IJAMS
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
Volume V, Issue 5 May 2025, eISSN: 2799-0664

# Instructional Practices in Implementing Alternative Teaching-Learning Approaches

**MARRON F. VALDEZ**
Pasileng Elementary School
marron.valdez@deped.gov.ph

*Abstract* — The study aimed to examine the implementation of alternative teaching-learning approaches in Binalonan District II, Schools Division Office of Pangasinan II. Specifically, it determined instructional practices in four key areas: blended modular learning, blended face-to-face learning, blended online learning, and parent- and peer-mediated instruction. A total of 98 teachers participated as respondents in this study. Data were collected using a researcher-designed questionnaire checklist, which was validated by experts in the field. The results revealed that the majority of teacher-respondents highly practiced alternative teaching-learning approaches, with a strong preference for the blended face-to-face approach over blended online learning, modular learning, and parent- and peer-mediated instruction. Furthermore, significant differences were found in teachers' instructional practices based on age with blended face-to-face learning, highest educational attainment was significantly related to blended modular, blended face-to-face, blended online learning, and parent- and peer-mediated instruction. Likewise, teaching experience significantly influenced the implementation of blended modular learning. Moreover, a significant relationship was found between teachers' teaching position and their implementation of the blended modular approach, as well as between teachers' educational attainment and their use of the blended face-to-face approach. An enhancement program was recommended to further strengthen teachers' instructional practices in implementing alternative teaching and learning approaches specifically along blended modular and online.

***Keywords — Blended learning, alternative teaching-learning, modular, parent-mediated, peer-mediated, face-to-face, instructional practices***

## I. Introduction

The understanding of effective teaching and learning has evolved significantly over time. Numerous efforts have been made to define successful teaching and identify the key characteristics contributing to teaching effectiveness (Clores & Nueva España, 2023). Successful teaching puts students at the center of instructional decisions, emphasizing the need to tailor education to fit the requirements of varied learners. This indicates a substantial movement in education from a teacher-centered to a student-centered model, in which teaching and learning are tailored to students' needs, interests, and talents (Kuok Ho, 2023).

According to (Francisco and Celon, 2020), instructional methods encompass a range of strategies, including organizing the physical environment, establishing norms and procedures, and maintaining students' engagement with lessons and commitment to activities. Furthermore, these instructional techniques comprise a series of teaching strategies and methods educators use to

achieve specific learning objectives. Thus, effective teaching is guided by well-defined instructional practices (Clores & Nueva España, 2023).

In like manner, for decades, the importance of alternative teaching methods and their many advantages in the teaching and learning processes have long been known. As a result, Education Ministries and departments worldwide promote the employment of non-traditional teaching approaches such as project-based learning and exploratory. Alternative teaching methods like project-based learning, Montessori, Waldorf education, game-based learning, and mastery learning engage students and make learning more meaningful (Harris, 2023). Prior research has shown that alternative teaching methods (ATMs) such as project-based, exploratory, collaborative, and technology-integrated teaching offer pedagogical benefits. However, they have a low implementation rate. Moreover, Dancy and Henderson's Framework, as cited by (Saleh and Jing, 2020), categorizes instructional practices into two types: traditional and alternative. Alternative instructional techniques, often called student-centered teaching approaches, emphasize responsiveness, collaboration, problem-solving, and democratic learning. In this approach, students and teachers actively determine how, what, and when learning occurs.

Daskan & Yildiz, (2020) discussed in his study that integrating technology into classroom instruction allows easy access to a wide range of resources, flexibility, pedagogical effectiveness, learner autonomy, a stress-free learning environment, engagement with course materials, immediate feedback, self-evaluation, and more time to interact with students.

Alvarez 2020) in his research stressed that lack of faculty training and support, language barriers, and poor promotion incentives for blended learning initiation are some of the problems identified in blended learning.

