

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2026, Vol. 7, No. 8, 3550 – 3577

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.07.08.22>

Research Article

Stakeholder Profiles and the Status of Alternative Learning System Implementation in the Selected Community Learning Centers

Arlene S. Rillorta¹, Priscila A. Santos²

¹ALS Teacher, Department of Education – Talugtug, Nueva Ecija, 3100, Philippines

²Graduate School, Wesleyan University-Philippines, 3100, Philippines

Article history:

Submission 30 July 2026

Revised 15 August 2026

Accepted 23 August 2026

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

arlene.rillorta@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study examined the profiles of Alternative Learning System (ALS) teachers and students, selected Community Learning Centers (CLCs), and the status of the implementation of the Alternative Learning System (ALS) in four CLCs. The research included 32 ALS learners and four ALS teachers. The researchers utilized structured questionnaires, a resource checklist and purposive sampling in gathering information. Average ratings, frequencies, and percentages were used to summarize the data. The learner profiles were dominated by students from low-income homes, men, adolescents, and jobless individuals. Financial hardships and family obligations were the most common reasons given for quitting formal education. The four married women who taught ALS ranged in age from 42 to 63. Two have master's degrees and two have bachelor's degrees, and all have specific training in special needs schooling. The four CLCs offered secure classrooms, facilities for learning activities, and permanent learning spaces; they were categorized as Type 3 centers. Important educational resources were still scarce, tho. The chosen centers lacked or had insufficient furniture, digital resources, instructional aids, visual aids, internet access, and supplemental materials. Despite these drawbacks, teachers and students reported generally positive experiences with ALS education. Positive scores were given to teacher assistance, course relevance, instructional tactics, and engagement; poorer ratings were given to the sufficiency of learning resources. The results indicate a disparity between the availability of basic facilities and the scarcity of digital and instructional resources that support them. The resource deficiencies found in the chosen CLCs may be filled by enhancing learning resources, technological access, professional development, and collaboration between DepEd, local government entities, and community partners.

Keywords: *ALS learners, ALS teachers, Alternative Learning System, Community Learning Centers, non-formal education, stakeholder support*

How to cite:

Rillorta, A. S., & Santos, P. A. (2026). Stakeholder Profiles and the Status of Alternative Learning System Implementation in the Selected Community Learning Centers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 7(8), 3550 – 3577. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.07.08.22

Introduction

Access to education remains a concern for individuals who are unable to continue their schooling through the formal education system. Economic difficulties, family responsibilities, geographic limitations, and other personal circumstances may interrupt a learner's participation in school. For these individuals, alternative and non-formal education programs provide opportunities to resume their studies and acquire competencies that can support further education, employment, and participation in community life.

Non-formal education programs have been developed in many countries to respond to the educational needs of learners who are not adequately served by conventional schooling. Although these programs provide more flexible pathways to education, their implementation may still be affected by concerns involving learner participation and retention, instructional quality, availability of learning resources, and support from different sectors of the community (UNESCO, 2022). Examining these conditions is therefore important in determining whether alternative education programs are able to respond effectively to the circumstances of their intended learners.

The Philippine Alternate Learning System (ALS) educates out-of-school children and adults without basic education. Republic Act No. 11510, the Alternative Learning System Act, introduced ALS as an educational model for people who cannot attend standard schools. Modular, mixed, and community-based learning methods allow ALS students to build skills similar to those in traditional education. However, ALS involves more than just teaching. The participation of educators, Community Learning Centers (CLCs), local authorities, community organizations, and other stakeholders who provide educational resources, learner support, instructional activities, and other program necessities. These resources and stakeholders' ability to perform their duties may affect community program functioning. Even though ALS was founded, student involvement, instructional techniques, resource availability, stakeholder engagement, and program viability remain issues. Multiple studies have

examined ALS, including learner characteristics and alternative education elements. Localized data on ALS stakeholders and Community Learning Center operations is needed. A detailed review of student and teacher demographics, resources, educational experiences, and stakeholder support helps improve ALS implementation understanding.

ALS is being implemented locally in Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija, where students who have had interruptions in their formal education are supported via Community Learning Centers. These students' conditions, the learning centers' resources, and the level of support provided by local stakeholders may differ from those documented in other parts of the country. In order to comprehend how the program addresses the educational context of the students in the city and the nearby municipalities in Nueva Ecija, it is important to examine how ALS is implemented locally.

Since the application of ALS involves more than simply the provision of learning modules, the local context is particularly crucial. A appropriate learning space, instructional materials, instructor support, student engagement, and cooperation with institutions and community partners are all necessary for a CLC to function. ALS students' and teachers' experiences may change depending on how accessible these conditions are in Cabanatuan City. As a result, a localized assessment might provide information that the Schools Division Office, local government units, community organizations, and other stakeholders involved in supporting ALS.

In the selected Community Learning Centers, there was a need to document these conditions together rather than examine learner characteristics, teacher characteristics, resources, and stakeholder support separately. The present study therefore described the profiles of ALS learners and teachers, the characteristics of the selected CLCs, the resources available in these centers, and the teaching and learning experiences and stakeholder support associated with ALS implementation. The findings were intended to provide a local basis for identifying areas that may require additional attention and support.

Literature Review

Demographic Profile of ALS Learners. Although socioeconomic situations, interrupted schooling, employment, family duties, and geographic constraints regularly occur across contexts, studies of alternative and non-formal education repeatedly demonstrate that learners enter these programs under varied circumstances. This diversity is demonstrated by examples from other countries. While Brazil's Educação de Jovens e Adultos serves working adults who dropped out of formal education due to family and financial obligations, alternative education in India serves students from rural and economically disadvantaged communities (Sharma & Srivastava, 2019; Lima & De Souza, 2018). While Vietnam's continuing education centers serve rural adults and workers who face financial or geographic obstacles to formal education, Germany's Volkshochschulen serve groups such as migrants, refugees, older adults, and workers with limited qualifications (Käpplinger & Lichte, 2020; Tran & Nguyen, 2021).

Some of these circumstances are reflected in the ALS situation in the Philippines. According to Acevedo and Orongan (2025), participants in ALS often range in age from 15 to 35, albeit elder students can also participate. The pursuit of more education and career prospects may be linked to participation. Socioeconomic circumstances are also crucial. Economic challenges were noted by Sumawang et al. (2023) as a contributing factor to educational disruption, while Pablo (2021) noted that a large number of ALS students had no formal education and were either jobless or working informally.

ALS learners are further distinguished from students in traditional education by their obligations to their families and their jobs. Flexible learning opportunities are especially important since students who have to work or take care of their families may find it difficult to adhere to conventional school schedules. Quintana and Villanueva (2024) especially emphasized the involvement of women, particularly mothers and those seeking higher education. Limited access to technology and educational resources may be an additional obstacle to participation in rural and underprivileged populations (Sumawang et al., 2023).

The body of research indicates that there isn't a single demographic profile that accurately describes all ALS learners. The community and the learners served determine the differences in age, sex, educational background, occupation, family conditions, and socioeconomic position. The necessity of local profiling of ALS learners is supported by this variance. In order to characterize the conditions of the students taking part in the program, these traits were investigated in four chosen Community Learning Centers.

Stakeholder Support in ALS Implementation. While local governments, community organizations, businesses, and other partners may offer venues, resources, learner recruitment, technology, livelihood possibilities, and other support, government agencies offer administrative and policy support. The literature from different nations shows how these connections might vary depending on the design and demands of the educational program. This is pertinent to ALS since having access to technology does not guaranty successful technology-supported learning; infrastructure availability and stakeholders' ability to offer suitable assistance continue to be crucial factors.

Partnerships may also link alternative education to job opportunities and skill development. According to Tran and Nguyen (2021), collaboration between local businesses and continuing education centers aided in matching vocational training to labor market demands. The study also identified financial and human resource limitations, despite the fact that these partnerships offered students choices. This suggests that stakeholder involvement may expand the range of options available to students while still being constrained by the resources that partners can sustain.

Similar types of cooperation have been reported in Bangladesh, Kenya, India, Brazil, and Germany. In Brazil, learner outreach, mentorship, and resource sharing have been facilitated by civil society organizations and grassroots groups (Soares & Lopes, 2020). Germany's adult education centers have relied on cooperation among government agencies, local governments, private organizations, and volunteers (Käpplinger & Lichte, 2020). In India, NGOs have supported learning centers and

learner mobilization, particularly in underserved areas (Sharma & Srivastava, 2019). Other examples include community-based support in Bangladesh and partnerships among government, civil society, and international organizations in Kenya (Ahmed, 2016; Mwangi & Wanjohi, 2017). The ASEAN Secretariat (2018) likewise documented collaborative approaches to non-formal education in several Southeast Asian countries.

According to Mendoza et al. (2025), professional development, resource sharing, and instructional enhancement can be facilitated by ALS facilitator collaboration in resource-poor regions. Numerous studies have discovered that learners receive support, instructional materials, digital resources, livelihood training, and other services thru partnerships with LGUs, community organizations, and private-sector groups (Balasa & Narita, 2025; Estrella & Manahan, 2024; Villanueva & Castillo, 2022; Obrador, 2022; Dela Peña).

Material resources are not the only resources that are supported. The emotional and psychosocial needs of students are supported by facilitators, families, and peers, as per Quintana and Villanueva (2024). LGU learning facilities, transportation, and financial aid were reported by Sumawang et al. (2023). Community leaders and barangay officials were the subjects of Pablo's (2021) discourse regarding learner recruitment, attendance, and program promotion. Galvez et al. (2022) proposed that community-based reward initiatives could serve as incentives and sustain learners.

