

Level of Implementation of Integrated Learning Experiences and its Effect on Grade 1 Learning Outcomes

Vilma S. Cangayo
University of Saint Anthony, Iriga City, Philippines
vilma.cangayo@deped.gov.ph

Date Submitted:

April 15, 2026

Date Accepted:

May 29, 2026

Date Published:

June 20, 2026

DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.20775772

ABSTRACT

This study determined the level of implementation of Integrated Learning Experiences (ILE) and its effect on Grade 1 learning outcomes in the 5th Congressional District of Camarines Sur during School Year 2025-2026. A descriptive-evaluative survey method was employed using a validated questionnaire. The respondents were 175 school heads and 300 Grade 1 teachers from public elementary schools, representing 100% of the target population. Data were analyzed using frequency distribution, percentage, weighted mean, a five-point rating scale, and the Mann-Whitney U test. Findings showed that the overall implementation of ILE was much evident ($M = 4.18$). Among the implementation dimensions, evaluation and assessment obtained the highest rating ($M = 4.21$, very much evident), followed by classroom management ($M = 4.19$), lesson implementation ($M = 4.18$), and planning for ILE lessons ($M = 4.14$), all interpreted as much evident. Significant differences were found in the assessment of school heads and teachers across the four implementation dimensions. In terms of learning outcomes, GMRC was rated much evident ($M = 3.86$), while Makabansa ($M = 3.33$), Mathematics ($M = 3.33$), Reading and Literacy ($M = 2.74$), and Language ($M = 2.71$) were moderately evident. No significant differences were found for Reading and Literacy, Language, and Makabansa, while significant differences were found for Mathematics and GMRC. Challenges in implementing ILE were rated very much challenging ($M = 4.21$), particularly the lack of adequate support systems and professional development. The study concludes that ILE is generally implemented, but stronger support, resources, professional development, and assessment practices are needed to maximize its effect on Grade 1 learning outcomes.

Keywords: *Grade 1 learning outcomes, integrated learning experiences, ILE implementation, MATATAG Curriculum, school heads, teachers*

INTRODUCTION

Schools are expected to provide meaningful and excellent educational opportunities that improve learner achievement and reduce learning gaps. In the early grades, this responsibility is especially important because foundational learning in literacy, numeracy, values, language, and cultural understanding shapes later academic development. The implementation of the K to 12 Basic Education Program and the continuing refinement of the MATATAG Curriculum emphasize the need for teaching approaches that respond to learners' varied needs and changing educational contexts.

Integrated Learning Experiences (ILE) are designed as an integrative teaching approach for early-grade learners. In Region V, the Curriculum and Learning Management Division developed ILE Learning Resource Packages for Grades 1, 2, and 3 to support teachers in delivering connected, active, and engaging instruction. ILE aligns with DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024, which underscores the need to enhance learning delivery and encourage teachers to adapt pedagogical strategies that keep learners effectively engaged.

The value of ILE lies in its focus on connecting concepts across learning areas. For Grade 1 learners, integration may help make lessons more meaningful because children can see how knowledge in Reading and Literacy, Language, Mathematics, Makabansa, and GMRC relates to everyday life. Integrated teaching also supports active learning, concrete experiences, collaboration, creativity, and holistic development. However, successful implementation depends on teachers' planning, classroom management, lesson delivery, assessment practices, and available support systems.

This study was anchored on Self-Efficacy Theory, Progressivism Theory, and Constructivism Theory. Self-efficacy explains why teachers' belief in their capacity to plan and implement instruction affects classroom practice. Progressivism emphasizes active learning and real-life experiences, while constructivism views learners as active builders of knowledge through meaningful experiences. These theories collectively support the relevance of ILE as a learner-centered, integrative, and experience-based teaching approach.

The study assessed the level of implementation of Integrated Learning Experiences and its effect on Grade 1 learning outcomes in the 5th Congressional District of Camarines Sur. It examined ILE implementation along planning for ILE lessons, classroom management, lesson implementation, and evaluation and assessment; assessed the effect of ILE on learning outcomes; determined differences in assessments; identified implementation challenges; and proposed strategies for Key Stage I teachers.

