# Instructional Factors and Community Support: Implications on the Academic Performance among Alternative Learning System (ALS) Learners

**Emmalyn A. Blanila., Alexander F. Suan**

**Lourdes College, Inc. Gen. Capistrano St. Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines**

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400367**

**Received: 15 April 2026; Accepted: 21 April 2026; Published: 11 May 2026**

## ABSTRACT

Instructional factors and community support are important influences on learners' academic performance, especially in flexible programs like the Alternative Learning System (ALS). ALS is intended to provide educational opportunities for out-of-school youth and adults who cannot attend regular formal schooling. Although it is designed to be inclusive, many learners still encounter challenges that can affect their academic success. While earlier studies have examined instructional practices and socioeconomic conditions separately, there is still a lack of research focusing on how instructional factors and community support jointly affect academic performance in ALS settings. This study seeks to fill that gap by analyzing the combined effects of these variables on learners' academic outcomes. This research employed a descriptive-correlational design to explore the relationship between instructional factors, community support, and the academic performance of ALS learners. The respondents were ALS Junior High School learners from one municipality in Bukidnon Province who accomplished a structured survey measuring instructional factors, community support, and relevant demographic information. The data gathered were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation, along with inferential statistics like ANOVA and regression analysis to determine significant relationships among variables.The study recommends strengthening ALS instructional practices through continuous teacher development focused on learner-centered strategies and improving access to learning materials. It also highlights the importance of enhancing collaboration among schools, families, and communities to support learners effectively. Future studies are encouraged to examine psychological and motivational factors influencing ALS learners and to conduct longitudinal research to monitor academic progress over time.

**Keywords:** Alternative Learning System, academic performance, socioeconomic determinants, instructional factors, community support

## INTRODUCTION

The **Alternative Learning System (ALS)** in the Philippines is a flexible, community-based education program designed for out-of-school youth and adults, allowing them to complete basic education through modular learning aligned with the national curriculum. It promotes inclusive education and helps learners improve their opportunities for employment and quality of life.

However, many ALS learners face challenges that affect their academic performance, such as low socioeconomic status, limited parental support, and the need to balance school with work or family responsibilities. Issues like unstable living conditions and lack of access to digital tools also contribute to learning difficulties.

Despite the program's growth and increased participation nationwide, existing research often examines influencing factors—such as socioeconomic status, teaching support, and community involvement—separately rather than as interconnected elements. There is also limited localized research, particularly in one municipality in the Province of Bukidnon.

This study aims to address these gaps by using a predictive approach to analyze how combined factors—family background, teaching support, and community participation—affect ALS learners' academic performance in the district. The findings seek to improve ALS program implementation and support systems while contributing to broader goals like inclusive education (SDG 4) and poverty reduction (SDG 1).

**Research Questions**

This study aims to determine the significant influence of various factors on the academic performance of ALS Junior High school learners from one municipality in the Province of Bukidnon. Specifically, it will answer the following questions:

1.What is the participants' assessment of socioeconomic factors in terms of:

1.1 family income;

1.2 parental educational attainment; and

1.3 family size?

2. What is the participants' assessment of instructional factors in terms of:

2.1 teaching style of the ALS facilitators;

2.2 availability and utilization of educational resources in the learning environment; and

2.3 teacher–student relationship in terms of support, communication, and engagement?

3. . What is the extent of the participants' community support ?

4. What is the level of academic performance of the participants based on their first quarter grades?

5. Do the participants' socioeconomic factors, instructional factors, and community support significantly influence their academic performance?

6. Do the participants' academic performance significantly differ when grouped according to their socioeconomic factors, instructional factors, and extent of community support?

**Hypotheses**

Problems 1,2,3 and 4 are hypothesis free. Problem number 5-6, the null hypotheses were tested below at 0.05 level of significance.

