

Familial Support System and Program Delivery of Students with Special Needs: Basis for Intervention Plan

Michael John G. Espenilla

Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila Campus

michaeljohnespenilla9@gmail.com

Date Submitted:

March 11, 2026

Date Accepted:

June 26, 2026

Date Published:

August 10, 2026

DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.21876858

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the familial support system and program delivery for students with special needs and used the findings as the basis for an intervention plan. A descriptive research design was employed with 240 respondents from selected public elementary schools in the Schools Division Office–Manila, consisting of five school administrators, 45 Special Education teachers, 174 receiving teachers, and 16 parents. Data were gathered through a researcher-made survey instrument and analyzed using percentage, weighted mean, analysis of variance, and Pearson product-moment correlation; Slovin’s formula was used in determining the sample for receiving teachers. Findings showed that familial support was generally evident across academic, social, economic, life skills, cultural, and spiritual dimensions, with parents consistently giving higher assessments than school personnel and significant differences observed

across respondent groups. Program delivery was highly delivered in socio-emotional, aesthetic and creative, and behavioral development, while the cognitive domain was delivered. Most relationships between familial support and program delivery were not significant; however, economic support and spiritual support were significantly associated with the cognitive domain. Problems in both familial support and program delivery were generally least encountered. The study concludes that family support and school program delivery are both important but not uniformly aligned across stakeholders. The proposed RISE Intervention—Reinforcing Inclusive Support Through Family Engagement—provides a structured basis for strengthening home-school collaboration and holistic support for learners with special needs.

Keywords: *familial support system, program delivery, students with special needs, inclusive education, home-school collaboration, intervention plan*

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education requires coordinated support from schools and families because learners with special needs develop within both educational and home environments. In the source manuscript, familial support is defined across academic, social, economic, life skills, cultural, and spiritual dimensions, while program delivery refers to school-based services that address socio-emotional, cognitive, aesthetic and creative, and behavioral development. This multidimensional framing is consistent with studies that connect parental involvement, family attributes, and familial support with academic performance, resilience, and broader learner development (Agbayani & Singson, 2024; Bautista & Mendoza, 2024; Bendijo et al., 2025; Wang & Li, 2025).

Within public-school special education settings, family involvement may take the form of reinforcing learning at home, providing emotional encouragement, meeting practical and economic needs, supporting life skills, and advocating for the learner. Research listed in the manuscript also situates social support, household support, and family-school cooperation as relevant to well-being, motivation, and educational participation

(Caparas & Atienza, 2024; Del Rosario & Santos, 2024; Liquigan, 2025; Reyes & Reyes, 2023). These perspectives support the need to examine family support not as a single behavior but as a system of complementary forms of assistance.

Program delivery is equally important because inclusive education depends on the quality and consistency with which individualized and specially designed instruction is implemented. Literature included in the source emphasizes social-emotional interventions, specially designed instruction, and family-school collaboration in special education service systems (Hassani & Schwab, 2021; Sayeski et al., 2022; Ahmad, 2023; Carter & Jenkins, 2022). The study therefore treats program delivery as a set of developmental domains rather than only as academic instruction.

Despite the recognized importance of both family support and school-based services, the manuscript identifies a local research gap concerning how these components interact and how their assessment differs among school administrators, Special Education teachers, receiving teachers, and parents. The present study addressed this gap by assessing the six domains of familial support, comparing stakeholder assessments, determining the extent of program delivery, examining relationships between familial support and program delivery, identifying problems encountered, and developing an intervention plan that responds to the findings. The study is particularly relevant to selected public elementary schools in the Schools Division Office–Manila, where home-school coordination is central to sustaining inclusive education for learners with special needs.

