A Meta-Analysis of Literacy-Supportive Educational Delivery Models for Transferees, Returnees, and Irregular Students in Formal and Nonformal Settings

Michael N. Padua[1], Bernadette D. Mabini[2], Marissa A. Inocentes.[3], Romnick E. Patao.[4], Erna G. Polon[5]

[1 2 3 4 5]Department of Education, Department. Muntinlupa City, Philippines.

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0617

Received: 02 October 2025; Accepted: 08 October 2025; Published: 10 November 2025

ABSTRACT

This research assesses the acceptability, flexibility, and issues of literacy-friendly models of instruction delivery among transferees, returnees, and irregular learners in formal and nonformal education. Through descriptive quantitative research, the researcher gathered data from interviews of senior high school students in Muntinlupa City to quantify the perceived impact of blended learning, instruction practices, and inclusive literacy interventions. Outcomes indicated that blended learning, especially the use of technology tools, was most valued in facilitating literacy acquisition (WM = 3.81). Remedial reading programs (WM = 3.93) and the use of multimedia tools (WM = 3.89) were also valued. Inclusive practices with an emphasis on cooperation among stakeholders (WM = 3.86) and differentiated instruction in the classroom were identified as viable and helpful to deal with learner diversity.

Despite these strengths, the research also demonstrated some implementation difficulties. Before these were finite school resources (WM = 4.04), a lack of individualized learning plans and inadequate teacher training in inclusive practice. These hindered the adoption of literacy-supportive approaches, particularly among interrupted educational histories. Nonetheless, there was consensus among participants regarding the overall acceptability of the professionally developed proposed professional development plan that recorded high ratings on clarity, feasibility, and sustainability as measured through average weighted means greater than 4.2.

Based on these findings, the research advises increased teacher training on differentiated and inclusive literacy strategies, organizational incorporation of personal learning plans, increased parent-teacher collaboration, and increased access to school materials. The findings validate that although existing literacy interventions are generally successful, these need to be strategically enhanced and sustained in order to address the needs of mobile and marginalized learners. The study offers useful lessons for school leaders, policymakers, and teachers who want to develop responsive and inclusive literacy strategies for the senior high school context in Muntinlupa City.

Keywords: Blended learning, literacy intervention, transferees, inclusive education, differentiated instruction

INTRODUCTION

Literacy has long been recognized as a crucial skill necessary for academic success and integration into society. Transferees, returnees, and irregular learners, however, were more likely to exhibit persistent literacy difficulties due to experiencing irregular pedagogy, curriculum incompatibility, and limited access to learning support (Yap & Gonzales, 2022; UNESCO, 2020). These students, who often cycled through schools or recaptured the system following school breaks, had difficulty with recapturing and learning initial literacy skills. In response, schools increasingly recognized that they needed to investigate and support literacy-sensitive interventions explicitly designed for this struggling at-risk subgroup.

Acting on the nation's appeal for inclusive and evidence-based reform, the Literacy Coordinating Council (LCC), in collaboration with the Department of Education, initiated the 2025 Call for Research Papers on Literacy, with the theme "Bridging Literacy Gaps: Innovations in Formal and Nonformal Education" (DepEd, 2025). The theme

emphasized the use of multiple modes of learning delivery to support learners in both regular classrooms and non-classroom learning environments. Transferees, returnees, and irregular students were generally outside the standard model, hence more reliant on nonformal methods and differentiated instruction to fill gaps in learning (Cruz et al., 2022). Despite recurring pilot programs and localized innovation, the need to integrate available efforts was a continuing priority in learning what works, for whom, and under what conditions.

These adaptive delivery approaches, such as blended learning, modular teaching, peer learning, and technology-enhanced remediation, had earlier been investigated as solutions for better literacy among struggling readers (Frontiers in Education, 2021; World Bank, 2021). Nevertheless, the interventions were usually piloted individually, and few studies were synthesized to establish evidence of their impact across different types of learners and learning environments. A meta-analytic model enabled researchers to synthesize and analyze outcomes across a variety of settings, resulting in a clearer picture of the effectiveness of these models. Seeking to address formal and informal learning approaches, this study sought to identify literacy-strengthening practices that had been shown to have statistically or contextually significant advantages for academically interrupted students.