Emerging research underscores the need for a shift in pedagogical approaches, emphasizing the importance of integrating in-person activities with online learning. As online learning has rapidly become the dominant pedagogical strategy, extensive research has examined the effects of internet-based technologies on student engagement. Recent advancements in online learning have introduced innovative and often subtle teaching methods that can foster rich and transformative learning outcomes for higher education students (Burke & Larmar, 2020). The deliberate blending of online and in-person learning modalities (blended learning) is gaining popularity in elementary, secondary, postsecondary, and corporate settings. Some have even described blended learning (BL) as the "new normal" in education (Graham & Halverson, 2023)

**Literature Review**

The effect of the COVID-19 pandemic has prompted educational institutions to adopt Modular Distance Learning (MDL) methods. A study of 15 secondary school teachers in Puerto Princesa City, Philippines, found they used strategies like sharing online resources and providing activity sheets and study guides to enhance learning. Video clips were used to improve student engagement and critical thinking skills. The study suggests that teachers can improve MDL

effectiveness by implementing best practices, providing necessary resources and training, and involving parents or guardians in their children's education. By implementing these best practices, teachers can better support learners in achieving essential learning competencies (MELCs) through MDL (Arzaga, 2023). On the other hand, the study (Harper, McCormick, & Marron, 2024) about online delivery in previously face-to-face higher education settings around the world looks into the impact of various delivery styles and assessments kinds on student outcomes.

Alternative learning aims to prepare students for a future where they can effectively discuss, process, work, and be life-long learners. Blended learning combines online resources with peer tutoring, enhancing learning experiences by providing personalized support, fostering active engagement, and bridging knowledge gaps. It allows students to review materials independently, while peer tutoring offers interactive explanations. This approach also strengthens critical thinking, communication, and leadership skills, promoting learning through independent digital content and collaborative peer interactions (Joshi et al., 2023). Peer instruction and the flipped classroom are two innovative approaches that extend learning beyond the physical and live classroom, laying the foundation for blended and fully online learning.

The study (Brian, 2022) targets the development of parent-mediated interventions for toddlers with autism spectrum disorder to increase access to early intervention. These approaches are helpful in parent and toddler learning. A study using a research-community partnership provided the Social ABCs program to 179 families, with 90% completing the 12-week program and 70% returning for a follow-up assessment three months later. The study found that parents learned strategies to support their toddlers' development, and toddlers made gains in language, communication, and social skills. These strategies were related to toddlers' skill gains, suggesting that these approaches should be made available for community delivery. The findings support the use of parent-mediated intervention in this young age group.

Learning theories provide frameworks for teachers to adapt to diverse learning styles and academic needs. They help students absorb information and manage behavior. They empower educators to create inclusive, conducive learning environments, whether online or in traditional classrooms (Tprestianni, 2023).

Social constructivism, a social learning theory by Lev Vygotsky, suggests that individuals actively create their knowledge in social and cultural settings. It focuses on dyads and small groups, where interactions with peers, teachers, and parents facilitate learning. According to social constructivism, learning happens through social interaction and other people's assistance, frequently in a group. According to social constructivism, social interaction shapes the understanding a person develops.

The relevance of these mediated instructions through parents and peers should also be determined to be able to evaluate the influence of these in the daily teaching-learning process, especially in the academic growth and progress of the students. Both theories highlight the

significant roles parents and peers play in shaping children's learning and development, underscoring the social nature of cognitive growth. They also highlight how learning and development are facilitated through interactions—within the family or among peers—by providing guidance, support, and opportunities for collaborative problem-solving.

These theories outline the teaching-learning process inside the classroom. Their interrelationships describe how young people learn and develop, facilitate increased learning opportunities, and improve teaching. These theories define and characterize the instructional practices in implementing alternative teaching-learning approaches.

## II. Methodology

The study employed a pre-experimental design, specifically the Ex Post Facto One-Shot Case Study design. This design examines the effects of an event or treatment after it has already occurred. Data is collected simultaneously, meaning there is no pre-test or control group. Instead, the researcher analyzes a single group that has undergone a particular event or intervention and measures the outcome only once (Meimban & Meimban, 2021).

The study was conducted in the eight (8) schools of Binalonan II Division Office of Pangasinan II, Binalonan, Pangasinan, for the school year 2022-2023. These DepEd schools in Pangasinan II are strictly monitored in implementing alternative learning approaches using modular, face-to-face, and online blended approaches and parent and peer-mediated instructions to respond to the students' basic learning needs.