Literature Review

Familial Support and Learner Development

The literature assembled in the source manuscript presents familial support as a broad influence on academic, emotional, and social development. Studies on parental involvement and support address academic performance, life skills, and learner resilience, while research on family attributes similarly examines outcomes for children with special educational needs (Agbayani & Singson, 2024; Ancheta & Casem, 2025; Bautista & Mendoza, 2024; Bendijo et al., 2025). Juguilon (2023) also places the family support system in direct relation to the academic performance of elementary pupils, reinforcing the relevance of examining concrete support practices within basic education.

Family support also operates through social and psychological pathways. Caparas and Atienza (2024), Del Rosario and Santos (2024), Magallanes and Tanhueco (2024), and Reyes and Reyes (2023) examine social support in relation to stress, quality of life, psychological well-being, and belongingness. These studies collectively support the manuscript's treatment of social support as part of a wider familial system that may reinforce learner confidence, emotional stability, and participation. For students with special needs, such support may complement rather than replace formal educational services.

Economic, Life Skills, Cultural, and Spiritual Dimensions of Support

The source literature extends familial support beyond academic assistance. Garcia and Tolentino (2024) and Santos (2021) focus on economic support and academic outcomes, while Paderes and Marasigan (2024) and Pascual (2024) connect family support and life-skills modeling with learners' self-efficacy and decision-making. Esplana (2022) likewise examines parental involvement and essential life skills in supporting primary pupils. These studies justify the inclusion of economic and life-skills dimensions because families often provide both material resources and practical routines that help learners participate in school and develop independence.

Cultural and spiritual support are also represented in the manuscript as meaningful family domains. Avital and Ben Shlomo (2026) examine emotional support in parent-child relationships, while Taher et al. (2025) consider social support and spiritual well-being in family caregiving. Within the study, cultural and spiritual support are not treated as substitutes for instruction; rather, they form part of the home context in which learners receive values, identity, encouragement, and caregiving. This broader view is appropriate for examining support among families of learners with special needs whose educational experiences often require continuity between school routines and family life.

Inclusive Program Delivery for Students with Special Needs

Effective program delivery in special education requires services that are responsive to learner diversity and are implemented consistently across developmental domains. Hassani and Schwab (2021) synthesize social-emotional learning interventions for students with special educational needs, while Sayeski et al. (2022) operationalize specially designed instruction as a core component of special education services. Macalino (2021) further addresses transitional challenges and psychoeducational strategies for learners with special needs. Together, these works support the study's focus on socio-emotional, cognitive, aesthetic and creative, and behavioral development as complementary areas of program delivery.

Program delivery is also shaped by the experiences of families navigating special education systems. Carter and Jenkins (2022) examine the experiences of low-income parents within special education service delivery, while Ahmad (2023) focuses on collaborative family-school models in individualized education program outcomes. These studies support the premise that effective delivery depends not only on teachers and school resources but also on communication with families. When educational plans are understood and reinforced across settings, learners are better positioned to receive consistent support.

Home-School Partnership and Family Empowerment

Family empowerment is a recurring theme in the literature relevant to the study. Sinco (2022) examines the experiences of marginalized families in special education, highlighting the importance of participation and empowerment in school contexts. Ahmad (2023) and Carter and Jenkins (2022) similarly frame family-school collaboration as central to the implementation of individualized services. These perspectives align with the study's concern that parents and school personnel may assess familial support differently even when both groups are working toward the same learner outcomes.

The literature therefore points toward intervention approaches that combine family engagement, communication, practical support, and school-based professional practice rather than relying on a single intervention. The study's proposed RISE Intervention is consistent with this integrated orientation because it combines parent empowerment, family-school partnership activities, socio-emotional support, community resource linkage, cultural and spiritual education, creative opportunities, and behavior monitoring. This structure reflects the study's multidimensional definition of both familial support and program delivery and provides a practical bridge between the reviewed literature and the empirical findings.

Conceptual Basis of the Study

The study conceptually links six dimensions of familial support—academic, social, economic, life skills, cultural, and spiritual support—with four domains of program delivery—socio-emotional, cognitive, aesthetic and creative, and behavioral development. Assessments from school administrators, Special Education teachers, receiving teachers, and parents are compared, and the observed relationships and problems serve as the empirical basis for the proposed RISE Intervention.