The local evidence also supports stakeholder participation in the implementation of ALS. The implementation of ALS in Dapitan City was examined by Abad and Galleto (2020), who discovered that stakeholder support had an impact on the performance of teachers and the implementation of the program. These results substantiate the notion that ALS is a network of relationships rather than an instructional program.

Synthesis of the Literature. Alternative education studies show that financial constraints, employment, family duties, geographic barriers, and interrupted schooling are common. These characteristics illustrate the need for learner support and flexible learning.

Second, alternative education depends on elements beyond instruction. In addition to facilities and instructional materials, partners provide psychosocial assistance, technology, livelihood opportunities, and community support. Form and extent of this participation vary between settings, therefore conditions in one community cannot be assumed to exist in another.

Despite extensive research on stakeholders and ALS learners, localized descriptions that include these factors are needed. Documenting learner and instructor characteristics, Community Learning Center conditions, learning materials, teaching and learning experiences, and stakeholder support can help explain local ALS implementation.

The current study analyzes ALS learners and teachers, selected Community Learning Centers, and ALS implementation to meet this need. Instead than presuming stakeholder characteristics determine program outcomes, the study discusses site conditions. This method helps identify regions that are well-supported and areas that may need extra attention from ALS implementers and other education stakeholders.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical foundation of this research is R. Edward Freeman's Stakeholder Theory (1984). According to the idea, organizations function within a network of people and groups that either influence or are influenced by the goals and actions of the organization. According to Freeman et al. (2020), stakeholders can offer resources, information, experience, and other kinds of support that are essential for an organization's effectiveness and sustainability. As a result, the theory provides a useful perspective for analyzing circumstances in which the achievement of program or organizational goals depends on the participation of several groups. The Alternative Learning System (ALS), which involves a wide range of stakeholders in the delivery and management of educational services, is particularly relevant to this technique. While ALS instructors and facilitators are directly involved in evaluating and training students, government agencies are responsible for creating laws and program guidelines. Edu-

cational facilities, instructional materials, financial or logistical assistance, student support, and other resources necessary for program implementation may be provided by municipal authorities, community organizations, non-governmental organizations, guardians, local leaders, and other partners.

In this study, stakeholder theory provides a framework for assessing the several organizations participating in ALS as well as the program's support systems. The idea is especially relevant as implementing ALS in Community Learning Centers requires stakeholder collaboration rather than depending only on individual teachers or educational authority. Additionally, the theory helps define the context of the variables under investigation. While the features of Community Learning Centers clarify the environments in which ALS activities take place, the characteristics of ALS learners and educators provide insights into the individuals involved in the educational process. Concurrently, assessing stakeholder support, learning opportunities, and accessible resources provides insight into the conditions related to program execution. Stakeholder Theory offers a suitable framework for analyzing how stakeholders' demographic and professional characteristics influence the implementation of the Alternative Learning System (ALS) program in this study. The theory posits that the traits and abilities of stakeholders profoundly influence the quality and efficacy of program execution, as the implementation of ALS necessitates collaborative endeavors among various stakeholders to facilitate instruction, supply learning materials, assist learners, perform assessments, and enhance stakeholder engagement.

Research Questions

This study examined the profiles of Alternative Learning System (ALS) learners, ALS teachers, and Community Learning Centers, (CLCs) as well as the implementation of the ALS program in selected CLCs. Specifically, this research aimed to answer the following problems:

1. How may the profile of the ALS learners be described in terms of:
 - 1.1. age;
 - 1.2. sex;
 - 1.3. last grade level attended;

- 1.4. last school year attended;
 - 1.5. monthly family income;
 - 1.6. current work or job status;
 - 1.7. parental highest educational attainment;
 - 1.7.1. father
 - 1.7.2. mother
 - 1.8. job of parents; and
 - 1.9. reasons from dropping out of formal school?
2. How may the profile of the ALS teacher be described in terms of:
 - 2.1. age;
 - 2.2. sex;
 - 2.3. civil Status;
 - 2.4. highest educational attainment;
 - 2.5. years of teaching experience;
 - 2.6. number of years as ALS Implementer; and,
 - 2.7. specialized Training in ALS?
3. How may the profile of the Community Learning Centers (CLCs) be described in terms of:
 - 3.1. total number of enrollees;
 - 3.2. type of CLC; and,
 - 3.3. resources available?
4. How may the Alternative Learning System (ALS) program being implemented be described in terms of:
 - 4.1. availability of resources
 - 4.2. support from stakeholders
 - 4.3. physical count of equipment, furniture, fixtures, and other PPE
 - 4.4. teaching and learning experiences in ALS in CLCs
 - 4.5. stakeholder support
5. What implications may be drawn from the findings to enhance the implementation of the Alternative Learning System (ALS) program?
6. What course of action may be proposed based on the findings of the study?

Materials and Methods

The study employed descriptive research design. Descriptive studies are designed to answer questions concerning the "what," "who," "where," and "how" of a phenomenon, making them suitable for identifying and documenting existing conditions (Gray & Grove, 2021). The design was used to describe the demographic

and professional profiles of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Alternative Learning System (ALS) program and to determine the extent of program implementation in terms of instructional delivery, learning resources, learner support services, assessment practices, and stakeholder participation.

Research Locale and Sampling Procedure

Purposive sampling was employed in selecting both the research sites and participants. The four selected Community Learning Centers—identified in this study as CLC-1, CLC-2, CLC-3, and CLC-4 were chosen based on their active implementation of the Alternative Learning System (ALS), performance within the Schools Division Office, and accessibility of relevant information. Thirty-two (32) ALS students and four (4) ALS teachers made up the participants. To ensure that learner respondents were dispersed evenly across the research locations, eight (8) learners were selected from each of the four participating CLCs. The learner participants met the following criteria: (1) they were enrolled in the ALS program during the 2025–2026 academic year; (2) they voluntarily agreed to participate in the study; and (3) they were able to complete the survey.

In addition to the learner respondents, one (1) ALS teacher from each participating CLC was included in the study, resulting in four (4) teacher respondents. The inclusion of both learners and teachers allowed the study to obtain information from two groups directly involved in the delivery and experience of ALS within the selected learning centers. Thus, the study involved a total of thirty-six (36) participants composed of thirty-two (32) ALS learners and four (4) ALS teachers. The use of purposive sampling was appropriate to the study because the research sites and participants were selected according to specific characteristics relevant to the investigation of ALS implementation in the selected Community Learning Centers.

Eight ALS learners from each of the four Community Learning Centers participated in the study. Each CLC had one ALS teacher in the trial. With eight students each CLC, researchers could characterize and compare the learning centers' conditions. The limited number of

respondents in each CLC limits the applicability of findings outside the participating sites.

The selected sample means the four CLCs were chosen based on their relevance to the study's goals rather than randomly from all Schools Division ALS centers. The results should be interpreted as a snapshot of the selected CLCs' experiences and conditions, not as a statistical representation of all ALS students, teachers, or Community Learning Centers in Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija, or the Schools Division.

However, ALS implementers and education stakeholders may find the data useful as background. Similarities or variances across the four CLCs may suggest subjects that require larger samples and more representative sampling methods. To determine whether this study's findings are shared throughout the division, future research may involve additional CLCs and more students and teachers.

Research Instruments

Two instruments were used to gather the quantitative data for the study: (1) a structured questionnaire administered to ALS learners and ALS teachers and (2) a resource checklist used to assess the resources available in the selected Community Learning Centers (CLCs).

The structured questionnaire was administered to the ALS learners and ALS teachers. Separate sets of items were provided for the two groups based on the information relevant to their respective roles and experiences in the ALS program. The learner questionnaire gathered information on the respondents' demographic characteristics and their experiences in teaching and learning within the ALS program. ALS implementation issues, teaching and learning experiences, stakeholder support, and professional and demographic traits were all included in the teacher questionnaire. A four-point Likert scale was used to score the questionnaire's perception-based elements.

The questionnaire was examined by experts in research and education to determine content validity. Prior to being given to the real participants, the instrument underwent a pilot test. A good degree of internal consistency among the items was shown by the pilot test's Cronbach's alpha value of 0.86.

The availability of educational materials, learning spaces, equipment, and other resources deemed essential for ALS implementation in each participating CLC was recorded using a resource checklist. The ALS instructors' official school records served as the basis for the data entered into the checklist.

Through firsthand observation and an inventory of the resources at each CLC, the researchers were able to confirm the information that had been recorded. In order to verify the information on the checklist, the supplies, facilities, and equipment were actually counted and inspected on-site.

Complementary sources of information were obtained by using the two instruments. While the resource checklist recorded the actual availability of resources inside the chosen Community Learning Centers, the questionnaire collected information supplied by ALS students and teachers on their traits and experiences.

Data Gathering Procedures

The Graduate School of Wesleyan University-Philippines and the Schools Division Superintendent of Cabanatuan City's Department of Education granted authorization for the researcher to begin data collection. Following approval, the four Community Learning Centers (CLCs) selected as research sites—CLC-1, CLC-2, CLC-3, and CLC-4—were coordinated with the Division ALS Focal Person and Education Program Supervisor.

Permission to access data and inventories in order to assess Community Learning Center resources was granted by the concerned ALS teachers. Data on instructional materials,

facilities, and equipment were gathered using a resource checklist.