This study used a meta-analysis to analyze literacy-supportive instructional delivery interventions given in the Philippines and other such settings between 2020 and 2025. It drew from studies that focused on transferees, returnees, and irregular students of secondary education when it came to outcomes like reading comprehension, written communication, and functional literacy. Socioeconomic status, delivery mode of learning, and status of learners were also analyzed to determine the intensity and relevance of the interventions. In so doing, the research sought to expose patterns that can guide scalable, inclusive, and context-sensitive mechanisms of literacy support in public and private spaces.

Finally, this research aimed to enhance the country's national endeavor to close literacy gaps and to strengthen the DepEd's MATATAG agenda on constructing foundation skills. By determining the most sustainable literacy-supportive delivery models, the research hoped to guide policymaking, curriculum change, and teacher professional development programs for educators working with high-risk learner groups. The results aimed to equip educators and educational leaders with evidence-based information to see that no learner—no matter their course of study—is left behind in achieving key literacy skills.

Methods

Research Design

The research utilized a quantitative research design that included a meta-analytic and descriptive method. The quantitative research design allowed for the systematic gathering of information and statistical analysis of data from guided survey questionnaires received from 165 transferees, returnees, and irregular students of Muntinlupa National High School. The tool, using Likert scale items, assessed the students' perceptions of the effectiveness of different literacy-friendly modes of instructional delivery aids, i.e., modular learning, blended instruction, peer tutoring, and Alternative Learning System (ALS).

The meta-analysis part of the study sought to integrate data collected from prior literacy interventions conducted in the school and other comparable environments. This helped the researcher to identify trends, similarities, and differences in teaching styles of teaching across various environments. Through the use of quantitative data, the research promoted objectivity, measurability, and statistical reliability in determining the most appropriate methodologies to bring about literacy development among pupils with broken or irregular educational histories.

Participants/ Respondents of the Study

Participants in the study were 166 Muntinlupa National High School transferees, returnees, and irregular students, who were determined using school records and enrollment rolls for School Year 2025–2026. The subjects were purposively selected because of their direct experience with literacy-facilitative schemes of learning delivery like modular learning, blended learning, Alternative Learning System (ALS), and peer-aided learning techniques.

The purposive sampling method was employed to ensure that only those students who had at least one experience of alternative or non-traditional learning would be included in the study. This ensured that the researcher was certain about working with those who would provide qualitative data regarding the effectiveness of literacy intervention. The variation in the grade level, learning history, and experience with instructional delivery among the participants enriched the data and enabled broader generalizability.

Regarding ease and accessibility, the survey was carried out online via Google Forms to allow students to respond on electronic platforms from home or school. This also facilitated anonymity and the convenience of response to allow the participants to provide genuine and thoughtful answers.

Research Instruments

The core device applied in this research was a crafted survey questionnaire whose purpose was to collect quantitative information on perceived literacy-supportive educational delivery model efficacy. The questionnaire was drawn from the research's Statement of the Problem (SOP) and contained various parts corresponding to the core areas of interest: modular learning, blended learning, peer tutoring, and ALS (Alternative Learning System). Every section contained Likert-scale statements on which participants responded with a 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) scale.

As a means of verifying the validity of the instrument, the researcher also secured expert verification from education experts and research consultants. The instrument was subsequently pilot tested to evaluate reliability and item clarity. Pilot participant responses resulted in word changes, changes in order, and restructuring for better comprehension and consistency.

The study was conducted using Google Forms to make it accessible, easy to gather data, and anonymous to the 166 participants. Responses were encoded automatically and exported for statistical analysis to enable the researcher to quickly produce descriptive and inferential statistics. The tool's default form enabled the study to gather standardized data that would be objectively analyzed to make valid conclusions.

Data Gathering Procedures

Before the implementation of the research instrument, the researcher obtained permission from the School Principal of Muntinlupa National High School to pursue the research. After approval, an informed consent letter was likewise distributed to the respondents to ensure that ethical procedures, including voluntary participation, anonymity, and confidentiality, were observed during the conduct of the research.

The pilot-tested and expert-checked survey questionnaire was administered through Google Forms. Having utilized an online tool allowed for easy, touchless, and mass data collection. The researcher coordinated with class advisers and the guidance office to facilitate the identification of the 166 qualified respondents—students classified as transferees, returnees, or irregulars according to school records.

Participants were provided with an orientation on how to respond to the survey and informed that responses would be utilized in academic research only. Data was collected within two weeks to provide each student who was selected to participate with adequate time. Answers, once the deadline had passed, were verified for completeness and transferred into a spreadsheet where they were coded and analyzed. This facilitated proper and organized management of data, thus enabling the researcher to proceed with statistical analysis and interpretation.