$Ho_1$ : The participants' instructional factors and community support do not significantly influence their academic performance

$Ho_2$: The participants' academic performance does not differ significantly across socioeconomic factors

# METHODOLOGY

In this study, a descriptive correlational research design was applied, which is a quantitative method. As Creswell (2014) clarified, this design was appropriate when a researcher sought to describe variables and establish relationships between two or more variables without controlling them. This methodology was suitable for the current study, as it analyzed the relationships among socioeconomic factors, instructional factors, and community support and the academic performance of ALS Junior High school learners in one of municipality of the Province of Bukidnon. Further, it was not found to influence any conditions; rather, it was observed in terms of relationships with one another and its correlation with academic outcomes.

A total of 80 Alternative Learning System (ALS) Junior High School learners from one municipality in the Province of Bukidnon were selected for the 2025–2026 school year using total enumeration. The sample was well distributed across Junior High School levels to capture learners at various stages of the ALS program. Participants were included if they were enrolled in the ALS Junior High School program and had complete academic records, particularly official first-quarter grades. Learners with missing documentation or incomplete records were excluded to ensure accuracy and consistency in the assessment. This distribution allowed the study to examine differences in learning experiences and academic achievement among ALS Junior High School learners.

The required sample size was determined using Taro Yamane's formula at a 95% confidence level, based on the total population of ALS Junior High School learners in the municipality. Data collection was conducted at both the beginning and end of the first quarter of the 2025–2026 academic year. Survey questionnaires were administered at the end of the first quarter, and official first-quarter grades were collected only after they were finalized and released by a volunteer teacher from the Uplift Cares Global Movement Foundation, ensuring the use of complete and verified academic data.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

**Problem 1: What is the participants' assessment of socioeconomic factors status in terms of:**

**1.1. parental income;**

**1.2. parental educational attainment; and**

**1.3. family size?**

Table 2 Frequency Distribution of Parental Income

| Parental Income | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| below ₱5,000 | 12 | 15.00 |
| between ₱5,001–₱10,000 | 41 | 51.25 |
| between ₱10,001–₱15,000 | 22 | 27.50 |
| between ₱15,001–₱20,000 | 2 | 2.50 |
| between ₱20,001–₱25,000 | 3 | 3.75 |
| between ₱25,001–₱30,000 | 0 | 0.00 |
| between ₱30,001–₱35,000 | 0 | 0.00 |
| above ₱35,000 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 80 | 100 |

Table 2 indicates that the majority of ALS learners were in low-income families. Over fifty percent indicated monthly income ₱5,001-10,000 (41 learners, 51.25%), 10,001-15,000 (22 learners, 27.50%). A smaller number represented the lower brackets, less than ₱5,000 (12 learners, 15.00%), and very few by the higher brackets. This distribution shows that a large number of learners were financially constrained, which could affect their study schedules, school attendance, and access to learning materials. The substantial evidence is always consistent in indicating that low socioeconomic status correlates with lower academic achievement due to insufficient learning opportunities and academic resources (Liu et al., 2022). This table indicates that financial strain was also a prevalent situation among the respondents.

Table 3 Frequency Distribution of Parental Education

| Parental Education | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Both parents completed college | 2 | 2.50 |
| At least one parent has a college degree | 4 | 5.00 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Both parents completed high school | 30 | 37.50 |
| At least one parent has a high school degree | 28 | 35.00 |
| Both parents completed elementary degree | 5 | 6.25 |
| At least one parent completed elementary degree | 5 | 6.25 |
| Both parents completed preschool | 2 | 2.50 |
| At least one parents completed preschool | 4 | 5.00 |
| Both of parents did not go to school | 0 | 0.00 |
| At least one parent did not go to school | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 80 | 100 |

As shown in Table 3, the parents' educational level of the learners was predominantly high school. The most common type was both parents completing high school (30 learners, 37.50%), followed by at least one parent completed highschool (28 learners, 35.00%), and finally neither parent completing high school (12 learners). Very few of them reported having completed college. According to this profile, a large proportion of learners might not receive much academic support at home, particularly in reading assistance, checking modules, and monitoring studies. The study indicates that academic performance is influenced by family schooling conditions and educational expectations, as reflected in support practices and learning routines in the home (Zhao and Zhao, 2022). The consideration of parental education leads to this table, which supports the notion that learners can increasingly rely on facilitators and school-based support.