This study employed a specifically designed questionnaire checklist, comprising two parts. The first part focuses on respondents' profiles, including age, sex, educational attainment, seminars/training attended in the last five years, teaching experience, and position. The second part addresses instructional practices for alternative teaching-learning approaches, like blended, modular, face-to-face, online, and parent and peer-mediated instructions. The questionnaire was refined according to expert guidance to enhance content validity. A dry run, with non-target respondents, confirmed the reliability of the items, yielding a Cronbach's alpha of 0.937, indicating excellent reliability.

The study employed appropriate statistical tools using R Statistical Software to analyze data related to the research questions. The first question about respondents' profiles was addressed using frequency count and percentage. The second question regarding teachers' instructional practices in the new normal was analyzed with a weighted mean based on a statistical limit-description scaling system.

For the teachers' extent of implementation of the different alternative teaching approaches, overall weighted mean was used and descriptive measures using a 4-point Likert scale with the corresponding numerical values and interpretation as shown below.

| Literal Rating | Mean Scale Range | Descriptive Rating | Descriptive Meaning |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 3.26 – 4.00 | Very Extensive | The teacher was remarkably consistent in practicing a variety of alternative teaching- learning approaches and effectively implemented them in the classroom |
| 3 | 2.51 – 3.25 | Extensive | The teacher was consistent in practicing a variety of alternative teaching-learning approaches and dutifully implemented them in the classroom. |
| 2 | 1.76 – 2.50 | Slightly Extensive | The teacher was not fully consistent in practicing a variety of alternative teaching- learning approaches and only fairly implemented them in the classroom. |
| 1 | 1.00 – 1.75 | Not Extensive | The teacher did not practice a variety of alternative teaching-learning approaches and did not implement them in the classroom. |

## III. Results and Discussion

The table below shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents with respect to their profile variables.

**Table 1**
**Profile of the Respondents**

| Age | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 21-30 years old | 7 | 7.1 |
| 31-40 years old | 17 | 17.3 |
| 41-50 years old | 48 | 49.0 |
| 51 years old and above | 26 | 26.5 |
| Total | 98 | 100.0 |
| Sex | Frequency | Percent |
| Male | 24 | 24.49 |
| Female | 74 | 75.51 |
| Total | 98 | 100 |
| **Highest Educational Attainment** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Bachelor's degree | 19 | 19.4 |
| Masteral Units | 49 | 50.0 |
| Masteral Degree | 26 | 26.5 |
| Doctoral Units | 4 | 4.1 |
| Total | 98 | 100.0 |
| **Seminars/Trainings attended for the last five (5) years** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| National Level | 23 | 7.6 |
| Regional Level | 25 | 8.3 |
| Division Level | 86 | 28.6 |
| District Level | 84 | 27.9 |
| School Level | 83 | 27.6 |
| Total | 301 | 100.0 |
| **Length of Service in Private** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| None | 10 | 10.2 |
| 1 - 5 years | 72 | 73.5 |
| 6 - 10 years | 16 | 16.3 |
| Total | 98 | 100.0 |

| **Length of Service in Public** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
|---|---|---|
| 1 - 5 years | 12 | 12.2 |
| 6 - 10 years | 19 | 19.4 |
| 16 years and above | 67 | 68.4 |
| Total | 98 | 100.0 |
| **Teaching Position** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Teacher I | 11 | 11.2 |
| Teacher II | 15 | 15.3 |
| Teacher III | 68 | 69.4 |
| Master Teacher I | 2 | 2.0 |
| Master Teacher II | 2 | 2.0 |
| Total | 98 | 100.0 |

Table 1 shows that the majority of teachers are female (75.51%), between the ages of 41 and 50 (49.0%), and earned master's units for advanced education (50.0%). Most of these teachers also participated in division-level seminars and training (86.6%). Furthermore, these instructors had at least one to five years of job experience at a private school (73.5%), compared to sixteen years or more (68.4) in a public school. Consequently, these teachers occupy Teacher III (69.4%), which only indicates that most of these respondents are seasoned and experienced teachers.