METHODS

Research Design

The study used a descriptive research design to describe, compare, and interpret the familial support system and program delivery for students with special needs as the basis for an intervention plan. The design was appropriate because the study examined conditions and stakeholder assessments as they existed without manipulating variables. It also permitted comparison among respondent groups and the examination of relationships between the measured support dimensions and program-delivery domains.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in selected public elementary schools under the Schools Division Office–Manila. Participating schools included Jose Rizal Elementary School, Gen. Vicente Lim Elementary School, Amado Hernandez Elementary School, Magat Salamat Elementary School, Isabelo Delo Reyes Elementary School, Rosauro Almario Elementary School, Timoteo Paez Integrated School–Elementary, Barrio Obrero Elementary School, Gen. Maximino Hizon Elementary School, and P. Gomez Elementary School. These schools provided representation from both special education and receiving-classroom contexts.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The population consisted of 497 potential respondents from four stakeholder groups. The final sample included 240 respondents: five school administrators, 45 Special Education teachers, 174 receiving teachers, and 16 parents of students with special needs. School administrators were completely represented, while purposive sampling was used to select respondents based on their knowledge and experience of the study context. Slovin's formula was used in determining the sample size for receiving teachers. The resulting sample represented 48.29% of the identified population.

Table 1. *Population and Sample of Respondents*

Respondent Group	Population	Sample	Percentage
School Administrators	5	5	100.00
Special Education Teachers	64	45	70.31
Receiving Teachers	308	174	56.49
Parents	120	16	13.33
Total	497	240	48.29

Research Instrument

Data were gathered using a researcher-made survey instrument. The instrument assessed the familial support system in terms of academic, social, economic, life skills, cultural, and spiritual support; program delivery in terms of socio-emotional, cognitive, aesthetic and creative, and behavioral development; and the problems encountered in familial support and program delivery.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher-made survey instrument was administered to the identified stakeholder groups across the participating schools. Responses from school administrators, Special Education teachers, receiving teachers, and parents were consolidated, encoded, and prepared for descriptive and inferential analysis.

Data Analysis

Percentage and weighted mean were used to summarize respondent characteristics and stakeholder assessments. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to test differences among the four respondent groups in their assessment of familial support. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to examine the relationship between each familial-support dimension and each program-delivery domain. The study interpreted inferential results at the 0.05 level of significance; the reported critical F value was 2.866, while the reported critical t value for the correlation tests was 2.262.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Familial Support System

Across all six dimensions, familial support was assessed as evident. Parents consistently provided the highest mean ratings, ranging from 4.66 for academic support to 4.83 for spiritual support, whereas school personnel generally rated the same dimensions within the evident range. The composite means ranged from 4.06 to 4.14, showing that academic, social, economic, life skills, cultural, and spiritual support were all present in the

experience of learners with special needs. The pattern supports the multidimensional framing of family support found in the literature, where academic assistance, material resources, life-skills modeling, and social-emotional support are treated as complementary family contributions (Agbayani & Singson, 2024; Bautista & Mendoza, 2024; Esplana, 2022; Garcia & Tolentino, 2024).

Table 2. Assessment of the Familial Support System

Dimension	Administrators	Receiving Teachers	SNED Teachers	Parents	Composite Mean
Academic Support	4.18	3.73	3.67	4.66	4.06
Social Support	4.10	3.83	3.87	4.72	4.13
Economic Support	4.00	3.84	3.69	4.73	4.07
Life Skills Support	3.98	3.84	3.73	4.72	4.07
Cultural Support	4.20	3.81	3.75	4.80	4.14
Spiritual Support	3.90	3.91	3.74	4.83	4.09

The consistently higher parental ratings indicate a perceptual gap between families and school personnel. This difference does not necessarily mean that one group is inaccurate; rather, it suggests that stakeholders may observe different aspects of support or use different standards when judging its consistency. The ANOVA results confirmed statistically significant differences in all six dimensions. The reported F values ranged from 51.5849 to 1256.062, all above the critical F value of 2.866. These findings reinforce the need for shared expectations and clearer home-school communication, a concern also reflected in family-school partnership literature (Ahmad, 2023; Carter & Jenkins, 2022; Sinco, 2022).