Table 4 Frequency Distribution of Family Size

| **Family Size** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|---|---|---|
| 3-4 members | 7 | 8.75 |
| 5-6 members | 31 | 38.75 |
| 7 and above members | 42 | 52.50 |
| Total | 80 | 100 |

Table 4 indicates that learners' family sizes were usually large. The upper level had 7 members or more (42 learners, 52.50%), and the 5-6-member level (31 learners, 38.75%) had a significant share as well. The number of learners with smaller households was very small. Household size might imply resource sharing, finding spaces to study together, and taking on more responsibilities, potentially diminishing study time and attention. Family literature can address this by explaining that the resources of time and learning may be stretched as household needs increase, which can influence educational performance (Kuhhirt et al., 2024). The findings in this table indicate that a significant number of learners were in environments with high household sharing.

**Problem 2: What is the participants' assessment of the instructional factors in terms of:**

**2.1 teachers' teaching style;**

**2.2 availability and utilization of resources in their learning environment;and**

**2.3 teacher-student relationship in terms of support, communication, and engagement ?**

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics and Frequency Distribution of Teachers' Teaching Style

| **Score Range** | **Interpretation** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.51 – 5.00 | Very High | 30 | 37.50 |
| 3.51 – 4.50 | High | 44 | 55.00 |
| 2.51 – 3.50 | Moderate | 6 | 7.50 |
| 1.51 – 2.50 | Low | 0 | 0.00 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.00 – 1.50 | Very Low | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | | 80 | 100 |
| Mean | | 4.31 | |
| Interpretation | | High | |
| SD | | 0.54 | |

| **My teacher… Statement** | **Mean** | **Description** | **SD** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. explains the lesson clearly and in an understandable way. | 4.36 | Agree | 0.73 |
| 3.encourages us to ask questions. | 4.29 | Agree | 0.60 |
| 4. adapts lessons to meet the needs of different learners. | 4.11 | Agree | 0.69 |
| 5.makes learning interesting and engaging. | 4.35 | Agree | 0.73 |
| 6.provides timely feedback on assignments and tests. | 4.44 | Agree | 0.63 |

In Table 5, teachers' teaching style is rated highly. The overall average of 4.31 *(SD* = 0.54) is considered High, and the distribution shows that the vast majority of learners evaluated the teaching style as High (55.00%) or Very High (37.50%). The strongest items reflect learners' belief that teachers provided feedback in a timely manner and clear explanations of the lessons. These findings imply that the facilitators employed methods that learners would follow and respond to. Research indicates that teacher clarity and feedback are consistently associated with greater learning, as they reduce confusion and guide learners in the right direction (Fryer et al., 2023). The results of this table indicate that the teaching practice was one of the strengths of the learning experience.

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics and Frequency Distribution of Availability and Utilization of Resources

| **Score Range** | **Interpretation** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.51 – 5.00 | Very High | 0 | 0.00 |
| 3.51 – 4.50 | High | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2.51 – 3.50 | Moderate | 5 | 6.25 |
| 1.51 – 2.50 | Low | 32 | 40.00 |
| 1.00 – 1.50 | Very Low | 43 | 53.75 |
| Total | | 80 | 100 |
| Mean | | 1.69 | |
| Interpretation | | Low | |
| SD | | 0.51 | |

| **Statement** | **Mean** | **Description** | **SD** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. There are enough textbooks and learning materials for every learner. | 1.64 | Disagree | 0.70 |
| 2. The classroom has access to technology (e.g., computers, projectors) when needed. | 1.39 | Strongly Disagree | 0.56 |
| 3. The school library is well-stocked and accessible. | 1.29 | Strongly Disagree | 0.56 |
| 5. Teachers make good use of available teaching aids and materials. | 1.60 | Disagree | 0.96 |
| 9. The school provides access to online learning platforms or resources. | 1.71 | Disagree | 0.84 |
| 10. The learning environment is comfortable and supports my studies. | 2.50 | Disagree | 1.52 |