Literature Review

Integrated Learning Experiences and Early-Grade Learning

Integrated Learning Experiences connect concepts, skills, and values across subject areas to create a cohesive learning experience. In the early grades, integration is useful because young learners often understand ideas better when lessons are concrete, contextualized, and connected to real-life experiences. The source dissertation describes ILE as an integrative teaching approach under the MATATAG Curriculum that provides active, hands-on, and engaging learning opportunities.

The literature reviewed in the dissertation emphasizes that learner engagement is closely connected with learning outcomes and academic success. Traditional lecture-based instruction may limit participation, while integrated and active learning approaches help learners apply concepts, collaborate, and develop practical skills. Explicit teaching, clear goals, guided practice, and meaningful feedback are also essential in supporting learning outcomes.

For Grade 1, ILE is particularly relevant because foundational learning areas are interrelated. Reading and Literacy, Language, Mathematics, Makabansa, and GMRC can be connected through stories, activities, songs, local contexts, values formation, and concrete tasks. When learning areas are integrated appropriately, learners may develop a broader understanding of relationships among concepts and become more motivated to participate.

Teacher Implementation, Classroom Management, and Assessment

Effective ILE implementation requires careful lesson planning. Teachers need mastery of the lesson exemplar, appropriate worksheets, teaching aids, differentiated materials, and flexible sequencing. Planning also involves ensuring that a full cycle of integrative lessons is implemented within the required time frame and that tasks are suited to the abilities and readiness of Grade 1 learners.

Classroom management is another key component because early-grade learners need clear routines, instructions, transitions, and learning spaces. Integrated instruction often involves whole-class discussions, small-group work, independent practice, waiting activities, and interrelated tasks. Therefore, teachers must create orderly, safe, and engaging learning environments that support active participation.

Evaluation and assessment determine whether integrated lessons result in measurable learning. The dissertation emphasizes checking worksheets, recording scores, evaluating learner performance, monitoring completed activities, adapting assessment for non-readers, and using summative assessment when appropriate. These practices provide feedback to teachers, learners, school heads, and parents and support data-based improvement.

Learning Outcomes and Challenges in Integrated Instruction

Learning outcomes in this study were assessed in Reading and Literacy, Language, Mathematics, Makabansa, and GMRC. These areas reflect the foundational competencies expected of Grade 1 learners. Reading and Literacy focus on high-frequency words, comprehension, phonological awareness, and letter sounds. Language focuses on greetings, social expressions, personal experiences, symbols, drawings, and vocabulary. Mathematics focuses on counting, shapes, numerals, comparison, and problem solving.

Makabansa and GMRC emphasize cultural awareness, citizenship, values, social responsibility, respect, honesty, empathy, discipline, and responsible behavior. These outcomes are important because early education should develop learners not only academically but also socially, emotionally, and morally.

Despite its benefits, integrated instruction can be challenging. Teachers may find it difficult to link concepts across subjects, prepare materials, select appropriate learning models, master new competencies, manage additional workload, and secure adequate resources. The dissertation also identified the lack of support systems and professional development as a major challenge, showing that teachers need sustained institutional assistance to implement ILE effectively.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-evaluative survey method. This design was appropriate because it described the level of implementation of Integrated Learning Experiences, evaluated their perceived effect on Grade 1 learning outcomes, and examined differences in the assessments of school heads and Grade 1 teachers without manipulating any variables.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in public elementary schools in the 5th Congressional District of the Schools Division Office of Camarines Sur, Region V, Philippines, during School Year 2025-2026. The locale was appropriate because the region implemented the Integrated Learning Experiences as an integrative teaching approach for early-grade learners.

Respondents and Sampling Technique

The respondents were 175 school heads and 300 Grade 1 teachers from public elementary schools in the 5th Congressional District of Camarines Sur. The study used the full target population or 100% of the identified respondents. This produced a total of 475 respondents who assessed the implementation of ILE and its effect on learning outcomes.