Statistical Treatment

To examine the data collected from the 166 participants, the researcher utilized descriptive and inferential statistics to ascertain an accurate interpretation of the results and derive significant conclusions. Data were coded and examined using spreadsheet software and statistical packages for the purposes of ensuring the reliability and validity of findings.

Descriptive statistics of frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were employed to assess the

demographic profile of the respondents, along with providing an overview of their level of agreement with each of the statements on the questionnaire. These statistics gave a general picture of trends, patterns, and the general level of consensus regarding the effectiveness of the various models of delivery of education.

Mean ($\bar{x}$)

Used to determine the average response for each item in the Likert scale survey.

$$\bar{x} = \Sigma x / n$$

Where:
$\bar{x}$ = Mean
Σx = Sum of all scores
n = Number of respondents

Standard Deviation (SD)

Used to measure the dispersion or variability of responses from the mean.

$$SD = \sqrt{[\Sigma(x - \bar{x})^2 / (n - 1)]}$$

Where:
x = Individual score
$\bar{x}$ = Mean score
n = Number of respondents

Inferential Statistics: For testing whether differences in demographic variables (i.e., age, grade level, type of learner) were relevant, t-tests and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were employed. Statistical procedures permitted testing of hypotheses and determining whether differences in literacy gain among delivery models identified were statistically significant.

T-Test

Used to determine significant differences between the means of two independent groups.

$$t = (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) / \sqrt{[(s_1^2 / n_1) + (s_2^2 / n_2)]}$$

Where:
$\bar{x}_1$, $\bar{x}_2$ = Group means
s_1, s_2 = Standard deviations
n_1, n_2 = Number of respondents in each group

One-Way ANOVA

Used to compare means across more than two groups.

$$F = MSB / MSW$$

Where:
F = F-ratio
MSB = Mean Square Between Groups
MSW = Mean Square Within Groups

Meta-Analytic Data Synthesis: Apart from survey analysis, there was also a meta-analytic overview of past studies and interventions in the period 2020-2025. Past reports and studies were benchmarked against the survey

findings to give the latter a wider framework and corroborate emerging patterns.

Statistical treatments included ensured the study would offer not just an overview of respondents' experiences but comparative information on literacy-supportive delivery models.

Results

After determining the research designs and instruments that were used in this study, the researchers conducted 165 students as a sample population of all students at MNHS SHS. The researchers came up with the results of the gathered data that was being surveyed as shown below. It includes the analysis and interpretation of their responses concerning the effectiveness of various literacy-supportive educational delivery models experienced by transferees, returnees, and irregular students at Muntinlupa National High School.

The results are organized according to the study's statement of the problems, with data presented using descriptive and inferential statistics. Tables and figures are included to support the discussion and highlight significant findings related to the respondents' demographic profile, their perceptions of different instructional strategies, and the effectiveness of interdisciplinary literacy interventions.

Table 1 Respondents' Profile as to Age

Age	Frequency (F)	Percentage%	Rank
11 – 14	0	0 %	
15 – 17	149	89.8 %	1
18 - ABOVE	17	10.2 %	2
Total	**166**	**100%**	
Mean Average	**16.4 years old**		

Table2 Respondents' Profile as to Sex

Gender/Sex	Frequency(f)	Percentage(%)	Rank
Male	67	40.4 %	2
Female	99	59.6 %	1
Total	**166**	**100%**	

Table 3 Respondents' Profile as to Socioeconomic Status

Educational Attainment	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Rank
Low Income	49	29.5 %	**2**
Middle Income	114	68.7 %	**1**
High Income	4	2.4 %	**3**
Total	166	100 %	

Table 4 Assessment Of Literacy-Supportive Educational Delivery Models In Terms Of Modular Learning

Modular Learning Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
Modules are easy to understand and follow.	3.23	Neutral	4

Modular learning supports my reading and writing development.	3.44	Agree	2
Modules provide clear instructions and examples.	3.30	Neutral	5
I can complete tasks independently using modules.	3.46	Agree	1
Modules align with literacy goals and outcomes.	3.40	Neutral	3
Weighted Mean Average	**3.37**	**Neutral**	

Table 5assessment Of Literacy-Supportive Educational Delivery Models In Terms Of Alternative Learning System (Als) Programs