Table 6 shows a pronounced lack of learning resources. The mean of 1.69 (*SD* = 0.51) is taken to be Low, and the majority of learners rated this aspect as Very Low (53.75%) or Low (40.00%). The least powerful include access to technology, libraries, and learning materials. This trend suggests that students lacked access to essential learning aids for practice, review, and module completion. The use of learning resources has been

found to be associated with poorer learning outcomes, and this is even more likely when students depend on school resources to offset the lack of home support (Joshi et al., 2025). The findings suggest that resource constraints are a significant issue in the learning environment.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics and Frequency Distribution of Teacher-Student Relationship

| **Score Range** | **Interpretation** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.51 – 5.00 | Very High | 33 | 41.25 |
| 3.51 – 4.50 | High | 46 | 57.50 |
| 2.51 – 3.50 | Moderate | 1 | 1.25 |
| 1.51 – 2.50 | Low | 0 | 0.00 |
| 1.00 – 1.50 | Very Low | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | | 80 | 100 |
| Mean | | 4.40 | |
| Interpretation | | High | |
| SD | | 0.39 | |

| **My teacher… Statement** | **Mean** | **Description** | **SD** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. treats me with respect. | 4.51 | Strongly Agree | 0.69 |
| 3.explains lessons in a way that I can understand. | 4.39 | Agree | 0.65 |
| 4. encourages me to ask questions when I am confused.. | 4.39 | Agree | 0.63 |
| 5.encourages me to continue studying even when lessons are difficult. | 4.43 | Agree | 0.63 |
| 8.makes learning activities interesting and meaningful to my life. | 4.15 | Agree | 0.66 |
| 10.has a positive relationship with me.. | 4.56 | Strongly Agree | 0.50 |

According to Table 7, the teacher-student relationship was rated as very strong by the learners. The average (mean) of 4.40 (*SD* = 0.39) can be considered High and nearly all learners rated it as High (57.50%) or Very High (41.25%). The results of the item indicate that the learners were respected, supported, and treated positively by teachers. The importance of a good teacher relationship is that when the learners feel accepted and valued, they will have a high probability of participating, asking questions, and will be more likely to attend school. It has been investigated that teacher-student relationship correlates with academic success and student persistence (Zhou et al., 2023). The findings indicate that facilitators supported ALS learners with solid interpersonal support.

Table 8 Summary Table of Instructional Factors

| **Instructional Factors** | **Mean** | **Interpretation** | **SD** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching Style | 4.31 | High | 0.54 |
| Availability and Utilization of Resources | 1.69 | Low | 0.51 |
| Teacher-Student Relationship | 4.40 | High | 0.39 |
| Overall | 3.47 | Moderate | 0.26 |

A significant trend is observed in Table 8 for the instruction factors. Teaching style (*M* = 4.31) and teacher-student relationship (*M* = 4.40) were rated high, and resource availability and their use (*M* = 1.69) were rated low. The mean for the instructional factors was Moderate (*M* = 3.47) because one factor was weak. This implies that the learning experience was effective in human support but poor in material support. The systematic review indicates a potential role for intensive instructional support in improving learners' outcomes, but the lack of educational tools and resources may also constrain learning success (Tlili et al., 2023). The table emphasizes that enhanced resources could be used to reinforce positive teaching and relationships.