Table 1. *Respondents of the Study*

| Respondent group | Number | Role in the study |
|------------------|--------|---|
| School heads | 175 | Assessed the level of ILE implementation and its effect on Grade 1 learning outcomes from a supervisory perspective |
| Grade 1 teachers | 300 | Assessed the level of ILE implementation, learning outcomes, and challenges based on classroom practice |
| Total | 475 | Represented 100% of the target population in the selected public elementary schools |

Research Instrument

A validated researcher-made questionnaire served as the primary data-gathering instrument. The questionnaire measured the level of implementation of Integrated Learning Experiences along planning for ILE lessons, classroom management, lesson implementation, and evaluation and assessment. It also measured the effect of ILE on Grade 1 learning outcomes in Reading and Literacy, Language, Mathematics, Makabansa, and GMRC, as well as the challenges encountered in implementation.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher secured the necessary permission before administering the questionnaire to school heads and Grade 1 teachers. The respondents were oriented regarding the purpose of the study and were asked to provide honest assessments based on their knowledge and experience with ILE implementation. The collected responses were tallied, tabulated, and prepared for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Frequency distribution and percentage were used to summarize respondent-related data when applicable. Weighted mean and a five-point rating scale were used to interpret the level of implementation, effect on learning outcomes, and challenges. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine significant differences between the assessments of school heads and teachers and to test differences in perceived effects on learning outcomes. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

Ethical Consideration

The study observed voluntary participation, confidentiality, and responsible handling of data. Respondents' answers were used only for academic purposes and were reported in aggregate form. The final journal submission should include the confirmed institutional ethics-review or approval reference number if required by the journal.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Implementation of Integrated Learning Experiences

The overall implementation of Integrated Learning Experiences was rated much evident, with an average weighted mean of 4.18. Evaluation and assessment obtained the highest mean of 4.21 and was interpreted as very much evident. Classroom management obtained a mean of 4.19, lesson implementation obtained 4.18, and planning for ILE lessons obtained 4.14, all interpreted as much evident. These results indicate that ILE was generally implemented in the selected Grade 1 classrooms, particularly in assessment-related practices.

Table 2. *Summary of the Level of Implementation of Integrated Learning Experiences*

| Implementation dimension | School heads WM | Teachers WM | Average WM | Verbal interpretation | Rank |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------------|------|
| Evaluation and Assessment | 4.18 | 4.23 | 4.21 | Very Much Evident | 1 |
| Classroom Management | 4.16 | 4.22 | 4.19 | Much Evident | 2 |
| Lesson Implementation | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.18 | Much Evident | 3 |
| Planning for ILE Lessons | 4.09 | 4.19 | 4.14 | Much Evident | 4 |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.14 | 4.22 | 4.18 | Much Evident | |

The stronger result for evaluation and assessment suggests that teachers and school heads observed regular checking of worksheets, recording of scores, use of summative assessments when appropriate, and monitoring of learner activities. The comparatively lower rating for planning suggests a need to strengthen preparation of materials, lesson sequencing, and differentiation for diverse ability groups.

Difference in the Implementation Assessments of School Heads and Teachers

Mann-Whitney U test results showed significant differences between the assessments of school heads and teachers in all four implementation dimensions. The null hypothesis was rejected for planning for ILE lessons, classroom management, lesson implementation, and evaluation and assessment. This means that school heads and teachers differed significantly in how they assessed ILE implementation.

Table 3. *Difference in the Implementation of Integrated Learning Experiences*

| Component | U1 | U2 | N1 | N2 | Critical U | Decision | Conclusion |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|------------|-----------|-------------|
| Planning for ILE Lessons | 49 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 8 | Reject Ho | Significant |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------|-----|---|---|---|-----------|-------------|
| Classroom Management | 45 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 8 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Lesson Implementation | 48.5 | 0.5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Evaluation and Assessment | 45 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 8 | Reject Ho | Significant |

The significant differences may reflect the different roles of the respondents. Teachers directly implement ILE in classrooms, while school heads assess implementation through supervision and monitoring. These distinct vantage points can produce different judgments about actual implementation quality.