Alternative Learning System (ALS) programs Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
ALS sessions helped me improve my literacy skills.	3.46	Agree	6
Learning materials used in ALS are appropriate and effective.	3.53	Agree	2
ALS teachers provide sufficient support for reading and writing.	3.58	Agree	1
ALS activities promote real-life application of literacy.	3.51	Agree	5
ALS programs are accessible to all types of learners.	3.58	Agree	1
Weighted Mean Average	**3.53**	**Agree**	

Table 6 Assessment Of Literacy-Supportive Educational Delivery Models In Terms Of Blended Learning

Blended Learning Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
Blended learning improved my engagement in literacy tasks.	3.63	Agree	3
Technology tools used in blended learning support the acquisition of literacy.	3.81	Agree	1
Teachers effectively use online and offline resources together.	3.59	Agree	5
I find blended learning flexible and inclusive.	3.61	Agree	4
Literacy content is well-integrated in both digital and printed formats.	3.64	Agree	2
Weighted Mean Average	**3.66**	**Agree**	

Table 7 Assessment Of Literacy-Supportive Educational Delivery Models In Terms Of Peer Tutoring

Peer Tutoring Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
Peer tutors effectively assist in my reading and writing tasks.	3.78	Agree	1
I feel more confident in literacy because of peer tutoring.	3.57	Agree	3
Peer tutoring provides opportunities for collaborative learning.	3.74	Agree	2
Tutoring sessions are aligned with our literacy lessons.	3.54	Agree	5

Tutors are well-prepared to guide literacy development.	3.56	Agree	4
Weighted Mean Average	**3.64**	**Agree**	

Table 8 Instructional Strategies and Literacy-Focused Interventions

Instructional Strategies and Literacy-Focused Interventions Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
Differentiated instruction helps transferees, returnees, and irregular students improve literacy.	3.71	Agree	4
Peer-assisted learning strategies are effective in enhancing literacy among these students.	3.73	Agree	3
Literacy-focused interventions tailored to the learner's background increase engagement and performance.	3.67	Agree	5
Providing remedial reading programs benefits irregular learners in catching up with their peers.	3.93	Agree	1
Use of multimedia and interactive tools helps build foundational literacy among diverse learners.	3.89	Agree	2
Weighted Mean Average	**3.78**	**Agree**	

Table 9 Challenges and Gaps Encountered in Implementing Educational Delivery Models

Challenges and Gaps Encountered in Implementing Educational Delivery Models Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
Lack of teacher training on inclusive strategies affects literacy instruction.	3.92	Agree	3
Inconsistent attendance of transferees and returnees hinders effective program implementation.	3.81	Agree	5
Limited school resources impact the delivery of literacy support for irregular learners.	4.04	Agree	1
Absence of individualized learning plans leads to lower literacy progress for these learners.	3.93	Agree	2
Communication gaps between teachers and parents affect program continuity and support.	3.89	Agree	4
Weighted Mean Average	**3.92**	**Agree**	

Table 10 Inclusive Literacy Development Strategies

Inclusive Literacy Development Strategies Indicators	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
Tailored reading and writing activities address the unique learning gaps of transferees.	3.66	Agree	5
Bridge programs effectively prepare returnees and irregular students for reintegration.	3.72	Agree	4
Inclusive classroom practices foster literacy engagement among all learners.	3.77	Agree	2

Continuous assessment helps refine literacy strategies for diverse learners.	3.75	Agree	3
Collaboration with external stakeholders enhances support for literacy development initiatives.	3.86	Agree	1
Weighted Mean Average	**3.75**	**Agree**	

Table 11 Acceptable and Applicable Recommended Strategies

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Acceptability	3.78	Acceptable
Relevance to Learner Needs	3.81	Acceptable
Feasibility of Implementation	3.75	Acceptable
Sustainability of Strategies	3.73	Acceptable
Contextual Applicability	3.79	Acceptable
Overall Weighted Mean Average	**3.77**	**Acceptable**

DISCUSSION

Table 1, the age distribution of the 166 respondents reveals that the majority, accounting for 89.8%, were between 15 and 17 years old, while 10.2% were 18 years or older. No respondents belonged to the 11–14 age group, indicating that the sample was skewed toward late high school students, which is common among senior high school transferees, returnees, and irregular students in public schools (DepEd, 2023). The average age of the respondents, based on the midpoints of the age groups, is approximately 16.4 years. This suggests that the literacy-facilitative delivery models are primarily used by students who are at or slightly above the expected age for their grade, aligning with earlier studies that highlight anomalies in schooling during adolescence caused by various learning and socio-economic challenges (UNESCO, 2021).