Teachers and students with ALS were given surveys. The researcher provided instructions and an explanation of the goal of the study before participants finished the surveys. The surveys were made available for statistical analysis following verification.

Data Management and Analysis

Survey questionnaire and resource checklist data were collected, processed, tabulated, and analyzed using descriptive statistics. The respondents' demographics and the selected Community Learning Centers' attributes were reported using frequency counts and percentages. ALS program execution was assessed using mean ratings based on resources, teaching and learning experiences, stakeholder support, and implementation difficulties. The mean scores were interpreted using the study instrument's scale. This study used descriptive statistics to define and assess ALS implementation rather than establish causal relationships or test group differences. Thus, ANOVA and other inferential statistical procedures were avoided. ALS teachers and Education Program Specialists II for Alternative Learning System (EPSA) were too small to fulfill inferential statistical assumptions.

Results and Discussion

The profile of the ALS learners in terms of age, sex, last grade level attended, last school year attended, monthly family income, current work or job status, parental highest educational attainment, job of parents, and reasons from dropping out of formal school.

Table 1. Profile of ALS Learners in CLC-1

Profile Area	Category	f	%	Father f (%)	Mother f (%)
Age	16	2	25.0		
	17	2	25.0		
	18	2	25.0		
	19	1	12.5		
	37+	1	12.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Sex	Male	6	75.0		
	Female	2	25.0		
	Total	8	100.0		

Profile Area	Category	f	%	Father f (%)	Mother f (%)
Last Grade Level	Grade 6	1	12.5		
	Grade 7	1	12.5		
	Grade 8	3	37.5		
	Grade 9	3	37.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Last School Year	2021-2022	2	25.0		
	2022-2023	1	12.5		
	2023-2024	5	62.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Monthly Family Income	Below P5,000	3	37.5		
	P5,000-P10,000	3	37.5		
	P10,001-P20,000	2	25.0		
	P20,001 and above	0	0.0		
	Total	8	100.0		
Current Work/Job Status	Unemployed	7	87.5		
	Part-time employed	0	0.0		
	Self-employed	1	12.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Parents' Education	Elementary or Below			3 (37.5)	4 (50.0)
	High School Level/Graduate			4 (50.0)	3 (37.5)
	College Level/Graduate			1 (12.5)	1 (12.5)
	Total			8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)
Parents' Job	Informal/Manual Work			4 (50.0)	3 (37.5)
	Vendor/Small Business			1 (12.5)	2 (25.0)
	None/Unemployed			3 (37.5)	3 (37.5)
	Total			8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)
Reasons For dropping out of school	Financial Difficulties	3	37.5		
	Family Responsibilities	2	25.0		
	Academic Challenges	2	25.0		
	Lack of Interest in School	1	12.5		
	Others	0	0.0		
	Total	8	100.0		

Table 1 shows that the profile had eight ALS learners. With two students in each of the age categories of 16, 17, and 18, or 25% of the total, the bulk of the pupils were in the adolescent

age range. One student, or 12.5% of the total, was 19 years old, while another student, or 12.5% of the total, was at least 37 years old.

In terms of gender, six students, or 75.0%, were male and two students, or 25.0%, were female. Three students, or 37.5% of the total, had previously attended Grade 8, and three more students, or 37.5% of the total, had previously attended Grade 9. Meanwhile, 12.5% of the students had previously attended Grade 6 and 12.5% had previously attended Grade 7. Five pupils, or 62.5% of the total, attended the 2023–2024 school year. Two students, or 25.0 percent, last attended during the 2021–2022 school year, whereas one student, or 12.5 percent, last attended during the 2022–2023 school year. Three students, or 37.5%, came from households earning less than ₱5,000 per month, while three more students, or 37.5%, came from houses earning between ₱5,000 and ₱10,000 per month. Two students, or 25.0%, were from households earning between ₱10,001 and ₱20,000 per month, while none of the students reported earning ₱20,001 or more.

In terms of employment status, seven students, or 87.5 percent, were unemployed, while one student, or 12.5 percent, worked for themselves. None of the pupils had part-time jobs. Four fathers, or 50% of the total, had either completed high school or graduated from college. Three fathers, or 37.5 percent, had only completed elementary school, while just one father, or 12.5 percent, had attended or completed college. One mother, or 12.5 percent, had finished college, four mothers, or 50.0

percent, had only completed elementary school, and three women, or 37.5 percent, had finished high school.

In terms of parents' occupation, four fathers, or 50.0 percent, were engaged in informal or manual work; one father, or 12.5 percent, was engaged in vending or small business; and three fathers, or 37.5 percent, had no work or were unemployed. Among mothers, three, or 37.5 percent, were engaged in informal or manual work; two, or 25.0 percent, were vendors or involved in small business; and three, or 37.5 percent, had no work or were unemployed.

The results revealed that male junior high school dropouts from low-income households made up the majority of ALS learners in CLC-1. Academic challenges, family responsibilities, and financial difficulties were the primary reasons for school dropout. According to Republic Act No. 11510, these results show how ALS serves as a second-chance education program that provides disadvantaged kids with a variety of learning opportunities.

The table also presents the profile of the ALS teacher at CLC-1. It contains relevant professional and demographic characteristics such as employment position, training attended, teaching experience, and educational attainment. These features are important background to understand the responsibilities, qualifications and contributions of instructors in the effective implementation of the Alternative Learning System (ALS) program.

Table 2. Profile of Learners in CLC-2

Profile Area	Category	f	%	Father f (%)	Mother f (%)
Age	16	1	12.5		
	17	4	50.0		
	18	2	25.0		
	19	1	12.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Sex	Male	5	62.5		
	Female	3	37.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Last Grade Level	Grade 6	1	12.5		
	Grade 7	1	12.5		
	Grade 8	3	37.5		
	Grade 9	3	37.5		
	Total	8	100.0		

Profile Area	Category	f	%	Father f (%)	Mother f (%)
Last School Year	2021-2022	1	12.5		
	2022-2023	2	25.0		
	2023-2024	5	62.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Monthly Family Income	Below P5,000	3	37.5		
	P5,000-P10,000	3	37.5		
	P10,001-P20,000	2	25.0		
	Total	8	100.0		
Current Work/Job Status	Unemployed	6	75.0		
	Part-time employed	2	25.0		
	Self-employed	0	0.0		
	Total	8	100.0		
Parents' Education	Elementary or Below			3 (37.5)	3 (37.5)
	High School Level/Graduate			4 (50.0)	5 (62.5)
	College Level/Graduate			1 (12.5)	0 (0.0)
	Total			8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)
Parents' Job	Informal/Manual Work			3 (37.5)	3 (37.5)
	Vendor/Small Business			2 (25.0)	2 (25.0)
	None/Unemployed			3 (37.5)	3 (37.5)
	Total			8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)
Reason for Dropping Out	Financial Difficulties	3	37.5		
	Family Responsibilities	2	25.0		
	Academic Challenges	2	25.0		
	Lack of Interest in School	1	12.5		
	Others	0	0.0		
	Total	8	100.0		

The socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of eight ALS students in CLC-2 are displayed in Table 2. Adolescents aged 17 made up the majority of learners (50.0%), followed by those aged 18 (25.0%), 16 (12.5%), and 19 (12.5%). Male students made up 62.5% of the total, while female students made up 37.5%. The majority of students last attended Grades 8 and 9 (37.5% each), with the remaining students coming from Grades 6 and 7 (12.5% each). In the 2023–2024 school year, the majority of students (62.5%) had just completed their formal education.

According to economic statistics, the majority of the learners hailed from low-income homes, with 37.5% making less than ₱5,000 per month, another 37.5% making between

₱5,000 and ₱10,000, and 25.0% making between ₱10,001 and ₱20,000. Two students (25.0%) worked part-time, while the majority of students (75.0%) were jobless. The majority of dads (50.0%) and mothers (62.5%) had completed high school, but just one father had earned a college degree. The majority of parents worked in manual labor or informal jobs (37.5%), small businesses or vending (25.0%), or unemployed (37.5%).

Financial hardships (37.5%), family obligations (25.0%), and academic difficulties (25.0%) were the main causes of dropout, while disinterest in education accounted for 12.5%. According to their research, the main causes of student dropouts were financial difficulties, family obligations, and academic

difficulties. This is in line with national research that show poverty, parental education, and family responsibilities are significant determinants of school retention and

participation in ALS programs (Albert et al., 2024; Philippine Statistics Authority, 2022; UNICEF Philippines, 2023).

Table 3. Profile of ALS Learners in CLC-3

Profile Area	Category	f	%	Father f (%)	Mother f (%)
Age	16	2	25.0		
	17	3	37.5		
	18	1	12.5		
	19	1	12.5		
	37+	1	12.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Sex	Male	5	62.5		
	Female	3	37.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Last Grade Level	Grade 6	1	12.5		
	Grade 7	2	25.0		
	Grade 8	2	25.0		
	Grade 9	3	37.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Last School Year	2021-2022	2	25.0		
	2022-2023	1	12.5		
	2023-2024	5	62.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Monthly Family Income	Below P5,000	3	37.5		
	P5,000-P10,000	4	50.0		
	P10,001-P20,000	0	0.0		
	P20,001 and above	1	12.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Current Work/Job Status	Unemployed	7	87.5		
	Part-time employed	1	12.5		
	Self-employed	0	0.0		
	Total	8	100.0		
Parents' Education	Elementary or Below			3 (37.5)	4 (50.0)
	High School Level/Graduate			5 (62.5)	4 (50.0)
	College Level/Graduate			0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Total			8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)
Parents' Job	Informal/Manual Work			4 (50.0)	3 (37.5)
	Vendor/Small Business			2 (25.0)	3 (37.5)
	None/Unemployed			2 (25.0)	2 (25.0)
	Total			8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)
Reason for Dropping Out	Financial Difficulties	3	37.5		
	Family Responsibilities	3	37.5		
	Academic Challenges	1	12.5		
	Lack of Interest in School	1	12.5		
	Others	0	0.0		
	Total	8	100.0		

According to Table 3, the majority of students were 17 years old (37.5%), followed by 16 (25.0%) and 18–19 (12.5% each). One student (12.5%) was older than 37. Males made up 62.5% of the population, while women made up 37.5%. The majority of students recently attended Grade 9 (37.5%), followed by Grades 7 and 8 (25.0% each), and Grade 6 (12.5%).