Effect of Integrated Learning Experiences on Grade 1 Learning Outcomes

The overall effect of Integrated Learning Experiences on Grade 1 learning outcomes was moderately evident, with an average weighted mean of 3.19. GMRC obtained the highest mean of 3.86, interpreted as much evident. Makabansa and Mathematics both obtained 3.33, while Reading and Literacy and Language obtained 2.74 and 2.71, respectively. These findings show that ILE appeared to have stronger perceived effects on values-related and citizenship-related outcomes than on early literacy and language competencies.

Table 4. *Summary of the Effect of ILE on Grade 1 Learning Outcomes*

| Learning outcome area | School heads WM | Teachers WM | Average WM | Verbal interpretation | Rank |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------|------|
| Good Manners and Right Conduct | 3.81 | 3.91 | 3.86 | Much Evident | 1 |
| Mathematics | 3.10 | 3.56 | 3.33 | Moderately Evident | 2.5 |
| Makabansa | 3.12 | 3.53 | 3.33 | Moderately Evident | 2.5 |
| Reading and Literacy | 2.62 | 2.86 | 2.74 | Moderately Evident | 4 |
| Language | 2.65 | 2.76 | 2.71 | Moderately Evident | 5 |
| Average Weighted Mean | 3.06 | 3.32 | 3.19 | Moderately Evident | |

The high rating for GMRC suggests that integrated lessons may effectively support values formation, honesty, respect, empathy, discipline, and responsible behavior. In contrast, Reading and Literacy and Language received the lowest means, indicating that early literacy and language development need more targeted reinforcement within integrated instruction.

Difference in the Effect of ILE on Grade 1 Learning Outcomes

The Mann-Whitney U test showed no significant differences in the perceived effects of ILE on Reading and Literacy, Language, and Makabansa. However, significant differences were found for Mathematics and GMRC. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted for Reading and Literacy, Language, and Makabansa, but rejected for Mathematics and GMRC.

Table 5. *Difference in the Effect of ILE on Grade 1 Learning Outcomes*

| Learning outcome area | U1 | U2 | N1 | N2 | Critical U | Decision | Conclusion |
|-----------------------|------|------|----|----|------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Reading and Literacy | 40 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 13 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Language | 40 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 13 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| Mathematics | 60 | 11 | 8 | 8 | 13 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Makabansa | 48.5 | 18.5 | 8 | 8 | 13 | Accept Ho | Not Significant |
| GMRC | 57 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 13 | Reject Ho | Significant |

The significant differences in Mathematics and GMRC suggest that school heads and teachers may have viewed the effect of ILE differently in these areas. This may be because mathematics outcomes require concrete evidence of numeracy development, while GMRC outcomes are often observed through behavior, participation, and classroom routines.

Challenges Encountered in Implementing Integrated Learning Experiences

The challenges encountered in implementing ILE were rated very much challenging overall, with an average weighted mean of 4.21. The highest-rated challenge was the lack of adequate support systems and professional development for teachers ($M = 4.25$). This was followed by inadequate resources, including instructional materials and technology ($M = 4.22$). These findings indicate that ILE implementation requires more institutional support, training, resource provision, and workload management.

Table 6. *Summary of Challenges in ILE Implementation*

| Challenge | School heads WM | Teachers WM | Average WM | Interpretation | Rank |
|--|-----------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------|------|
| Lack of adequate support systems and professional development for teachers | 4.19 | 4.30 | 4.25 | Very Much Challenging | 1 |
| Inadequate resources, including instructional materials and technology | 4.18 | 4.26 | 4.22 | Very Much Challenging | 2 |
| Limited knowledge across disciplines to create meaningful integrated lessons | 4.17 | 4.25 | 4.21 | Very Much Challenging | 3.5 |
| Time-consuming process of integrating subjects, preparing materials, and executing lessons | 4.14 | 4.27 | 4.21 | Very Much Challenging | 3.5 |
| Difficulty linking concepts between different subjects | 4.16 | 4.23 | 4.20 | Very Much Challenging | 5.5 |
| Increased workload demands | 4.15 | 4.25 | 4.20 | Very Much Challenging | 5.5 |
| Difficulty selecting effective learning models, methods, and strategies | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.18 | Much Challenging | 7 |
| Lack of familiarity with new curriculum competencies | 4.12 | 4.21 | 4.17 | Much Challenging | 8 |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.21 | Very Much Challenging | |

The results show that teachers need more than lesson exemplars. They need continuous mentoring, accessible instructional materials, technology support, collaboration time, and training on how to link competencies across learning areas. Without these supports, ILE may be implemented, but its effect on learner outcomes may remain uneven.