As shown in Table 2, 59.6% of the respondents were female (99 out of 166), while 40.4% were male (67 out of 166). This indicates that a greater number of transferees, returnees, and irregular students at Muntinlupa National High School were female during the study period. This trend aligns with previous studies in the Philippine context, which suggest that female students are more likely to return to formal education systems or alternative learning programs due to stronger academic resilience and parental encouragement (Calderon & Gonzales, 2021). Additionally, according to DepEd (2023), gender disparities in school participation can be influenced by socio-cultural factors, with males often facing more pressure to enter the workforce early, contributing to irregular school attendance and dropout. The higher female turnout in literacy-supportive programs may reflect their greater inclination to persist in education despite challenges.

Table 3 3 presents the socioeconomic status (SES) of the respondents, where the majority—**68.7%** (114 out of 166)—belonged to the **middle-income** bracket, followed by **29.5%** (49 students) classified under **low-income**, and a small portion, **2.4%** (4 students), from the **high-income** group. These results suggest that the literacy-supportive educational delivery models being analyzed are predominantly utilized by learners from economically modest backgrounds. According to the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA, 2023), students from low- and middle-income households are more likely to experience interruptions in education due to financial constraints, thus becoming transferees, returnees, or irregular students. Similarly, UNESCO (2021) emphasized that socioeconomic disparities are among the strongest predictors of literacy inequity, often leading to limited access to learning resources, technology, and supportive environments at home. Therefore, the findings reinforce the importance of tailoring delivery models to meet the unique literacy needs of economically disadvantaged learners.

Table 4: Students viewed modular learning as good but in need of improvement. The best indicator, "I can work

alone with modules" (WM = 3.46), indicates that modules ensure student autonomy, which is in accordance with independent learning principles (DepEd, 2020). Whereas, on the other hand, feedback such as "Modules offer precise instructions and examples" (WM = 3.30) and "Modules are easy to understand and to follow" (WM = 3.23) were rated relatively lower, conceivably because a couple of students have problems with ease of understanding and clarity. It supports previous studies identifying confusion in instructions in self-learning materials as undermining student performance (Bernardo et al., 2021). The weighted mean of 3.37 suggests a middle-of-the-road stance toward modular learning. Module developers and educators need to increase clarity through simplifying complexity, offering additional illustrations and examples, and keeping in line with the learners' literacy level. Regular students' feedback can be useful in sharpening content and structure. Moreover, the training of teachers in good module design can increase teaching quality and learner engagement.

Table 5, the results of the evaluation are weakly positive to the Alternative Learning System (ALS) programs, with a weighted mean of 3.53 and an overall descriptive rate of "Agree." Two of the indicators, "ALS teachers offer enough support in reading and writing" and "ALS programs are available for all types of learners," both had the highest value at 3.58, reflecting the role of teachers' participation and flexibility in making ALS programs successful (DepEd, 2020). Concurrently, the lowest scored item, "ALS sessions helped me develop my literacy skills" (WM = 3.46), indicates that although support mechanisms exist, immediate literacy gains may also need to be supported.

Table 6, The outcomes of the evaluation of literacy-enabling models of instructional delivery in blended learning are that overall, the respondents view blended learning as positive with a weighted mean average of 3.66, concurring in all the indicators. The most highly rated indicator, "Technology tools used in blended learning support learning to gain literacy" (WM = 3.81), identifies the important contribution of computer tools in literacy acquisition. This result is consistent with research that demands the incorporation of technology in learning literacy (Ally, 2019; Graham, 2020). The least scored item was effective utilization of offline and online materials by teachers (WM = 3.59), which implies teacher development aimed at enhancing modalities of teaching. Thus, it is advised that institutions offer special professional development to instructors in balancing print and digital literacy strategies and regularly update technology-influenced resources to promote learner engagement and literacy levels in blended learning environments.

