, parental involvement, attendance, learning resources, and individualized academic interventions. In this way, teachers' instructional skills can be supported by other factors that collectively contribute to improved learner outcomes.

Relationship Between Stakeholders' Support and Academic Performance

Table 6. Relationship Between Stakeholders Support and Academic Performance.

Variable	Test Statistics (r^s)	P-value	Decision for Ho	Interpretation
Stakeholders Support Vs Academic Performance	.089	.381	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Table 6 presents the relationship between stakeholders' support and learners' academic performance. The analysis yielded a very weak positive correlation ($\rho = .089$, $p = .381$). Since the p-value exceeded the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Thus, there was no statistically significant relationship between stakeholders' support and learners' academic performance.

The finding indicates that the measured level of parental, school administrative, and community support was not statistically associated with differences in learners' academic performance in the present sample. This result does not suggest that stakeholder involvement is unimportant. Rather, the absence of a significant relationship may reflect differences in the quality, consistency, timing, and nature of the support provided. Involvement that is general or participation-based may not necessarily translate into direct improvements in learners' reading performance.

The result should also be interpreted in light of variables that were not measured in the study. Learner attendance, the home learning environment, prior achievement, socioeconomic circumstances, access to learning materials, and participation in reading interventions may influence academic performance and may interact with the effects

of stakeholder support. Since these variables were not included in the analysis, their contribution cannot be statistically established. Future research should therefore examine stakeholder support together with these learner and contextual factors to provide a more comprehensive explanation of academic outcomes.

The findings further suggest that schools should focus not only on increasing stakeholder participation but also on improving the relevance and quality of that participation. Parents may be provided with practical strategies for supporting reading at home, monitoring progress, and communicating regularly with teachers. School administrators and community partners may likewise coordinate targeted programs that directly address learners' identified academic needs. A meta-analysis by Kim (2022) likewise found that parental involvement was positively associated with achievement overall, but the strength of the relationship differed according to the type of involvement, with parent expectations and aspirations showing stronger effects than some forms of homework assistance. Thus, schools may strengthen stakeholder programs by making involvement more specific, consistent, and directly connected to learners' academic needs.

Several contextual factors may also help explain why stakeholder support was not significantly related to academic performance. The quantity of stakeholder participation may not necessarily reflect the quality, consistency, or instructional relevance of the support received by learners. For instance, parental participation in school activities may have limited effects on reading performance when learners have irregular attendance, insufficient opportunities for practice at home, limited access to learning materials, or other learning difficulties. Similarly, school and community support may contribute to the learning environment without producing an immediate or measurable effect on individual academic performance. Because learner attendance, home learning conditions, socioeconomic circumstances, prior academic performance, and participation in reading interventions were not included as measured variables, their potential influence cannot be statistically determined from the present findings. Future research should therefore examine these factors simultaneously to obtain a more comprehensive explanation of learners' academic outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were formulated:

Teachers demonstrated a high level of instructional skills, with differentiated instruction as the strongest area, while adaptive teaching remained an area that needed further improvement.

Stakeholders' support was moderate, with community support showing the highest level and parental involvement showing the lowest level among the dimensions.

Learners demonstrated varied levels of academic performance, with most learners classified as transitioning readers or reading at grade level, while some still required additional reading support.

Instructional skills had no significant relationship with academic performance, indicating that variations in the measured level of teachers' instructional skills were not statistically associated with variations in learners' academic performance in the study. This finding suggests that other learner-related, family-related, and contextual factors may also contribute to academic outcomes.

Stakeholders' support likewise had no significant relationship with academic performance, indicating that variations in the measured support of parents, school administrators, and community stakeholders were not statistically associated with learners' academic performance. The finding underscores the need to consider the quality, consistency, and contextual conditions surrounding stakeholder involvement, as well as other factors that were not measured in the present study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher sincerely expresses her deepest gratitude to everyone who contributed to the successful completion of this study.