Table 2 on the next page illustrates the summary of extent of instructional practices in implementing alternative teaching-learning approaches.

**Table 2**
**Summary of Extent of Instructional Practices in Implementing Alternative Teaching-Learning Approaches**

| **Alternative Teaching-Learning Approaches** | **Average Weighted Mean** | **Descriptive Equivalent** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Blended Learning Approach (Modular) | 3.75 | Very Extensive | 2 |
| Blended Learning Approach (Face to Face) | 3.89 | Very Extensive | 1 |
| Blended Learning Approach (Online) | 3.40 | Very Extensive | 5 |
| Parent Mediated Instruction | 3.74 | Very Extensive | 3 |
| Peer Mediated Instruction | 3.64 | Very Extensive | 4 |
| **Overall Weighted Mean** | **3.684** | **Very Extensive** | |

As indicated in the table, blended face-to-face learning achieved the highest computed average weighted mean of 3.89, which corresponds to a descriptive equivalent of "very extensive." This approach, being the most traditional form of instructional delivery, offers learners a higher level of interaction with their peers. In face-to-face settings, students are held accountable for their progress during scheduled class meetings.

This mode of learning not only fosters a deeper understanding and retention of lesson content but also facilitates bonding among classmates. Research shows that the completion rate for teacher-led classes is nearly five times higher than that for online learning (Shah, 2022).

Conversely, the blended online learning approach recorded the lowest average weighted mean of 3.40 among the alternative teaching methodologies presented. Its limited use can be attributed to challenges in teaching physical skills and the technical difficulties that often arise. Furthermore, the spontaneous discussions that enrich physical classrooms are difficult to replicate in an online environment, which can detract from the overall learning experience. Additionally, while the flexibility of online learning is an advantage, it can also result in decreased motivation and structure, making it challenging for some students to maintain their academic progress.

A statistically determined p-value of 0.036 (CS = 6.897, df = 9) was calculated to evaluate the extent of practices in the blended learning approach (face-to-face) concerning the age variable. Since the computed p-value is less than the 0.05 significance level, it indicates that the extent of practices significantly differs based on age. This finding demonstrates that respondents' engagement with the face-to-face blended learning approach varies notably across different age groups.

Conversely, the comparison of practices in the blended learning approach (modular), blended learning approach (online), parent-mediated instruction, and peer-mediated instruction relative to age groups yielded p-values of 0.075 (CS = 6.897, df = 3), 0.086 (CS = 6.594, df = 3), 0.252 (CS = 4.087, df = 3), and 0.127 (CS = 5.699, df = 3), respectively. These results indicate that respondents did not exhibit significant variation in their practices when classified according to age groups. Therefore, educators across different age cohorts demonstrated nearly similar awareness of instructional practices in implementing alternative teaching and learning approaches.

In terms of blended learning approaches (modular, face-to-face, and online) and parent-mediated and peer-mediated instruction, the computed significant values were 0.297, 0.086, 0.908, 0.203, and 0.788, respectively. Since these values exceed 0.05, we accept the null hypothesis, suggesting no significant difference in instructional practices related to the implementation of alternative teaching and learning approaches based on gender. This outcome may be attributed to universal teaching strategies, professional standards, and the evolving expectations of educators.

The blended learning approach (modular) shows a computed p-value of 8.118 and a significance value of 0.44. The blended learning approach (face-to-face) reports a p-value of 9.248 with a significance value of 0.26, while the blended learning approach (online) presents a p-value of 13.682 and a significance value of 0.003. Parent-mediated instruction has a p-value of 8.446 and a significance value of 0.38, and peer-mediated instruction features a p-value of 10.830 with a significance value of 0.13. With significant values below 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis, indicating a significant difference in instructional practices related to alternative teaching and learning approaches based on the highest educational attainment of the respondents.

The blended face-to-face learning approach (p-value = 3.821, sig = 0.431), blended online learning approach (p-value = 6.861, sig = 0.143), parent-mediated instruction (p-value = 4.767, sig = 0.312), and peer-mediated instruction (p-value = 7.601, sig = 0.107) all exhibit significance values greater than 0.05. This lack of significance suggests no substantial difference in these instructional practices when educators implement alternative teaching and learning approaches across various teaching positions.