**Problem 3: What is the extent of the participants' community support ?**

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics and Frequency Distribution of Community Support

| Score Range | Interpretation | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.51 – 5.00 | Very High | 21 | 26.25 |
| 3.51 – 4.50 | High | 55 | 68.75 |
| 2.51 – 3.50 | Moderate | 4 | 5.00 |
| 1.51 – 2.50 | Low | 0 | 0.00 |
| 1.00 – 1.50 | Very Low | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | | 80 | 100 |
| Mean | | 4.35 | |
| Interpretation | | High | |
| SD | | 0.35 | |

| Statement | Mean | Description | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. There are community organizations I can go to for help | 4.46 | Agree | 0.71 |
| 2. I know where to go in my community when I need help or services | 4.75 | Strongly Agree | 0.49 |
| 3. Community leaders respond to residents' needs | 4.49 | Agree | 0.67 |
| 4. Community leaders are approachable and supportive | 4.49 | Agree | 0.66 |
| 5. My community holds regular events or activities | 4.23 | Agree | 0.57 |
| 6. There are local programs to help families in need | 4.48 | Agree | 0.57 |
| 7. My family participates in barangay or church programs | 4.00 | Agree | 0.64 |
| 8. My community offers learning support for out-of-school youth | 3.91 | Agree | 0.56 |
| 9. I feel a sense of belonging in my community | 4.46 | Agree | 0.71 |
| 10. I feel comfortable asking neighbors or community leaders for assistance | 4.75 | Strongly Agree | 0.49 |

Table 9 shows that the respondents reported high levels of community support ($M$ = 4.35, $SD$ = 0.35). The majority of respondents were in the High category (55, 68.75%), followed by 21 (26.25%) in the Very High category and 4 (5.00%) in the Moderate category. It is the distribution that implies that the community is supportive and that most of the ALS learners experience a sense of support, particularly regarding the need to know where to consult and the ability to ask or request help, which are the primary indicators of functional support in learning situations (Zhang and Qian, 2024).

In considering the item-level scores, the highest levels of community support were denoted by the following statements, which were read as Strongly Agree: “I know where to go in my community when I need help or services (Mean = 4.75), and I feel comfortable asking neighbors or community leaders to help me (Mean = 4.75). It indicates that students can easily find points of help and areas of trust within neighborhood support structures. However, the lowest-rated statement was "My community provides learning support to out-of-school youth" (Mean = 3.91, Agree). This positive score, though, shows that direct learning support programs for OSY or ALS learners can be less obvious or less accessible than general assistance and services. In general, the findings reveal that learners have strong social and barangay-level support, though learning-specific support can be further strengthened.

Table 10 Frequency Distribution of Academic Performance

| Academic Performance | Interpretation | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 95 – 100 | Outstanding | 0 | 0.00 |
| 85 – 94.99 | Very Satisfactory | 29 | 36.25 |
| 76 – 84.99 | Satisfactory | 51 | 63.75 |
| Below 76 | Failed | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | | 80 | 100 |
| Mean | | 83.36 | |
| Interpretation | | Very Satisfactory | |
| SD | | 2.65 | |

Table 10 indicates that the participants' academic performance during the first quarter was generally satisfactory to very satisfactory (Mean = 83.36, *SD* = 2.65). Most respondents were in the Satisfactory (7684.99) range (51, 63.75%), and 29 (36.25%) were in the Very Satisfactory (8594.99) range. No learner scored below Failed (Below 76) and no learner scored above the outstanding category (95 -100). This trend indicates that the group as a whole is performing according to the expected learning standards, with the majority of the students concentrated in the middle of performance range where they still need support to advance more students to the higher performance range, which is consistent with the research that academic performance is influenced by numerous interacting factors other than the effort of learners themselves (Allouch et al., 2024).

The small standard deviation (*SD* = 2.65) indicates that grades were not widely dispersed, suggesting learners were at quite similar performance levels. This is significant because it implies that variability in results can be associated with specific supports or impediments rather than severe discrepancies in capacity. The distribution also justifies the use of quarterly grades as a constant level to examine which independent variables contribute to explaining the differences in the performance of ALS learners.