Proposed Strategies in Integrated Learning Experiences for Key Stage I Teachers

Based on the findings, a strategy matrix is proposed to strengthen ILE implementation and improve Grade 1 learning outcomes. The strategies focus on the dimensions with lower ratings and the challenges rated as very much challenging.

Table 7. *Proposed Strategy Matrix for Strengthening ILE Implementation*

| Priority area | Basis from findings | Suggested strategies | Expected outcome |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| Professional development | Lack of support and professional development was the highest challenge. | Conduct regular LAC sessions, demonstration teaching, coaching, and mentoring focused on ILE planning, integration, and assessment. | Teachers become more confident and competent in designing and implementing integrated lessons. |
| Instructional resources | Inadequate resources and technology were very much challenging. | Provide ready-to-use activity sheets, manipulatives, story materials, local examples, and digital resources aligned with MATATAG competencies. | Teachers have adequate materials for active and connected Grade 1 learning. |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Planning for ILE lessons | Planning received the lowest implementation mean. | Use collaborative planning, lesson mapping, theme-based integration, and differentiated tasks for different ability groups. | ILE lessons become more coherent, learner-centered, and manageable. |
| Reading and Language outcomes | Reading and Literacy and Language received the lowest learning-outcome means. | Integrate explicit phonological awareness, vocabulary, storytelling, guided reading, oral language practice, and mother tongue bridging within ILE. | Early literacy and language outcomes are strengthened. |
| Assessment and feedback | Evaluation and assessment was strong but needs sustained monitoring. | Use formative checks, worksheet review, oral assessments, observation notes, and parent feedback to monitor learning progress. | Teachers use evidence to adjust instruction and support struggling learners. |
| Workload management | Teachers viewed integration as time-consuming and workload-increasing. | Create shared lesson banks, peer resource folders, team teaching support, and simplified monitoring templates. | Teachers experience more manageable implementation demands. |

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the Integrated Learning Experiences were implemented at a generally much evident level in the 5th Congressional District of Camarines Sur. Planning for ILE lessons, classroom management, and lesson implementation were much evident, while evaluation and assessment was very much evident. These findings show that Grade 1 teachers and school heads recognized the actual use of ILE practices in classrooms.

There were significant differences between the assessments of school heads and teachers across all implementation dimensions. This indicates that the two respondent groups viewed ILE implementation differently, likely because of their distinct roles in classroom implementation and instructional supervision.

The perceived effect of ILE on Grade 1 learning outcomes was moderately evident overall. GMRC was the strongest learning-outcome area, while Reading and Literacy and Language were the weakest. No significant differences were found for Reading and Literacy, Language, and Makabansa, while significant differences were found for Mathematics and GMRC. These results suggest that ILE supports values and citizenship outcomes more visibly, but early literacy and language outcomes require stronger targeted instruction within integrated lessons.

The challenges in ILE implementation were very much challenging, especially the lack of support systems and professional development, inadequate resources, interdisciplinary lesson preparation, time demands, and increased workload. Therefore, effective ILE implementation requires sustained professional support, adequate materials, collaborative planning, and stronger monitoring of learner outcomes.

Recommendation

Teachers should continue implementing Integrated Learning Experiences while strengthening lesson planning, interdisciplinary connections, and differentiated activities for Grade 1 learners. Greater attention should be given to Reading and Literacy and Language because these areas obtained the lowest outcome ratings. Teachers may integrate explicit reading instruction, oral language development, vocabulary building, and formative feedback into ILE activities.