According to economic profiles, the majority of students hailed from low-income homes, with 37.5% making less than ₱5,000 and 50.0% making between ₱5,000 and ₱10,000 per month. A family income over ₱20,001 was recorded by just one student. One student worked part-time, while the majority of students (87.5%) were jobless. The majority of dads (62.5%) and women (50.0%) had completed high school, but some parents had only

completed elementary school. The majority of parents worked in manual or informal jobs (mothers 37.5%, dads 50.0%), with others working in small businesses or being jobless.

Financial hardships (37.5%) and family obligations (37.5%) were the primary causes of dropouts, followed by academic difficulties (12.5%) and disinterest in education (12.5%). These results imply that home responsibilities and financial difficulties had a greater impact on students' decision to drop out of school than scholastic difficulties. These trends are consistent with research showing that school retention among out-of-school kids in the Philippines is strongly impacted by poverty, family duties, and parental educational background (Balana et al., 2020; Lagasca et al., 2021).

Table 4. Profile of Learners in CLC-4

Profile Area	Category	f	%	Father f (%)	Mother f (%)
Age	16	2	25.0		
	17	3	37.5		
	18	2	25.0		
	19	0	0.0		
	37+	1	12.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Sex	Male	5	62.5		
	Female	3	37.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Last Grade Level	Grade 6	1	12.5		
	Grade 7	1	12.5		
	Grade 8	3	37.5		
	Grade 9	3	37.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Last School Year	2021-2022	2	25.0		
	2022-2023	1	12.5		
	2023-2024	5	62.5		
	Total	8	100.0		
Monthly Family Income	Below P5,000	3	37.5		
	P5,000-P10,000	3	37.5		
	P10,001-P20,000	2	25.0		
	P20,001 and above	0	0.0		
	Total	8	100.0		
Current Work/Job Status	Unemployed	7	87.5		
	Part-time employed	1	12.5		

Profile Area	Category	f	%	Father f (%)	Mother f (%)
	Self-employed	0	0.0		
	Total	8	100.0		
Parents' Education	Elementary or Below			3 (37.5)	3 (37.5)
	High School Level/Graduate			5 (62.5)	5 (62.5)
	College Level/Graduate			0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Total			8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)
Parents' Job	Informal/Manual Work			4 (50.0)	3 (37.5)
	Vendor/Small Business			1 (12.5)	3 (37.5)
	None/Unemployed			3 (37.5)	2 (25.0)
	Total			8 (100.0)	8 (100.0)
Reason for Dropping Out	Financial Difficulties	3	37.5		
	Family Responsibilities	3	37.5		
	Academic Challenges	1	12.5		
	Lack of Interest in School	0	0.0		
	Others	1	12.5		
	Total	8	100.0		

According to Table 4, the majority of students were 17 years old (37.5%), followed by 16 and 18 years old (25.0% each), and one student (12.5%) was 37 years of age or older. Males made up 62.5% of the population, while women made up 37.5%. The majority of students last attended Grades 8 and 9 (37.5% each), with the remaining students coming from Grades 6 and 7 (12.5% each). The majority of students (62.5%) last attended formal education in the 2023–2024 academic year.

The majority of the students were from low-income families. Three students (37.5%) said their family made less than ₱5,000 per month, while three more (37.5%) said their family made between ₱5,000 and ₱10,000. None of the students reported a household income over ₱20,001, and two students (25.0%) hailed from homes making between ₱10,001 and ₱20,000. One student (12.5%) had a part-time job, while the majority of students (87.5%) were unemployed. The majority of dads and mothers (62.5% each) had completed high school, while the remaining parents had

only completed elementary school or less. The main vocations of the parents were unemployment, small company or selling, and informal or physical labor.

Financial hardships (37.5%) and family obligations (37.5%) were the main causes of school dropouts, followed by academic difficulties (12.5%) and other reasons (12.5%). No student cited a lack of interest in learning as a justification for quitting school. The results show that home obligations and financial difficulty had a significant impact on students in CLC-4 quitting school. These findings corroborate earlier research demonstrating that socioeconomic circumstances, family responsibilities, and poverty continue to be significant causes of school dropout among ALS students in the Philippines (Balana et al., 2020; Lao et al., 2021).

The profile of the ALS teacher in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, number of years as ALS implementer, and specialized training in ALS.

Table 5. Profile of ALS Teacher in Selected CLCs

Profile Variable	CLC-1	CLC-2	CLC-3	CLC-4
Age	42	44	42	63
Sex	Female	Female	Female	Female
Civil Status	Married	Married	Married	Married

Profile Variable	CLC-1	CLC-2	CLC-3	CLC-4
Educational Attainment	Master's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree
Years of Teaching	7	7	5	28
Years in ALS	7	7	5	22
Specialized Training	Special Needs Education Program Training (Olongapo City, Sept 16–21, 2026)	Special Needs Education Program Training (Olongapo City, Sept 16–21, 2026)	Special Needs Education Program Training (Olongapo City, Sept 16–21, 2026)	Special Needs Education Program Training (Olongapo City, Sept 16–21, 2026)

The table shows the ALS teachers' profiles at the four Community Learning Centers (CLCs). All four implementers were women and married. Their ages varied from 42 to 63 years, with two teachers at 42, one at 44, and one at 63. In terms of educational achievement, two instructors had master's degrees while the other two received bachelor's degrees. All had undergone the Special Needs Education Program Training, which took place in Olongapo City from September 16 to 21, 2025.

The length of service varied among the professors. Teaching experience varied from 5 to 28 years, while service in the ALS program ranged from 5 to 22 years. The teachers assigned to CLC-1 and CLC-2 had each been teaching at ALS for seven years. The implementer in CLC-3 had five years of experience, while the teacher in CLC-4 had the most, with 28 years in the teaching profession, 22 of which were spent in ALS. Despite the fact that all of the implementers had dedicated their teaching careers to the ALS program, these differences reflect varying degrees of professional experience.

When taken as a whole, the profiles demonstrate that the chosen Community Learning Centers employed educators who were certified to instruct the ALS program. They all had

direct experience with ALS and the same specialized training in Special Needs Education, even if their years of experience and educational backgrounds varied. This combination of professional training, real-world experience, and academic preparation forms the foundation for addressing the diverse learning requirements observed in ALS classrooms.

The findings are consistent with the study, which emphasizes that a teacher's performance is influenced by a mix of educational attainment, teaching experience, and ongoing professional development. While years of teaching experience enhance classroom practices and responsiveness to learners' needs, teachers who seek graduate education have stronger pedagogical understanding and more confidence in instructional decision-making (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Kini & Podolsky, 2021). According to OECD (2020), UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (2022), and UNESCO (2023), specialized training enables educators to employ more inclusive teaching strategies and better address students with varying skill levels.

The profile of the Community Learning Centers (CLCs) in terms of total number of enrollees, type of CLC, and resources available.

Table 6. Profile of Community Learning Center in Terms of Enrolment and Type of CLC 1

Community Learning Center	Elementary	Junior High School	Total Number of Enrollees	Type of CLC
CLC- 1	23	38	61	Type 3
CLC- 2	11	35	46	Type 3
CLC- 3	8	12	20	Type 3
CLC- 4	4	33	37	Type 3

Table 6 displays the profile of the four selected Community Learning Centers (CLCs) with respect to Junior High School (JHS) ALS

enrollment and CLC type. According to the findings, CLC-1 had 38 JHS ALS students enrolled during the School Year 2025–2026, followed by

CLC-2 with 35, CLC-4 with 33, and CLC-3 with 12. Furthermore, CLC-1 claimed that 61 pupils, including those from the center's other educational levels, were enrolled altogether. Despite the variations in participation, all four learning centers were classified as Type 3 Community Learning Centers.

The results demonstrate that each learning center operates in a permanent learning environment equipped with the basic resources needed to deliver instruction. Even while the number of enrolled students varied between the four CLCs, the availability of a dedicated learning space provides a constant setting for the use of the Alternative Learning System. In-person instruction, learner assessment, and other educational activities necessary for program implementation are made possible by these facilities.

The results also imply that the chosen CLCs have set the minimal physical standards required to support learning among adult and juvenile learners who are not enrolled in school. All four centers offer a stable setting in which learning activities may be carried out, however the diversity in enrollment may be due to variations in learner involvement, the size of the communities served, or local implementation of ALS programs.

These results align with the Alternative Learning System Implementing Rules and Guidelines of the Department of Education, which characterize Community Learning Centers as specific locations where students can access educational materials, take part in learning activities, and engage in other ALS-related activities. A Type 3 Community Learning Center is defined by the Department of Education (DepEd) as a permanent or school-based learning facility that is built of sturdy materials and furnished with basic furnishings and instructional materials required for teaching and learning (Department of Education, 2024). The existence of permanent learning facilities is also consistent with UNESCO's belief that learning settings that are secure, easily accessible, and well-equipped enhance student engagement, the efficacy of education, and the general caliber of lifelong learning initiatives (UNESCO, 2023).