**Table 3**
**Significant Relationship Between the Extent of Respondents' Use Of Alternative Teaching And Learning Practices And Their Selected Profile Variables.**

| | | Blended Learning Approach (Modular) | Blended Learning Approach (Face to Face) | Blended Learning Approach (Online) | Parent Mediated Instruction | Peer Mediated Instruction |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | Correlation Coefficient | .036 | .023 | -.147 | -.082 | -.058 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .726 | .821 | .147 | .420 | .568 |
| | N | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Sex | Correlation Coefficient | .106 | .174 | -.012 | .129 | .027 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .300 | .086 | .909 | .204 | .789 |
| | N | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Highest Educational Attainment | Correlation Coefficient | -.018 | -.208* | -.112 | -.115 | -.077 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .863 | **.040** | .271 | .258 | .452 |
| | N | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Length of Teaching Experience | Correlation Coefficient | .010 | -.128 | -.060 | -.017 | .010 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .926 | .208 | .559 | .869 | .923 |
| | N | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Teaching Position | Correlation Coefficient | .291* | .043 | .120 | .131 | .169 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | **.004** | .675 | .239 | .199 | .096 |
| | N | | | | | |

Legend:

| Correlation Coefficient | Interpretation |
|---|---|
| <0.20 | Negligible Relationship |
| 0.20 – 0.40 | Low Relationship |
| 0.41 – 0.70 | Moderate Relationship |
| 0.71 – 0.90 | High Relationship |
| >0.90 | Very High Relationship |

Source: Guildford (1973)

Table 3 presents the computed correlation coefficients for Age in relation to various instructional strategies: Blended Learning Approach (Modular), Blended Learning Approach (Face-to-Face), Blended Learning Approach (Online), Parent Mediated Instruction, and Peer

Mediated Instruction, yielding coefficients of .036, .023, - .147, - .082, and - .058, respectively. With all significant values exceeding .05, these results indicate a low to negligible relationship. Thus, teachers' ages do not appear to influence their utilization or effectiveness in employing these instructional strategies. This suggests that variables beyond Age may have a more substantial impact on the adoption of various educational techniques.

Similarly, the correlation coefficients related to gender and the same instructional strategies are .106, .174, - .012, .129, and .127, respectively, with significant values again higher than .05, revealing a low to negligible relationship. This indicates that teachers' gender does not seem to affect their implementation of these teaching methods.

**Table 4**
**Overall Result of the Significant Relationship Between the Extent of Blended Learning Instructional Practices and the Respondents' Profile Variables in Implementing Alternative Teaching-Learning Approaches.**

| | | Blended Learning Approaches |
|---|---|---|
| Age | Correlation Coefficient | -.097 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .342 |
| | N | 98 |
| Sex | Correlation Coefficient | .025 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .804 |
| | N | 98 |
| Highest Educational Attainment | Correlation Coefficient | -.105 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .305 |
| | N | 98 |
| Length of Teaching Experience | Correlation Coefficient | -.033 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .748 |
| | N | 98 |
| Teaching Position | Correlation Coefficient | .222* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | **.028** |
| | N | 98 |

Legend:

| Correlation Coefficient | Interpretation |
|---|---|
| <0.20 | Negligible Relationship |
| 0.20 – 0.40 | Low Relationship |
| 0.41 – 0.70 | Moderate Relationship |
| 0.71 – 0.90 | High Relationship |
| >0.90 | Very High Relationship |

Source: Guildford (1973)

Table 4 presents the overall significant relationship between blended learning and the implementation of alternative teaching-learning approaches, alongside selected profile variables. The computed correlation coefficient for teaching position is 0.222, with a significance value of 0.028, which is below the 0.05 threshold, indicating a statistically significant yet low relationship.

Factors such as experience, responsibility, autonomy, and access to resources across various teaching roles influence the adoption of the blended learning method (Modular).