School heads should provide instructional supervision, coaching, and regular monitoring to support teachers in implementing ILE. They may organize school-based Learning Action Cell sessions focused on lesson integration, assessment practices, classroom management, and preparation of learning materials. They should also help reduce workload by encouraging collaborative preparation of lesson resources.

The Schools Division Office, Education Program Supervisors, and DepEd Regional Office V should provide sustained professional development, adequate instructional resources, technology support, and clear

monitoring tools for ILE implementation. Capability-building activities should focus on interdisciplinary lesson design, literacy integration, assessment of Grade 1 learning outcomes, and strategies for struggling learners.

Parents and community stakeholders should be encouraged to support Grade 1 learners by reinforcing reading, language, numeracy, values, and cultural learning at home and in the community. Future researchers may conduct similar studies in other districts or divisions, examine learner-level achievement data, and evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed strategies after implementation.

References

- Anwar, K. (2020). Explicit teaching and structured learning in basic education. *Journal of Educational Practice*, 11(4), 44-52.
- Ansong, D., et al. (2024). Teacher support and learner outcomes in classroom instruction. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 19(2), 35-48.
- Bao, Y., et al. (2022). Teacher engagement, self-efficacy, and learner success in language learning contexts. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 112, Article 103642.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2021). *Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Department of Education. (2024). DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum. Department of Education. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>
- Garad, A. A. (2019). Knowledge, perception, practices, and challenges of assessment for learning. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 24(6), 21-33.
- Hughes, C. A., Morris, J. R., Therrien, W. J., & Benson, S. K. (2019). Explicit instruction: Historical and contemporary contexts. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 34(3), 140-148.
- Inayat, A., & Ali, A. Z. (2020). Influence of teaching style on students' engagement, curiosity and exploration in the classroom. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 7(1), 87-102.
- Kanya, N. (2021). Factors affecting teacher performance in basic education. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 3(2), 89-99.
- Koçak, O., Göksu, I., & Göktepe, Y. (2021). The factors affecting academic achievement: A systematic review of meta-analyses. *International Online Journal of Education*, 8(1), 480-484.
- Marinda, L. (2019). Teachers' knowledge and planning for instruction. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 60(14), 172-179.
- Martinez, I., et al. (2019). Theory and application of integrated learning. *Philippine Journal of Elementary Education*, 9(2), 88-93.
- Merlo, M. (2022). Teacher performance and learner academic success. *Journal of Educational Development*, 14(2), 55-67.
- Milanković, J. (2022). Attitudes of elementary school students and teachers towards integrative teaching model. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 55(11), 36-47.
- Naatonis, R. N., Masitoh, S., & Nursalim, M. (2022). Perspectives on the philosophy of education: Progressivism in learning models. *Journal Studi Keislaman*, 13(2), 127-133.
- Oliver, K. M. (2020). Methods for developing constructivist learning on the web. *Educational Technology*, 40(9), 48-51.
- Padillo, G. (2021). Teacher challenges and innovative teaching practices in basic education. *Journal of Teacher Education and Research*, 16(1), 18-30.
- Regional Memorandum No. 01162, s. 2024. Guidelines in the implementation of the Integrated Learning Experiences (ILE) as an integrative teaching approach for early-grade learners in Region V. Department of Education Regional Office V. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>
- Renninger, K. A., & Bachrach, J. E. (2022). Studying triggers for interest and engagement using observational methods. *Educational Psychologist*, 57(1), 12-28.
- Santos, D., & Revilla, S. (2022). Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing and improving assessment. *Journal of Organizational and Educational Leadership*, 15(3), 33-37.
- Sarmiento, R. C. (2022). Parental involvement in values formation: Implications for home-school collaboration. *The Educator's Forum*, 11(2), 25-37.
- Sharma, P., et al. (2023). Active learning and learner engagement in contemporary classrooms. *Journal of Learning Innovation*, 8(1), 15-29.
- Spencer, M., et al. (2022). Early oral language skills and reading development: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Child Language*, 49(10), 512-519.

- Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2021). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(14), 543-578.
- Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(2), 51-55.
- Zitha, I., et al. (2023). Learner engagement and academic success in integrated learning environments. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 12(1), 21-34.