The Alternative Learning System (ALS) Program Being Implemented in terms of Availability of Resources, Physical Count of Equipment, Furniture, Fixtures, and Other PPE, Teaching and Learning Experiences in ALS, and Stakeholder Support of ALS Teacher in Selected CLCs

Table 7. Availability of Resources in Selected CLCs

Resources	Availability/Status			
	CLC-1	CLC-2	CLC-3	CLC-4
ALS Modules	Complete (2000)	Complete (2000)	Complete (2000)	Complete (2000)
Supplementary Materials	Inadequate (35)	Inadequate (35)	Inadequate (14)	Inadequate (15)
Visual Aids	Inadequate (7)	Inadequate (5)	Inadequate (7)	Inadequate (10)
Digital Resources	Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate
Writing Materials	Inadequate (11)	Inadequate (8)	Inadequate (8)	Inadequate (15)
Teaching Aids	Inadequate (4)	Inadequate (8)	Inadequate (7)	Inadequate (5)
Computers	Inadequate (1)	Inadequate (1)	Inadequate (1)	Inadequate (1)
Internet	None	None	None	None
Audio-Visual Equipment	None	None	None	Limited (1)
Functional CLC	Complete	Complete	Complete	Complete
Classroom Safety	Complete	Complete	Complete	Complete
Space for Activities	Complete	Complete	Complete	Complete
Furniture	Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate
Localized Materials	Inadequate (70)	Inadequate	Inadequate (70)	Inadequate (70)

The teaching and learning materials available in the four Community Learning Centers (CLCs) that were chosen are shown in Table 7. The results show that each of the four CLCs has 2,000 full ALS modules in stock. Similarly, every center reported having a working Community Learning Center, a secure classroom setting, and enough room for educational activities. These results show that all of the chosen learning centers have the fundamental resources needed to provide in-person ALS education.

The majority of supporting resources were determined to be insufficient, even tho the essential teaching materials and learning facilities were available. There were between 14 and 35 more learning resources, five to ten visual aids, eight to fifteen writing materials, and four to eight teaching aids. There was just one computer per CLC, and there was reportedly a lack of furnishings and locally relevant educational resources. Additionally, all four CLCs lacked internet access, and digital learning materials were either unavailable or insufficient. Three learning centers lacked audio-visual equipment, while only CLC-4 claimed to have one.

Overall, the findings indicate that even tho the chosen Community Learning Centers have the infrastructure and printed ALS modules required to maintain program implementation, they still have a lack of instructional support resources. Teachers' capacity to execute a variety of interactive learning activities may be limited by the absence of sufficient supplemental materials, digital technology, and locally relevant instructional resources. Similarly, as technology becomes more crucial in providing flexible and learner-centered education, the lack of internet access restricts possibilities to incorporate digital learning tools and online instructional materials into instruction.

These results are in line with other research showing that the quality of teaching and learning in Alternative Learning System programs is strongly influenced by the availability of instructional resources. Teachers can enhance learning outcomes, encourage learner engagement, and vary instructional methodologies with the use of technology-based resources,

localized instructional materials, and adequate teaching aids (Philippine Institute for Development Studies, 2021; UNESCO, 2023). In a similar vein, Albert et al. (2024) pointed out that enhancing the delivery of basic education programs, especially for underprivileged and alternative learning environments, still requires bolstering educational infrastructure and increasing access to digital learning materials. In order to facilitate the successful and inclusive implementation of ALS, the Department of Education (2024) also acknowledges that Community Learning Centers should have sufficient instructional materials and learning resources.

The inventory of CLC-1's physical resources is also included in the table. One teacher's chair, one teacher's table, twenty monoblock seats, a whiteboard, a ceiling fan, a stand fan, and a Dell laptop were all present in the center. Nevertheless, there was a total inventory of 44 accessible physical resources because there was no wooden cabinet.

According to the inventory, CLC-1 has the necessary furniture and equipment to provide classroom instruction and accommodate students during in-person sessions. Basic support for teaching and learning activities is provided by the availability of instructional materials, a laptop, and classroom furniture. However, the correct arrangement, storage, and upkeep of educational materials and school records may be impacted by the lack of storage facilities, such as a wooden cabinet.

These results corroborate earlier research emphasizing the value of sufficient classroom facilities and educational materials in fostering successful teaching and learning. While suitable facilities support student involvement and classroom management, a well-equipped learning environment helps teachers arrange instructional resources properly and deliver classes more successfully (Navarro, 2024). Additionally, UNESCO (2023) stressed that, especially in alternative education programs that serve a variety of learner demographics, the supply and upkeep of sufficient educational facilities continue to be essential to establishing inclusive and favorable learning environments.

Table 8. Physical Count of Equipment, Furniture, Fixtures, and Other PPE in Selected CLCs

Article	Description	CLC-1	CLC-2	CLC-3	CLC-4
Cabinet	Wooden Cabinet	0	1	1	2
Table	Teacher's Table	1	1	1	2
Chair	Monoblock Chair	38	20	0	0
	Armchair		0	15	25
	Teacher's Chair	1	1	1	2
Board	Whiteboard	1	0	0	2
	Blackboard	0	0	1	0
Electric fan	Ceiling fan	1	0	1	2
	Stand fan	1	1	1	1
Laptop	Dell	1	1	1	1
Projector	Projector machine	0	0	0	1
	Projector white screen	0	0	0	1
Television		0	0	0	1

The teaching and learning resources available at the four Community Learning Centers (CLCs) that were chosen are displayed in Table 8. The results showed that all four CLCs had completed 2,000 ALS learning modules and reported having a working Community Learning Center, a safe classroom environment, and suitable space for educational activities. These results demonstrate that the chosen learning centers provide the fundamental teaching tools and physical space needed to conduct in-person Alternative Learning System (ALS) classes.

The majority of supporting instructional resources were found to be inadequate across all four CLCs, despite the presence of crucial learning modules and fundamental classroom infrastructure. There were 14–35 additional learning resources, 5–10 visual aids, 8–15 writing materials, and 4–8 teaching aids. There was just one computer in each learning center, and the furniture and locally relevant educational resources were also considered inadequate. All four CLCs lacked internet connectivity, only CLC-4 had one piece of audio-visual equipment, and the other centers had none. Digital learning resources were either inadequate or nonexistent.

Overall, the results demonstrate that, despite their continued lack of instructional support resources, the selected Community Learning Centers offer a practical and safe learning environment. The lack of supplemental materials, visual aids, localized resources, and teaching aids may restrict instructors' capacity to use a variety of learner-centered instructional

techniques, even if the full ALS modules guaranty that students have access to the required learning abilities. Similar to this, possibilities for technology-enhanced education, online resource utilization, and multimedia-assisted learning may be limited by the absence of internet connectivity in all learning centers as well as the shortage of digital and audiovisual equipment. These limitations may affect student engagement and the use of flexible teaching strategies that meet the various learning needs of adult and juvenile learners who are not enrolled in school.

The information also shows differences in the degree of resource accessibility among the chosen CLCs. Despite having more audiovisual and physical resources than the other centers, CLC-4's inventory was limited to a single laptop, projector, projection screen, and television, indicating that opportunities for technology-enhanced instruction may still be few. In a similar vein, the next three CLCs mostly relied on printed teaching materials and rudimentary classroom equipment. These results show that even tho the learning centers have set up the bare minimum of resources needed for ALS implementation, more funding is needed for instructional technologies, classroom furnishings, additional learning materials, and locally relevant teaching resources in order to enhance program delivery and enhance students' educational experiences.

These results are in line with other studies showing that effective teaching and learning in Alternative Learning System programs depend

on appropriate instructional materials, classroom facilities, and technology resources. Teachers can employ more interactive, learner-centered, and contextualized instructional strategies that encourage student participation and achievement by using visual aids, supplemental learning materials, localized resources, and digital technologies (Garcia & Tan, 2021; Torres & Bautista, 2021; Villanueva & Reyes, 2022). The quality of learning experiences and learner engagement are also significantly impacted by appropriate classroom infrastructure and instructional materials, according to studies (Navarro, 2024). Technology resources

are more successful when paired with institutional support and teachers' capacity to successfully integrate them into the classroom, according to UNESCO (2023). Furthermore, the Department of Education (2024) recognizes that Community Learning Centers should be equipped with appropriate instructional materials, digital resources, and physical facilities to ensure accessible, inclusive, and high-quality ALS implementation, even though Albert et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of supporting educational infrastructure and digital access to improve learning opportunities for underserved communities.

Table 9. Teaching and Learning Experiences in ALS in CLC- 1

Indicators	Teachers Mean	Interpretation	Learners Mean	Interpretation
I am satisfied with my ALS learning experience.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.75	Strongly Agree
The teaching strategies used in ALS are effective.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
The lessons are relevant to learners' daily lives.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
The ALS teacher or facilitator is supportive.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.75	Strongly Agree
I actively participate in ALS activities.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
Instructions given during sessions are clear and understandable.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
The learning materials provided are adequate.	4.00	Strongly Agree	2.00	Disagree
The learning environment is comfortable.	2.00	Disagree	2.88	Agree
ALS has improved my skills and knowledge.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
I would recommend the ALS program to others.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
Total Mean	3.80	Strongly Agree	3.40	Strongly Agree

Legend:

Mean	Interpretation
4.00 – 3.00	Strongly Agree
2.99 – 2.00	Agree
1.99 – 1.00	Disagree
1.00 – 0.99	Strongly Disagree

Table 9 indicates that educators expressed high satisfaction with the teaching methodologies, lesson pertinence, instructor assistance, clarity of instruction, and student growth provided in the ALS program, as evidenced by all

metrics achieving a mean score of 4.00, denoting "Strongly Agree." The overall weighted mean of 3.80 further reflects a highly positive perception of their teaching experiences in ALS, also interpreted as "Strongly Agree."