Conversely, the analysis reveals no significant relationships for several other variables. The correlation coefficient for age is -0.097 with a significance value of 0.342; for sex, it is 0.025 with a significance value of 0.804; for highest educational attainment, the coefficient is -0.105 with a significance value of 0.305; for length of service in private institutions, the coefficient is 0.076 with a significance value of 0.457; and for length of service in public institutions, the coefficient is -0.033 with a significance value of 0.748. All of these results, with significance values exceeding 0.05, indicate no significant relationship.

## IV. Conclusion

The participating educators are experienced professionals skilled in various alternative teaching methodologies, consistently employing these approaches in their instruction. They actively incorporate a range of innovative methodologies into their teaching practices, demonstrating a strong commitment to enhancing student engagement and improving learning outcomes through creative and dynamic strategies. Furthermore, their ongoing use of blended learning—through modular, face-to-face, online, and parent-mediated instructional strategies—promotes a balanced, student-centered approach that strengthens both teaching effectiveness and student achievement. Nevertheless, there remains a need for further professional development to equip them to effectively address the daily challenges of teaching. Variations in demographic factors influence the adoption of alternative teaching-learning approaches, potentially affecting respondents' competence in instructional practices when implementing these methods. However, the profile variables show little to no significant correlation with the extent of instructional practices utilized in implementing alternative teaching-learning approaches.

## REFERENCES

[1] Alvarez, A. V. (2020, June). The phenomenon of learning at a distance through emergency remote teaching amidst the pandemic crisis. Asian Journal of Distance Education, 147-153.
[2] Ambayon, C. (2020, August 12). Modular-Based Approach and Students' Achievement in Literature. International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 32.
[3] Anzaldo, G. (2021, May 03). Modular Distance Learning in the New Normal Education Amidst Covid-19. International Journal Of Scientific Advances, 263-266.
[4] Arzaga, J. (2023, May). Assessment Challenges Encountered by Teachers in the Implementation of Printed Modular Distance Learning. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research, 1535-1545.
[5] Belay, A., Gasheya, K. A., Engdaw, G., Guyasa, G., & Tesfaye, A. (2023, July 03). Work-related burnout among public secondary school teachers is significantly influenced by the psychosocial work factors: a cross-sectional study from Ethiopia. Frontiers in Psychology.

[6] Brian, J. D.-A. (2022). Effectiveness of a parent-mediated intervention for toddlers with autism spectrum disorder: Evidence from a large community implementation.
[7] Burke, K., & Larmar, S. (2020, September 07). cknowledging another face in the virtual crowd: Reimagining the online experience in higher education through an online pedagogy of care. Journal of Further and Higher Education.
[8] Castroverde, F., & Acala, M. (2021, May 30). Modular distance learning modality: Challenges of Teachers in Teaching Amid the COVID-19 Pandemic. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 7-15. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352746170_Modular_distance_learning_modality_Challenges_of_teachers_in_teaching_amid_the_Covid-19_pandemic/link/60d87dcf299bf1ea9ec46c1b/download?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIiwicGFnZSI6InB1
[9] Chi, C. (2023). CHR: DepEd blended learning option helps learners adapt to climate crisis. Philstar.com.
[10] Clores, L. J., & Nueva España, R. C. (2023). Assessment of Teachers' Instructional Practices: Towards Proposing an. Journal of Practical Studies in Education, 4(4), 1-15.
[11] Cornell, D. (2024, January 03). HelpfulProfessor.com. Retrieved from https://helpfulprofessor.com/peer-mediation/
[12] Dangle, Y. R., & Sumaoang, J. D. (2020, November). The Implementation of Modular Distance Learning in the Philippine Secondary Public Schools.
[13] Daskan, A., & Yildiz, Y. (2020, December). Blended Learning: A Potential Approach to Promote Learning Outcomes. International Journal of Social Sciences and Educational Studies, 103-108.
[14] Department of Education. (2020, July 20). Policy Guidelines for the Provision of LEarning Resources in the Implementation of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan.
[15] Department of Education. (2022, July). Deped Data Bits: Learning Delivery Modalities S.Y 2021-2022.
[16] Francisco, C. D., & Celon, L. C. (2020). Teachers' Instructional Practices and Its Effects on Students' Academic. International Journal of Scientific Research in Multidisciplinary Studies, 64-71.
[17] Graham, C. R., & Halverson, L. R. (2023, January). Blended Learning Research and Practice. Handbook of Open, Distance and Digital Education.
[18] Harper, C., McCormick, L. M., & Marron, L. (2024, January 10). Face-to-face vs. blended learning in higher education: a quantitative analysis of biological science student outcomes. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education.
[19] Harris, C. C. (2023, June 20). Alternative Teaching Methods For Young Students.
[20] Huerto-Villaluz, J. G. (2022, May 27). PEER TUTORING A REMEDIATION STRATEGY TO IMPROVE THE. depedbataan.com publications.
[21] Ikhlas, M., & Mokhtar, M. (2022, February 16). Parental Involvement towards Students' Formation in Daily Secondary Schools. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences.
[22] Joshi, D., Zalte, S. M., Sridhar, Johny, K., & Mahajan, D. A. (2023, JUne 10). The Impact of Blended Learning on Student Engagement in the Digital Era. European Chemical Bulletin.
[23] Kuok Ho, D. T. (2023). Student-centered Approach in Teaching and Learning: What Does It Really Mean? 72, 83.