**Problem 5: Do the participants' socioeconomic, instructional factors and community support significantly influence their academic performance?**

$Ho_1$ : The participants' instructional factors and community support do not significantly influence their academic performance

Table 11 Regression Analysis of Instructional Factors and Community Support on Academic Performance

| **Predictor** | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | **β** | **95% CI** | | **t** | **p** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **B** | **SE** | | **Lower** | **Upper** | | |
| Constant | 73.24 | 4.49 | | 64.29 | 82.19 | 16.30* | <.001 |
| Instructional Factors | -2.02 | 1.01 | -0.195 | -4.04 | -0.01 | -2.00 | 0.049 |
| Community Support | 3.94 | 0.74 | 0.516 | 2.46 | 5.42 | 5.30 | <.001 |
| Model Summary | | | | | | | |
| $R = 0.530$ $R^2 = 0.281$ Adjusted $R^2 = 0.262$ $F(2,77) = 15.10^*$ $p<.001$ | | | | | | | |
| *Note. B = unstandardized beta coefficient, SE = standard error, β = standardized beta coefficient, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval, t = t statistic, p = probability value. *Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.* | | | | | | | |

*Model Equation: P = 3.94C – 2.02I + 73.24*

*Legend: P = Academic Performance, C = Community Support, I = Instructional Factors*

Table 11 presents the multiple regression model predicting academic performance based on instructional factors and community support.The instructional factors have a significant negative effect on the academic performance (B=-2.02, β =-0.195,p=0.049),suggest that holding other variables constant, an increase in instructional factors is associated with a decrease in learners' academic performance. The regression model as a whole was statistically significant, F(2, 77) = 15.10, p <.001, R = 0.530, and $R^2$ = 0.281 (Adjusted $R^2$= 0.262). This implies that the two predictors could explain approximately 28.1 percent of the variation in academic performance, indicating a significant relationship between instructional factors, community support, and learners' grades.Therefore, $Ho_2$ was not rejected.

Community support had a significant positive influence on academic performance (B = 3.94, β = 0.516, t = 5.30, p < .001). This implies that the higher the community support score is by 1 unit, the higher the academic performance, on average, is at 3.94 grade points, other factors in instruction remaining constant. This finding aligns with evidence that social support enhances academic performance by increasing learners' self-management and learning behaviors (Mayo et al., 2023). Conversely, there was a statistically significant negative coefficient for instructional factors (B = -2.02, β = -0.195, t = -2.00, p = .049). This indicates that the increased scores on instructional factors were correlated with relatively smaller grades when community support was manipulated.

There is also a pragmatic meaning of the negative sign, namely that even with strong instruction by teachers, the learner may still be struggling with learning and therefore with low grades, despite a positive teaching perception. It can also represent overlap of predictors, in that community support could reflect the more powerful aspect of the support effect in the relationship between higher grades and community support in this group. The model constant (73.24) represents the predicted grade at zero values of both predictors and is primarily used as a reference point in the regression model, not in a practical situation.

**Problem 6. Do participants' academic performance differ significantly across socioeconomic factors?**

**$Ho_2$: The participants' academic performance does not differ significantly across socioeconomic factors.**

Table 12 Factorial ANOVA Summary of Socioeconomic Factors on Academic Performance

| **Source of Variation** | **$df_1$** | **$df_2$** | **F** | **p** | **Partial $\eta^2$** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 20 | 59 | 1.035 | 0.439 | 0.260 |
| Parental Income | 4 | | 1.179 | 0.329 | 0.074 |
| Parental Education | 7 | | 1.121 | 0.362 | 0.117 |
| Family Size | 2 | | 0.821 | 0.445 | 0.027 |
| **Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level. $df_1$ = degrees of freedom 1, $df_2$ = degrees of freedom 2, F = f statistic, p = probability value, Partial $\eta^2$ = effect size* | | | | | |

Table 12 presents the Three-way Factorial Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for socioeconomic factors on Academic Performance. The analysis tested whether Parental Income, Parents' Highest Educational Attainment, and Family Size have a significant effect on Academic Performance. The findings showed that the fixed model was insignificant, $F(20, 59) = 1.035$, $p = .439$, partial $\eta^2 = .260$. It indicates that the joint effects did not have a significant impact on academic performance,$Ho_2$ was not rejected.