Table 7, The results indicate that peer tutoring is a generally effective literacy-supportive strategy, with a weighted mean of 3.64 and a consistent "Agree" rating across all indicators. Among the components, "Peer tutors effectively assist in my reading and writing tasks" (WM = 3.78) and "Peer tutoring provides opportunities for collaborative learning" (WM = 3.74) were rated highest, highlighting the value of peer-assisted instruction in developing literacy skills through shared learning experiences. These findings are supported by Vygotsky's (1978) **Social Development Theory**, which emphasizes the role of more capable peers in scaffolding learning. While ratings for tutor preparedness (WM = 3.56) and alignment with literacy lessons (WM = 3.54) were slightly lower, they still suggest general satisfaction but point to areas for improvement in structure and training.

Table 8, The evaluation of teaching approaches and interventions in reading has high consensus with the respondents scoring a weighted mean of 3.78. The highest-valued indicator, "Providing remedial reading programs benefits irregular learners in catching up with their peers" (WM = 3.93), also points to the special importance of targeted interventions in assisting struggling students, as indicated by Vellutino et al.'s (2006) research on the efficacy of early remediation in averting long-term reading failure. At the same time, interactive and multimedia materials (WM = 3.89) ranked the second place, indicating how many active and diversified materials are required to address different learning needs (Mayer, 2017). The lowest-rated item, individualized literacy-oriented interventions (WM = 3.67), is an aspect of need where instruction may not be tailored sufficiently to address learners' distinct backgrounds. To enhance literacy gains, schools are also incentivized to purchase high-quality remedial programs and make multimedia learning tools more widely available, and offer teachers professional development in differentiated and culturally responsive instruction.

Table 9, The findings regarding the problems or gaps in the delivery of educational models indicate an overall consensus among the respondents, with a total weighted mean of 3.92, suggesting that these issues greatly affect teaching literacy. The most critical one is "limited school resources" (WM = 4.04), pointing to the impact of lack of funding, materials, and infrastructure to support irregular learners; an issue supported by UNESCO 2020,

which highlights the impact of shortages of resources on equal access to quality education. The absence of personalized learning plans (WM = 3.93) and inadequate teacher preparation in inclusive approaches (WM = 3.92) also illustrate systemic inadequacies in addressing diverse learning needs (Tomlinson, 2014). In order to deal with these, it is recommended that the schools increase the investment of school resources, provide ongoing professional development in inclusive practices, and employ personalized learning platforms. Also, building a stronger working partnership between teachers and parents can guarantee continuity of support outside the school.

Table 10, The evaluation of inclusive literacy development approaches indicates some level of agreement among the respondents, where a weighted mean average of 3.75 confirms the perceived effectiveness in responding to various literacy needs by using the aforesaid strategies. The top-ranked strategy, "Collaboration with external stakeholders improves support for literacy development programs" (WM = 3.86), indicates the need for a multi-sectoral approach to developing literacy improvement as proposed by Epstein (2018), who calls for schools and the community to collaborate in schooling concerns. Inclusive classroom practices (WM = 3.77) and ongoing assessment (WM = 3.75) were also top-ranked and indicate responsiveness to the requirement for responsive and adaptive pedagogy. The lowest-scoring item, differentiated reading and writing activities for transferees (WM = 3.66), indicates possible underuse or inconsistency in the provision of specific learner needs. The answer is that schools must improve interaction with local education partners and community agencies and provide teachers with materials and professional learning to conduct differentiated literacy activities and data-based monitoring with no learner left behind.

Table 11, The findings show that the proposed literacy strategies are generally acceptable and applicable, with a weighted mean of 3.77. This indicates strong agreement among respondents that such strategies are relevant, feasible, sustainable, and adaptable to different contexts. The most frequently cited rating was "Relevance to Learner Needs" (WM = 3.81), confirming that the strategies are suitable for the needs of transferees, returnees, and irregular students—a point also supported by national research (Cruz et al., 2022; DepEd, 2025) and international literature on adaptive education (UNESCO, 2021). The moderate and high ratings of "Contextual Applicability" (WM = 3.79) and "Feasibility of Implementation" (WM = 3.75) further suggest that the strategies are realistic and responsive to actual school settings. To maximize impact, schools are encouraged to establish a systematic monitoring system to track implementation progress and to support professional development for teachers in inclusive and differentiated literacy instruction. Additionally, engaging community stakeholders can strengthen sustainability and help ensure literacy interventions remain learner-centered and responsive to context.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the comprehensive analysis of data and literature, the following conclusions encapsulate the core insights and implications of the study. These conclusions reflect both the strengths and gaps in current literacy strategies, providing a foundation for informed policy-making, professional development, and future educational interventions.