The highest mean among the students was 3.75 for teacher support, indicating "Strongly Agree." This suggests that students appreciated the help, direction, and motivation offered by their ALS professors. Conversely, the lowest mean for the sufficiency of educational materials was 2.00, indicating "disagree." This implies that students saw a lack of enough learning resources to meet their requirements. Notwithstanding grievances about the course content, the overall weighted mean of 3.40, interpreted as "Strongly Agree," suggests that students had a favorable view of their educational experiences in the ALS program.

The results indicate that both educators and learners evaluated the ALS program positively. Favorable educational experiences were influenced by outstanding instructor assistance; nevertheless, the poor assessment of learning materials suggests that instructional resources need enhancement to more

effectively facilitate student success. Galang et al. (2023) investigate the educational experiences of ALS facilitators and participants. This includes instructional strategies, difficulties faced, and support networks that affect educational results in the setting of ALS. According to the reviewed research, learner-centered, adaptable, contextualized, and technology-enhanced methods that take into account the various needs and situations of learners are essential for effective ALS training. There is little study on the real teaching and learning experiences of ALS implementers and learners in particular local contexts, despite earlier studies showing the efficacy of these instructional methodologies. This disparity highlights the need for localized research to have a deeper understanding of how contextual difficulties and instructional strategies affect learner results and ALS implementation.

Table 10. Teaching and Learning Experiences in ALS in CLC-2

Indicators	Teachers Mean	Interpretation	Learners Mean	Interpretation
I am satisfied with my ALS learning experience.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
The teaching strategies used in ALS are effective.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
The lessons are relevant to learners' daily lives.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.75	Strongly Agree
The ALS teacher or facilitator is supportive.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
I actively participate in ALS activities.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
Instructions given during sessions are clear and understandable.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
The learning materials provided are adequate.	2.00	Disagree	2.25	Disagree
The learning environment is comfortable.	3.00	Agree	2.25	Disagree
ALS has improved my skills and knowledge.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.75	Strongly Agree
I would recommend the ALS program to others.	4.00	Strongly Agree	4.00	Strongly Agree
Total Mean	3.70	Strongly Agree	3.39	Strongly Agree

Legend:

Mean	Interpretation
4.00 – 3.00	Strongly Agree
2.99 – 2.00	Agree
1.99 – 1.00	Disagree
1.00 – 0.99	Strongly Disagree

Table 10 reveals that instructors consistently rated all categories as "Strongly Agree," with mean ratings of 4.00, indicating great satisfaction with teaching methodologies, lesson relevance, teacher support, instructional clarity, and skill development. The total mean for instructors was 3.70, which is read as "Strongly Agree." Learners had largely favorable opinions, with most indicators defined as "Strongly Agree." They believed that ALS increased their abilities and knowledge (3.75), that courses were relevant to everyday life (3.75), and that teaching tactics were successful (3.62). Students also rated teacher support (3.62) and engagement in learning activities (3.50). They did, however, disagree that the learning materials

were appropriate (2.25) and expressed discomfort with the learning environment (2.25). The mean score for all learners was 3.39, which is read as "Strongly Agree." These findings indicate that ALS in CLC-2 efficiently enhances learner engagement and skill development; nevertheless, limitations exist in the quality of learning resources and the comfort of the learning environment. According to research, instructional quality, facilitator assistance, and availability to adequate learning materials all have a significant impact on learner satisfaction and perceived relevance in alternative learning programs. Addressing these gaps may improve learning outcomes and program effectiveness.

Table 11. Teaching and Learning Experiences in ALS in CLC- 3

Indicators	Teachers Mean	Interpretation	Learners Mean	Interpretation
I am satisfied with my ALS learning experience.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
The teaching strategies used in ALS are effective.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
The lessons are relevant to learners' daily lives.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.38	Strongly Agree
The ALS teacher or facilitator is supportive.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.75	Strongly Agree
I actively participate in ALS activities.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.12	Agree
Instructions given during sessions are clear and understandable.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.38	Strongly Agree
The learning materials provided are adequate.	2.00	Disagree	2.12	Disagree
The learning environment is comfortable.	3.00	Agree	2.50	Disagree
ALS has improved my skills and knowledge.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
I would recommend the ALS program to others.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.62	Strongly Agree
Total Mean	3.70	Strongly Agree	3.27	Strongly Agree

Legend:

Mean	Interpretation
4.00 – 3.00	Strongly Agree
2.99 – 2.00	Agree
1.99 – 1.00	Disagree
1.00 – 0.99	Strongly Disagree

With an overall mean of 3.70, Table 11 demonstrates that instructors consistently evaluated all categories as "Strongly Agree," indicating strong satisfaction with instructional

techniques, lesson relevance, teacher support, instruction clarity, and students' skill growth. Although their scores were lower than those of the teachers, learners still reported

generally good impressions. They firmly agreed that the program enhanced their abilities and knowledge (3.62) and that the ALS teacher was helpful (3.75). The majority of students also concurred that the teaching methods were successful (3.62) and that the teachings were applicable to their everyday lives (3.38). However, students reported less positive opinions about the comfort of the learning environment (2.50) and disputed that the learning resources offered were sufficient (2.12). The mean score for all students was 3.27, which is deemed "Strongly Agree. These findings suggest that ALS in CLC-3 effectively promotes

student satisfaction, instructor assistance, and skill development. Nevertheless, challenges persist about the comfort of the classroom and the quality of the teaching materials. Previous studies have shown that the caliber of teaching, effective facilitation, and access to appropriate learning materials and surroundings significantly influence learner outcomes and satisfaction in ALS programs (Alvarez & Gonzales, 2021; Dela Cruz & Reyes, 2022). Addressing these concerns might enhance program effectiveness and student involvement to an even greater extent.

Table 12. Teaching and Learning Experiences in CLC- 4

Indicators	Teachers Mean	Interpretation	Learners Mean	Interpretation
I am satisfied with my ALS learning experience.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
The teaching strategies used in ALS are effective.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.38	Strongly Agree
The lessons are relevant to learners' daily lives.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.25	Agree
The ALS teacher or facilitator is supportive.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.50	Strongly Agree
I actively participate in ALS activities.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.12	Agree
Instructions given during sessions are clear and understandable.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.38	Strongly Agree
The learning materials provided are adequate.	2.00	Disagree	2.75	Agree
The learning environment is comfortable.	3.00	Agree	3.00	Agree
ALS has improved my skills and knowledge.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.12	Agree
I would recommend the ALS program to others.	4.00	Strongly Agree	3.12	Agree
Total Mean	3.70	Strongly Agree	3.21	Agree

Legend:

Mean	Interpretation
4.00 – 3.00	Strongly Agree
2.99 – 2.00	Agree
1.99 – 1.00	Disagree
1.00 – 0.99	Strongly Disagree

Table 12 shows the perceptions of teachers and learners regarding their teaching and learning experiences in ALS in CLC-4. Teachers consistently rated all indicators as "Strongly Agree," with a mean of 3.70, reflecting high satisfaction with teaching strategies, lesson

relevance, teacher support, clarity of instructions, and learner skill development.

Learners generally reported positive perceptions, although their ratings were lower than those of the teachers. Learners strongly agreed that the ALS teacher was supportive

(3.50) and that the program met their learning needs (3.50). Most learners agreed that lessons were relevant (3.25), that they actively participated in learning activities (3.12), and that ALS improved their skills and knowledge (3.12). Ratings for learning materials (2.75) indicated moderate adequacy, while the learning environment (3.00) was rated as satisfactory. The overall learners' mean was 3.21, interpreted as "Agree."

These findings suggest that ALS in CLC-4 effectively promotes learner engagement and

skill development; however, gaps remain in the adequacy of learning materials and the level of learner participation. Studies emphasize that learner satisfaction and program effectiveness in ALS are strongly influenced by teacher support, instructional strategies, and access to sufficient learning resources (Diaz & Rosales, 2021; Mendoza & Cruz, 2022). Addressing these gaps may further enhance learner engagement and improve the overall quality of ALS implementation.

Table 13. Stakeholder Support of ALS Teacher in Selected CLCs

Indicators	CLC-1 Teachers Mean	Inter- preta- tion	CLC-2 Teachers Mean	Inter- preta- tion	CLC-3 Teachers Mean	Inter- preta- tion	CLC-4 Teachers Mean	Inter- preta- tion
School ad- ministration support	4.00	SA	3.00	A	3.00	A	3.00	A
LGU support	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D
Community involvement	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D
Parent sup- port	3.00	A	3.00	A	3.00	A	3.00	A
NGO support	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D
Provision of materials	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D
Stakeholder collaboration	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D
Participation in planning	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D
Financial sup- port	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D
Stakeholder strengthens ALS	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D	2.00	D
Total Mean	2.30	D	2.20	D	2.20	D	2.20	D

Legend:

Mean	Interpretation
4.00 – 3.00	Strongly Agree
2.99 – 2.00	Agree
1.99 – 1.00	Disagree
1.00 – 0.99	Strongly Disagree

Support from stakeholders in the local learning environment and support from external stakeholders varies significantly, as Table 13 demonstrates. With a mean score of 4.00 in CLC-1 and 3.00 in CLCs 2, 3, and 4, school administration was rated well in all four CLCs. In all four centers, the mean score for parent

support was 3.00. On the other hand, each CLC obtained a mean score of 2.00, which is read as "Disagree," for LGU support, community engagement, NGO assistance, material supply, stakeholder cooperation, planning participation, financial support, and stakeholders' commitment to building ALS. As a result, the total

stakeholder-support means, which ranged from 2.20 to 2.30, remained low.