Parental income did not have a significant effect, $F(4, 59) = 1.179$, $p = .329$, partial $\eta^2 = .074$, indicating no significant difference in academic performance across parental income groups. The primary impact of parent education was small, $F(7, 59) = 1.121$, $p = .362$, and partial $\eta^2 = .117$, indicating no difference in academic performance across the highest educational levels as the grouping factor. There was also no significant influence of family size, $F(2, 59) = 0.821$, $p = .445$, partial $\eta^2 = .027$, indicating that there is no significant difference in academic performance across family sizes. This finding indicates that neither the socioeconomic factors nor their interaction produced statistically significant effects on academic performance when evaluated separately or together in the model.

## CONCLUSION

The study found that ALS learners in one municipality of the Province of Bukidnon often balance education with adult responsibilities like work and family care, while coming from low-income households with limited parental education and large family sizes. Despite these challenges, ALS facilitators provide strong teaching support and maintain positive teacher–student relationships, which help sustain learner engagement. However, limited access to learning materials remains a key weakness. Community support emerged as the most significant factor in improving academic performance. Notably, socioeconomic factors did not significantly affect performance when strong instructional and community support were present.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. The ALS facilitators are encouraged to maintain learner centered instruction, as well as reinforce teacher student relationship by providing regular feedback, encouragement and direction. Facilitators can also enhance the monitoring of struggling learners as the teacher support is usually given to learners who require extra support.

2. The accessibility to learning resources should be the priority of school administrators and DepEd ALS coordinators in terms of enhancing access to printed learning resources, reference books, and simple instructional tools. In areas where technology is scarce, learning facilities can adopt a shared learning kit model which incorporates reviewers, additional worksheets and inexpensive instructional aids that can be swapped between learning groups.
3. The local government units and barangay officials must enhance community-based education support by establishing learning hubs, they must have access to printing facilities and they must have safe and quiet learning centers in the community. Community support is the most influential predictor of academic performance, and by offering learners more learning-focused services, one can potentially increase academic achievement and decrease the risk of dropping out.
4. The partnership between ALS learning centers and the community organizations, religious groups, and non-government organizations should be consolidated by assisting in learning-driven programs like school supplies, tutoring sessions, food support during study programs, and mentoring programs. The assistance must be in a manner that it does not only cover the general needs but it must also incorporate assistance that directly enhances continuity in the learning process.
5. Future researchers are encouraged to carry out follow-up research to clarify the reasons as to why instructional variables had negative correlation with performance in academics when assessed in conjunction with the community support. Further research can be conducted on whether this is an attribute of learner difficulty, predictor overlap, or varying resource availability at learning centers. To further explain the experiences of the learners behind the quantitative findings, researchers can also incorporate qualitative interviews.

**Compliance with Ethical Standards**

The study followed ethical standards based on the Belmont Report, ensuring fair participant selection, informed consent, and voluntary participation. ALS learners were carefully identified with the help of coordinators, and data collection was scheduled without disrupting classes.

Participants were clearly informed about the study and completed questionnaires independently, with guidance available when needed. Academic performance data were obtained from official grade reports with consent and recorded using codes to protect identities.

Strict confidentiality was maintained throughout, with secure storage of data and no disclosure of personal information. Overall, the research process ensured accuracy while protecting the rights, privacy, and safety of all participants.