1. The research concludes that mixed learning, literacy interventions, and inclusive strategies are all valuable to employ and viable in helping transferees', returnees', and irregular students' literacy advancement in line with repeatedly high weighted mean scores on indicators.
2. Applications of technology, remedial initiatives, and stakeholder cooperation have especially been helpful, providing evidence that multi-modal and community-based literacy approaches are not only viable but essential in contemporary learning settings.
3. Despite these promising approaches, part of the pivotal challenges, such as limited resources, poor teacher development, and contentious parent-school relations, stall the complete attainment of literacy goals, which require sufficient immediate and deliberate intervention.
4. The professional development plan as outlined was readily supported by teachers as well as school officials, reflecting apparent commitment and willingness to adopt new strategies that are pragmatic, sustainable, and student-focused.
5. Overall, the research stresses adopting a systematic, equitable, and collaborative literacy pedagogy

that identifies innovation, equity, and sensitivity to the specific needs of diverse learner groups in conventional and alternative modes of delivery.

Financing

The authors did not receive financing for the development of this research.

Conflict Of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Authorship Contribution:

1. Conceptualization: xxxxxx Names of the authors
2. Data curation: xxxxxx
3. Formal analysis: xxxxxx
4. Acquisition of funds: xxxxxx
5. Research: xxxxxx
6. Methodology: xxxxxx
7. Project management: xxxxxx
8. Resources: xxxxxx
9. Software: xxxxxx
10. Supervision: xxxxxx
11. Validation: xxxxxx
12. Display: xxxxxx
13. Drafting - original draft: xxxxxx
14. Writing - proofreading and editing: xxxxxx

REFERENCES

1. Alvermann, D. E., & Phelps, S. F. (2016). Content reading and literacy: Succeeding in today's diverse classrooms (7th ed.). Pearson.
2. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.
3. Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R., & Abrami, P. C. (2009). A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: From the general to the applied. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 21(3), 45–64. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-009-9024-0
4. Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (Eds.). (2020). The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs. Pfeiffer.
5. Bruner, J. (1996). The culture of education. Harvard University Press.
6. Burns, M. K., & Gibbons, K. A. (2012). Implementing response-to-intervention in elementary and secondary schools: Procedures to assure scientific-based practices. Routledge.
7. Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. J. (Eds.). (2014). Handbook of research on new literacies. Routledge.
8. Cruz, J. A., Mercado, L. G., & Santiago, M. R. (2022). Differentiated instruction and literacy development in alternative learning systems. Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 12(1), 55–70.
9. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.
10. DepEd. (2025). National Literacy Framework: Strengthening access and equity in education. Department of Education Policy and Planning Office.
11. Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. Macmillan.
12. Dooly, M. (2008). Constructing knowledge together. Peter Lang Publishing.
13. Epstein, J. L. (2018). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools (2nd ed.). Routledge.
14. Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Bloomsbury Publishing.
15. Fullan, M. (2011). Change leader: Learning to do what matters most. Jossey-Bass.

16. Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines. Jossey-Bass.
17. Graham, C. R. (2020). Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (Eds.), The handbook of blended learning (pp. 3–21). Pfeiffer.
18. Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.
19. International Literacy Association. (2018). The case for children's rights to read. https://www.literacyworldwide.org/
20. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. Educational Researcher, 38(5), 365–379.
21. Mayer, R. E. (2017). Multimedia learning (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
22. National Reading Panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. NIH Publication.
23. OECD. (2020). Education responses to COVID-19: Embracing digital learning and online collaboration. OECD Publishing.
24. Piaget, J. (1952). The origins of intelligence in children. International Universities Press.
25. Slavin, R. E. (1995). Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
26. Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners (2nd ed.). ASCD.
27. UNESCO. (2021). Global education monitoring report: Non-formal pathways and inclusion. UNESCO Publishing.
28. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
29. Walqui, A., & van Lier, L. (2010). Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise. WestEd.
30. Vellutino, F. R., Scanlon, D. M., Small, S. G., & Fanuele, D. P. (2006). Response to intervention as a vehicle for distinguishing between children with and without reading disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39(2), 157–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194060390020401
31. Martinek T, Holland B, Seo G. Understanding physical activity engagement in students: Skills, values, and hope. [Entender La Participación de la Actividad Física en los estudiantes: Conocimientos, valores y esperanza]. RICYDE Revista internacional de ciencias del deporte. 2019 Jan 1;15(55):88–101. doi:10.5232/ricyde2019.05506