[24] Matildo, E. L., & Dagondon, R. (2022, June 01). CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED BY STUDENTS IN FLEXIBLE LEARNING: THE CASE OF THE PHILIPPINES DURING PANDEMIC. 321-325.
[25] Meimban, N. U., & Meimban, L. V. (2021). Research in Action in the Academe & Beyond.
[26] Mesfin, B., & Adimasu, A. (2020, September 04). Enhancing Students' Participation in Classroom Group Discussions: An Action research project on University Students. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP), 829-842.
[27] Miller, I., Ryan, C., Keitner, G., Bishop, D., & Epstein, N. (2000, May 01). The McMaster Approach to Families: theory, assessment, treatment and research. Journal of Family Therapy.
[28] Nerantzi, C. (2020, June 05). The Use of Peer Instruction and Flipped Learning to Support Flexible Blended Learning During and After the COVID-19 Pandemic. International Journal Of Management and Applied Research, 184-195.
[29] Nevill, R., Lecavalier, L., & Stratis , E. A. (2018, February). Meta-analysis of parent-mediated interventions for young children with autism spectrum disorder. Autism, 84-98.
[30] Palma, A. (2021, April 12). Homeschooling and the Learning Modalities in the Philippines During COVID-19. Academia Letters.
[31] Parilla, E. S. (2024, March 27). Measuring the Effectiveness of Online and Face-to-Face Classes Using the Community of Inquiry Framework. Education and Policy Development.
[32] Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Students and teachers' challenges of using technology in blended learning environments.
[33] Rueda, G. J. (2023). Seasoned Teachers. Press Reader.
[34] Saleh, S., & Jing, T. A. (2020, July 18). Instructional Practices in Science Education in German and Malaysian Secondary Schools: A Comparative Case Study. International Journal of Instruction.
[35] Samortin, M., Corcuera, L., Alvarez, A. V., & Palmero, H. R. (2022, June). Education and the pandemic: Examining students' remote learning experiences in the Philippines.
[36] Shah, S. (2022, Januart 21). Teaching and Learning with Technology: Effectiveness of ICT Integration in Schools. Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Technology, 133-140.
[37] Singh, J., Steele, K., & Singh, L. (2021). Combining the Best of Online and Face-to-Face Learning: Hybrid and Blended Learning Approach for COVID-19, Post Vaccine, & Post-Pandemic World. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 140-171.
[38] Sumanasekera, I., Hamid, J., Khatibi, A., & Azam, S. M. (2021, December 06). Involvement and Style of Parents on Student Motivation towards Student Performance with the moderating effect of Academic Causal Factors: Development of a Conceptual Model. Global Journal of Management and Business Research.
[39] Utami, A. (2022, December 30). The Role of Parental Involvement in Student Academic Outcomes. Journal of Education Review Provision.
[40] Walsh, T. (2022, September 12). Considerations for teachers when using video in the classroom. Retrieved from Teacher Magazine: https://www.teachermagazine.com/au_en/articles/considerations-for-teachers-when-using-video-in-the-classroom