## REFERENCES

1. Alviso, V. J. Q., & Tacadena, J. E. (2023). Revealing the lived experiences of Alternative Learning System (ALS) volunteer teachers in the new normal.Journal of Learning and Educational Policy, 3(5), 23–29.
2. Ansong, D., Okumu, M., Owusu Amoako, E., Appiah-Kubi, J., Ampomah, A.O., Koomson, I., & Hamilton, E. (2024). The role of teacher support in students' academic performance in low- and high-stakes assessments.Learning and Individual Differences, 109,102396.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102396
3. Baccal, V. S., & Ormilla, R. C. G. (2021). The implementation of the alternative learning system in public schools in Isabela, Philippines. Educatum Journal of Social Sciences, 7(1), 19–29.https://doi.org/10.37134/ejoss.vol7.1.3.2021
4. Baria, K., & Gomez, D. (2022). Influence of social support on student learning and development. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 11(2). https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2022.112
5. Black, S. E., Devereux, P. J., & Salvanes, K. G. (2005). The more the merrier? The effect of family size and birth order on children's education. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 120(2), 669–700. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/120.2.669
6. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Harvard University Press.

7. Cagang, A. C. (2024). Implementation of the alternative learning system and 21st-century life skills of senior high school learners in Region XII. European Journal of Education Studies, 11(6). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v11i6.5374
8. Calingasan, K. A., & Plata, S. (2022). Effects of effort praise on struggling Filipino ESL readers' motivation and mindset. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11(3), 601–611. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i3.32898
9. Casingal, C. P. (2025). Competencies and professional development needs of Philippine alternative learning system (ALS) teachers: Strategies, challenges, and learning facilitation insights. Southeast Asian Journal of Agriculture and Allied Sciences, 5(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.63943/sajaas.vol5iss1art64pp1-2
10. Cayabas, J. P., Jr., Codod, C. L. C., Sumeg-ang, D. A., & Lacaben, E. P. (2023). Contributions and partnership strategies of external stakeholders in the implementation of the alternative learning system. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 22(7), 454–472. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.7.24
11. Department of Education. (2019). ALS K to 12 basic education curriculum.
12. Di Lisio, G., Halty, A., Berástegui, A., Milá Roa, A., & Couso Losada, A. (2025). The longitudinal associations between teacher–student relationships and school outcomes in typical and vulnerable student populations: A systematic review. Social Psychology of Education, 28, Article 144. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-025-10107-8
13. Ding, X., Li, S., Zhang, X., & Shi, J. (2024). The mediating role of executive function between socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic structural equation model. Learning and Individual Differences, 110, 102418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2024.102418
14. Downey, D. B. (2001). Number of siblings and intellectual development: The resource dilution explanation. American Psychologist, 56(6–7), 497–504. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.6-7.497
15. Fryer, L. K., Wisniewski, B., & Zierer, K. (2023). Toward an organising theoretical model for teacher clarity, feedback and self-efficacy in the classroom. Educational Psychology Review, 35, 68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09787-5
16. George, D., & Mallery, P. (2019). IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference (16th ed.). Routledge.
17. Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). Student–teacher relationships. In Children's needs III.
18. Harlen, W. (2005). Teachers' summative assessment and assessment for learning: Tensions and synergies. The Curriculum Journal, 16(2), 207–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170500136093
19. Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.
20. Idulsa, F. L., Jr., & Luzano, R. (2024). Students' motivation and academic engagement in the Alternative Learning System. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 7(3). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i03-21
21. Tao, Y., & Chen, G. (2024). The relationship between teacher talk and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 45, 100638. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100638
22. York, T. T., Gibson, C., & Rankin, S. (2015). Defining and measuring academic success. Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 20(5).
23. Zhang, X., & Qian, W. (2024). The effect of social support on academic performance among adolescents: The chain mediating roles of self-efficacy and learning engagement. PLOS ONE, 19(12), e0311597. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0311597
24. Zhao, L., & Zhao, W. (2022). Impacts of family environment on adolescents' academic achievement: The role of peer interaction quality and educational expectation gap. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 911959. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.911959
25. Zhou, D., Liu, S., Zhou, H., Liu, J., & Ma, Y. (2023). The association among teacher–student relationship, subjective well-being, and academic achievement. Frontiers in Psychology, 14, 1097094. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1097094