Notably, all four learning centers consistently received 2.00 ratings. The trend suggests that the participating ALS instructors generally saw little participation from stakeholders outside the school and home setting, rather than being a problem exclusive to one CLC. The same grades for LGU assistance, NGO support, financial support, material supply, planning involvement, and stakeholder cooperation, in particular, indicate a limited formal or ongoing role of external partners in the day-to-day implementation of ALS in the chosen locations.

However, the findings shouldn't be taken as proof that local government units, non-governmental organizations, or community groups won't assist ALS. The current research assessed teachers' opinions on stakeholder support, but it did not use documentary analysis or interviews to look into the causes of the low scores. The observed pattern may be caused by a number of factors, such as the lack of formal partnership agreements, poor communication between CLC implementers and external stakeholders, unclear responsibilities, conflicting local organization priorities, or the absence of a regular mechanism for mobilizing resources for ALS. Future qualitative or mixed-method research is needed to confirm these potential reasons.

When the resource inventory in Table 7 is taken into account, the stakeholder results take on more significance. Complete ALS modules, useful learning areas, secure classrooms, and sufficient areas for educational activities were all present in all four CLCs. Nevertheless, there was only one computer per center, no internet access, insufficient digital resources, subpar furnishings, and no audio-visual equipment in three of the centers. The centers have the necessary conditions to conduct ALS sessions, but external stakeholder participation does not seem to be sufficient to address the additional resources required for broader and more technologically supported learning activities. This suggests a potential implementation gap, given the concurrent occurrence of resource limitations and low ratings for external material and financial support.

Local ALS governance may be impacted by this discovery. It may be necessary to

coordinate stakeholder engagement via more explicit institutional structures rather than depending mostly on unofficial or sporadic support. A local ALS stakeholder framework that identifies LGUs, community groups, commercial sector partners, and NGOs based on their areas of contribution might be established by the Schools Division Office and participating CLCs. Connectivity, digital devices, educational resources, student transportation or communication support, building upgrades, and community-based learning initiatives are a few examples of these areas.

A stakeholder commitment plan, an annual CLC resource-needs assessment, and recurring contribution monitoring might all be part of a more formal arrangement. Teachers' observed resource deficiencies might be converted into specific demands that possible partners could fulfill with the help of such a framework. The goal would be to provide supplementary assistance that enhances the resources presently offered via the ALS program rather than shifting the Department of Education's administration of ALS to other groups.

Therefore, policy and program emphasis should be focused on the persistently poor stakeholder evaluations. In addition to securing contributions, strengthening external relationships should concentrate on creating dependable avenues for involvement in planning, resource mobilization, monitoring, and learner support. This strategy may increase community ownership of ALS implementation while addressing the resource constraints noted in the chosen CLCs.

Implications drawn from the findings to enhance the implementation of the Alternative Learning System (ALS) program.

The results suggest that the Alternative Learning System (ALS) is still carrying out its mission of giving out-of-school kids and adults, especially those from low-income households, second-chance educational chances. Socioeconomic conditions continue to be major obstacles to educational engagement, as evidenced by the high percentage of students from low-income households and the identification of family obligations and financial difficulties as the main causes of school discontinuation. This

emphasizes the necessity of improved student support systems outside of the classroom.

The study also shows that, in spite of current resource limitations, ALS teachers are able to deliver high-quality education because they have sufficient credentials, a significant amount of teaching experience, and specialized training. Human resources continue to be one of the most effective elements of ALS implementation, as seen by the instructors' and students' continuously good opinions of instructional tactics, teacher support, and lesson relevance.

However, the delivery of learner-centered, technology-integrated, and contextualized education may be hampered by the lack of instructional materials, digital resources, internet access, furniture, and audio-visual equipment across the Community Learning Centers (CLCs). The overall quality of learning experiences, instructional creativity, and learner engagement may all be hampered by these resource shortages.

The results also highlight how crucial stakeholder cooperation is. Stronger collaborations between the Department of Education, local government entities, private businesses, non-governmental organizations, and community stakeholders are required to maintain resource provision and enhance program execution, even tho Community Learning Centers offer practical and secure learning environments. The long-term viability and efficacy of ALS will be enhanced by fortifying these alliances.

Course of Action Based on the Findings of the Study.

The researchers suggest a CLC Digital Access and Resource Support Framework (CDARS) in response to the persistently poor ratings for LGU and external stakeholder support as well as the resource shortages noted in the chosen CLCs. The framework is designed to serve as a locally flexible mechanism that allows the Schools Division Office, local government entities, CLC implementers, and outside partners to coordinate the supply of resources that are difficult for individual CLCs to get on their own.

Five interrelated stages might make up the framework:

Needs analysis and resource mapping. A yearly inventory detailing the quantity and state of computers, internet access, digital resources, teaching materials, furniture, and audio-visual equipment should be prepared by each CLC. Instead of just listing the resources that are available, the inventory should indicate priority gaps. For instance, the availability of just one computer per center and the lack of internet access in all four CLCs would be considered priority digital resource requirements in the current research.

Planning for LGU-CLC resources. Identified ALS requirements may be included into the yearly planning and budgeting procedures for education by the Schools Division Office and relevant local government units. A brief resource plan including the necessary item, estimated cost, intended usage, number of learners to benefit, and suggested source of funding might be submitted by each CLC. Instead of making vague pleas for help, this would provide LGUs specific resource needs.

Collaboration and shared funds. The LGU, DepEd, private companies, NGOs, alumni or civic organizations, and other community partners may coordinate funding via a shared-support structure. Partners might assume some components instead of expecting one stakeholder to provide all resources. For instance, a business sector partner may provide or give gadgets, an LGU might offer internet access, and community groups might help with educational resources or learner support.

Device availability and connectivity. Establishing dependable internet access in the chosen CLCs should be the top digital priority. Shared learner devices should then be provided or upgraded. CLCs may use a shared-device model in which a certain number of students have access to laptops or tablets for digital learning activities when it is not financially possible to provide individual devices for each student. Additionally, offline digital resources should be kept up to date for times when connection isn't accessible.

Accountability and observation. A basic monitoring system should be used to record

the usage of LGU and partner-supported resources. The resources obtained, the source of assistance, the date of acquisition, the quantity of students served, the state of the equipment, and ongoing operating expenses may all be documented by the CLC. After that, an annual evaluation may ascertain if the intervention enhanced access to digital and instructional materials and pinpoint any gaps that still need to be filled for the next year.

The Department of Education's duties are not meant to be replaced by the suggested framework. Rather, it offers a way to organize supplemental local assistance based on identified CLC needs. The four participating CLCs' poor scores for stakeholder engagement, planning involvement, financial assistance, and material supply may also be addressed by such an arrangement.

Conclusion

The majority of the ALS students at the chosen Community Learning Centers were male teenagers who had dropped out of junior high school. The majority came from households with informal work, had parents with just elementary or high school education, were jobless, and belonged to low-income families. Family obligations and financial hardships were shown to be the main causes of formal school dropout. These results demonstrate that the ALS program is still serving its target population, which consists of out-of-school kids and adults who are economically poor and marginalized in terms of education.

The ALS instructors were seasoned female educators with master's or bachelor's degrees, years of ALS program teaching experience, and specialized training in special needs education. Their training, work history, and ongoing capacity-building initiatives show that they have the skills required to successfully support instruction in a variety of ALS environments.

All of the chosen Community Learning Centers were categorized as Type 3 CLCs, offering ALS students permanent and useful learning environments. The centers ranged in enrollment size and typically lacked adequate teaching materials, furniture, digital resources, internet access, and audio-visual equipment, while having basic classroom facilities and en-

tire ALS modules. Therefore, resource deficiencies continue to be a major worry even if the physical learning settings were operational.

In general, the chosen Community Learning Centers successfully executed the ALS program. Regarding instructional techniques, course relevance, student involvement, teacher support, and overall learning experiences, both teachers and students had very good opinions. However, the implementation was hampered by a lack of internet access, poor furniture, restricted digital resources, and inadequate educational materials, suggesting that resource constraints continue to be a significant obstacle to providing high-quality, technologically advanced training.

The results show that enhancing ALS implementation calls for an all-encompassing strategy that incorporates qualified instructors, sufficient educational materials, useful learning spaces, and ongoing stakeholder support. In order to close resource shortages, enhance learner support services, and guarantee the long-term viability and efficacy of the ALS program, the Department of Education, local government entities, private organizations, and community stakeholders must fortify their collaborations.

A workable solution for filling the gaps in digital resources and outside stakeholder assistance is offered by the proposed CLC Digital Access and Resource assistance Framework (CDARS). The framework may enhance resource support for ALS implementation in the chosen Community Learning Centers via coordinated resource evaluation, LGU-CLC planning, shared finance, better connection and device supply, and routine monitoring.