The researcher is grateful to the school administrators, research adviser, research director, statistician, grammarian, panel members, and research instrument validators for their valuable guidance, constructive suggestions, expertise, and encouragement throughout the research process.

Sincere appreciation is also extended to the school administration, faculty, and staff for their cooperation and support during the conduct of the study, as well as to all the respondents for their time, participation, and honest responses, which made the completion of this research possible.

The researcher also gratefully acknowledges her friends and colleagues for their encouragement, understanding, prayers, and moral support throughout this academic journey.

Above all, the researcher offers her deepest gratitude to Almighty God for providing wisdom, strength, perseverance, and guidance in overcoming challenges and completing this study. To Him be all the honor, glory, and praise.

REFERENCES

1. Curtis, K., Anicama, C., & Zhou, Q. (2021). Longitudinal relations among school context, school-based parent involvement, and academic achievement of Chinese American children in immigrant families. *Journal of School Psychology, 88*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2021.07.002>
2. Department of Education. (2022). *Amending DepEd Order No. 14, s. 2021 (Guidelines on the release and utilization of support funds for remedial programs) (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022)*. [Department of Education](#)
3. Department of Education. (2022). *Basic education statistical data and student performance metrics across foundational skills*. DepEd Central Office.
4. Department of Education. (2024). *Targeted instructional interventions and home-school partnerships: Division action research compilation*. Schools Division of Bago City.
5. Epstein, J. L. (2021). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
6. Garbacz, S. A., Herman, K. C., Thompson, A. M., & Reinke, W. M. (2020). Family engagement in education and intervention: Implementation and effectiveness. *School Psychology Review, 49*(3), 281–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2020.1804511>
7. Gibbs, K., & McKay, L. (2021). Differentiated teaching practices of Australian mainstream classroom teachers: A systematic review and thematic analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research, 109*, 101799. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101799>
8. Hardy, I., Meschede, N., & Mannel, S. (2022). Measuring adaptive teaching in classroom discourse: Effects on student learning in elementary science education. *Frontiers in Education, 7*, 1041316. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.1041316>
9. Kahmann, R., Droop, M., & Lazonder, A. W. (2022). Meta-analysis of professional development programs in differentiated instruction. *International Journal of Educational Research, 114*, 102072. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102072>
10. Kim, S. W. (2022). Fifty years of parental involvement and achievement research: A second-order meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 37*, 100463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100463>
11. Kraft, M. A., Marinell, W. H., & Shen-Wei Yee, D. (2020). School organizational contexts, teacher turnover, and student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 42*(1), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373719888268>
12. Labangon, R. M., Santos, E. L., & Teves, P. H. (2025). *Aligning classroom instruction with school leadership and parental monitoring tracks*. *Journal of Applied Educational Studies, 31*(1), 15–30.
13. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Adaptive teaching and real-time pedagogical adjustments: International classroom standards and delivery matrices*. OECD Publishing.
14. Pepito, D. C., & Sambo, A. E. (2023). Home-bound literacy deficits: Direct effects of fragmented parental monitoring on student reading proficiency. *Philippine Journal of Reading and Literacy Development, 5*(2), 74–89.

-
15. Republic of the Philippines. (2013). *Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Republic Act No. 10533)*. Official Gazette
 16. Segura, L. P., Mahistrado, A. M., & Ongcachuy, S. B. (2025). *Home-school communication networks and elementary student literacy metrics*. *Journal of Early Childhood and Primary Education*, 22(1), 95–110.
 17. Sumbilon, M. G., & Valmorida, R. L. (2023). *Amplifying classroom pedagogy: Interactive effects of teaching strategies and parent stakeholder integration*. *Northern Mindanao Research Journal*, 15(3), 142–156.
 18. van der Kleij, F. M., Cumming, J., & Looney, J. (2021). A conceptual framework for assessment-informed differentiation in the classroom. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2021.1942118>
 19. Xuan, Q., Cheung, A., & Sun, D. (2022). The effectiveness of formative assessment for enhancing reading achievement in K–12 classrooms: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 990196.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.990196>