Recommendation

In order to lower learner dropout rates and promote sustained engagement among economically disadvantaged students, the Department of Education and Community Learning Centers may enhance their learner support programs by offering financial aid, transportation assistance, guidance and counseling services, flexible learning schedules, and community-based interventions.

To further enhance instructional quality, the Department of Education may maintain and

increase professional development opportunities for ALS teachers by providing frequent training on differentiated instruction, digital learning technologies, inclusive education, contextualized teaching strategies, and learner support services.

To enhance the overall learning environment in Community Learning Centers, the Schools Division Office, local government entities, and partner organizations may give top priority to providing instructional materials, classroom furniture, computers, internet connectivity, audio-visual equipment, and localized learning resources.

While making the most of the technology and community resources at their disposal, ALS implementers should keep using learner-centered and contextualized instructional methodologies. ALS implementation may also be regularly monitored and evaluated to guaranty ongoing enhancements to program efficacy, learner engagement, and instructional delivery.

In order to support resource mobilization, learner welfare programs, and capacity-building initiatives, the Department of Education may fortify stakeholder collaboration by forming long-lasting partnerships with local government entities, private institutions, non-governmental organizations, and community stakeholders. In order to further enhance ALS policy and implementation procedures, future researchers are also urged to carry out larger, more thorough studies with more Community Learning Centers and other factors.

Finally, the Schools Division Office, LGUs, CLC implementers, and external stakeholders are advised to think about implementing the CDARS framework in order to solve the issues of insufficient instructional materials, limited digital devices, and poor internet access. Establishing dependable internet connectivity, offering shared digital gadgets, and creating long-term LGU-supported financing and collaboration systems may be prioritized.

References

Abad, R., & Galleto, P. (2020). *Alternative Learning System program's implementation landscape in a division in the Philippines*. *International Journal of Educational*

Management and Development Studies, 1(2), 45–60.

Ahmed, M. (2016). *Non-formal education and development in Bangladesh*. BRAC University Press.

Albert, J. R. G., Mendoza, R. U., Cabalfin, D. L. D., Mahmoud, M. A., & Muñoz, M. S. (2024). *A process evaluation of the Philippine Alternative Learning System* (PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2024-31). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2024.31>

Alvarez, M., & Gonzales, R. (2021). *Resource availability and quality of instruction in Alternative Learning System centers*. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 49(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.51743/pjer.49.1.45>

Andrada, R., & Villanueva, M. (2021). *Resource adequacy and learner engagement in Philippine Alternative Learning System programs*. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 48(2), 105–120. <https://doi.org/10.51743/pjer.48.2.105>

ASEAN Secretariat. (2018). *Non-formal education initiatives in Southeast Asia*. ASEAN Secretariat.

Balana, B., Reyes, M., & Villanueva, R. (2020). *Out-of-school youth and determinants of school dropout in the Philippines*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 47(3), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.51743/pjer.47.3.95>

Bautista, R., & Medina, P. (2021). *Stakeholder participation and sustainability of the Alternative Learning System in the Philippines*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 15(2), 77–94.

Dela Cruz, J., & Reyes, M. (2022). *Learning environments and learner satisfaction in Alternative Learning System programs*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Research*, 12(2), 81–98.

Department of Education. (2020). *Alternative Learning System K to 12 curriculum guide*. Department of Education.

Department of Education. (2023). *Alternative Learning System (ALS) program overview*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/about-als/>

Diaz, R., & Rosales, M. (2021). *Teacher experience and learner outcomes in Alternative Learning System programs in the*

- Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 50(2), 67–84.
<https://doi.org/10.51743/pjer.50.2.67>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- Freeman, R. E., Phillips, R., & Sisodia, R. (2020). Tensions in stakeholder theory. *Business & Society*, 59(2), 213–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650318773750>
- Galang, M., Santos, J., & Reyes, A. (2023). *Teaching and learning experiences of Alternative Learning System implementers and learners in the Philippines*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 50(1), 23–42.
- Garcia, A., & Santos, P. (2021). *Stakeholder collaboration and program implementation in the Alternative Learning System*. *Journal of Philippine Educational Management*, 16(1), 45–61.
- Garcia, R., & Tan, M. (2021). *Physical learning resources and instructional effectiveness in community learning centers*. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 49(2), 89–104.
- Gonzales, R., & de Leon, M. (2021). *Teacher competency and learner engagement in Philippine alternative education programs*. *Asian Journal of Education*, 23(2), 45–59.
<https://doi.org/10.31235/aje.2021.23.2.45>
- Gray, J. R., & Grove, S. K. (2021). *Burns and Grove's the practice of nursing research: Appraisal, synthesis, and generation of evidence* (9th ed.). Elsevier.
- Hero, J. L. (2022). *Assessment of 21st-century skills acquisition of ALS senior high school learners*. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 21(5), 112–128.
- Käpplinger, B., & Lichte, N. (2020). *Adult education and Volkshochschulen in Germany*. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 39(4), 399–414.
- Lagasca, A., Cruz, J., & Santos, L. (2021). *Socio-economic factors influencing participation in the Alternative Learning System*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 24(1), 55–72.
<https://doi.org/10.31235/apjer.24.1.55>
- Lao, A., & Cruz, J. (2020). *Stakeholder engagement and community participation in Alternative Learning System implementation*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Studies*, 10(4), 95–111.
- Lao, A., Cruz, J., & Santos, L. (2021). *Socio-economic factors affecting participation in the Alternative Learning System in rural Philippines*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Research*, 11(3), 112–128.
<https://doi.org/10.31235/apjer.11.3.112>
- Lima, A., & De Souza, M. (2018). *Educação de Jovens e Adultos (EJA) and second-chance education in Brazil*. *Brazilian Journal of Education*, 23(4), 87–103.
- Mendoza, L., & Cruz, J. (2022). *Specialized training and instructional effectiveness in ALS centers*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Research*, 12(2), 101–118.
<https://doi.org/10.31235/apjer.12.2.101>
- Mwangi, P., & Wanjohi, G. (2017). *Basic literacy program and workforce readiness in Kenya*. *African Educational Research Journal*, 5(3), 150–161.
- Navarro, E. (2024). *Learning environments and instructional resource adequacy in Philippine Alternative Learning System centers*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 52(1), 55–73.
- Nguyen, H., & Le, T. (2022). *Continuing Education Centers and lifelong learning in Vietnam*. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 8(3), 101–115.
- Pablo, C. (2021). *Demographic profile and educational motivations of ALS learners*. *Philippine Educational Review*, 9(2), 56–71.
- Padilla, R., & Mercado, S. (2021). *Learner satisfaction and instructional quality in Alternative Learning System programs*. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 49(3), 121–138.
- Pham, T., & Bui, N. (2023). *Digital technologies in non-formal education programs in Vietnam*. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 52(1), 88–104.
- Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2021). *Improving access and quality in the Alternative Learning System*.
<https://pids.gov.ph/publications/als-access-quality>
- Quintana, M., & Villanueva, R. (2024). *Gender participation trends among ALS learners in the Philippines*. *Journal of Educational Policy and Practice*, 12(1), 21–39.

- Republic Act No. 11510. (2020). *Alternative Learning System Act*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2020/ra_11510_2020.html
- Reyes, J., Bautista, P., & Tan, R. (2022). *Special needs training for ALS teachers: Effects on learner performance*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 49(1), 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.51743/pjer.49.1.75>
- Reyes, M., & Flores, P. (2022). *Instructional quality, learner support, and satisfaction in Alternative Learning System programs*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Research*, 12(1), 63–80.
- Sharma, R., & Srivastava, N. (2019). *Vocational education and training: An Indian perspective*. *Indian Journal of Adult Education*, 80(2), 14–30.
- Soares, L., & Lopes, M. (2020). *Instructional and human resource issues in Brazil's EJA program*. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 26(3), 244–260.
- Sumawang, K., Halili, J., & Vargas, P. (2023). *Educational disruption and participation in ALS programs*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Studies*, 18(2), 33–49.
- Torres, R., & Bautista, M. (2021). *Resource adequacy and instructional quality in Philippine Alternative Learning System centers*. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 50(3), 85–100. <https://doi.org/10.51743/pjer.50.3.85>
- Torres, R., & Dela Cruz, M. (2021). *Teacher performance and resource adequacy in ALS programs in the Philippines*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Research*, 10(3), 88–102. <https://doi.org/10.31235/apjer.10.3.88>
- Tran, H. (2021). *Vocational education effectiveness in Vietnam's Continuing Education Centers*. *Asian Journal of Vocational Education*, 7(2), 89–106.
- Tran, H., & Nguyen, P. (2021). *Continuing Education Centers and rural adult learners in Vietnam*. *International Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 40(5), 512–528.
- UNESCO. (2022). *Information and communication technologies (ICTs) in education: Policy and practice in low resource settings*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000375487>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/technology>
- UNICEF Philippines. (2023). *Education: Philippines fact sheet*. <https://www.unicef.org/philippines/media/7386/file/Education%20Fact-sheet.pdf>
- Villanueva, L., & Dela Cruz, J. (2022). *Teaching resources and learner engagement in alternative learning programs*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Research*, 12(3), 115–130. <https://doi.org/10.31235/apjer.12.3.115>
- Villanueva, L., & Reyes, J. (2022). *The impact of specialized training on ALS teacher performance and learner outcomes*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Research*, 11(2), 101–116. <https://doi.org/10.31235/apjer.11.2.101>