Table 3. Significant Differences in Familial Support Assessments

Dimension	F Value	Critical F	Decision
Academic Support	51.6432	2.866	Significant
Social Support	62.5128	2.866	Significant
Economic Support	89.4268	2.866	Significant
Life Skills Support	85.0768	2.866	Significant
Cultural Support	1256.062	2.866	Significant
Spiritual Support	51.5849	2.866	Significant

Program Delivery for Students with Special Needs

Program delivery was assessed positively across all four developmental domains. Socio-emotional development obtained the highest composite mean of 4.36 and was rated Highly Delivered. Aesthetic and creative development (4.28) and behavioral development (4.27) were likewise Highly Delivered, while the cognitive domain obtained a composite mean of 4.17 and was rated Delivered. Parents again provided the highest ratings in each domain. The results indicate that participating schools were implementing a broad set of supports rather than concentrating exclusively on academic outcomes.

Table 4. Extent of Program Delivery for Students with Special Needs

Domain	Administrators	Receiving Teachers	SNED Teachers	Parents	Composite Mean	Interpretation
Socio-Emotional	4.16	4.13	4.24	4.89	4.36	Highly Delivered
Cognitive	3.52	4.08	4.28	4.80	4.17	Delivered
Aesthetic and Creative	3.82	4.13	4.30	4.87	4.28	Highly Delivered
Behavioral Development	3.82	4.17	4.26	4.83	4.27	Highly Delivered

The comparatively lower cognitive rating, particularly from administrators (3.52), identifies an area for continued attention even though the domain remained positively assessed overall. The result is consistent with the literature's emphasis on specially designed instruction and coordinated educational services for learners with

special needs (Hassani & Schwab, 2021; Sayeski et al., 2022; Macalino, 2021). The strong ratings in socio-emotional and behavioral domains also underscore the importance of inclusive programming that addresses well-being and adjustment in addition to academic learning.

Relationship Between Familial Support and Program Delivery

The correlation analysis showed that most relationships between familial support dimensions and program-delivery domains were negligible to moderate and were not statistically significant. For the socio-emotional domain, coefficients ranged from -0.45 to 0.08; for the aesthetic and creative domain, from -0.37 to 0.36; and for behavioral development, from -0.34 to 0.16. These findings suggest that the presence of family support does not automatically translate into higher ratings of every school-based developmental domain.

Table 5. *Correlations Between Familial Support and Program Delivery Domains*

Familial Support	Socio-Emotional	Cognitive	Aesthetic/Creative	Behavioral
Academic Support	-0.17	0.61	-0.37	-0.34
Social Support	-0.34	0.48	0.35	-0.18
Economic Support	-0.45	0.70*	0.32	0.06
Life Skills Support	-0.44	0.43	0.36	-0.19
Cultural Support	-0.22	-0.08	0.02	0.14
Spiritual Support	0.08	-0.69*	0.08	0.16

*Significant relationship at the reported 0.05 level based on the study's t-test of the obtained correlation coefficient.

Only economic support ($r = 0.70$; $t = 2.76$) and spiritual support ($r = -0.69$; $t = -2.68$) showed significant relationships with the cognitive domain because their absolute t values exceeded the reported critical value of 2.262. The positive relationship for economic support suggests that access to material and financial support may accompany stronger cognitive program outcomes, whereas the negative relationship for spiritual support indicates an inverse association in this dataset that should be interpreted cautiously and not as evidence of causation. The broader pattern is consistent with literature showing that family support may relate to educational outcomes through multiple pathways and that school and environmental factors remain important (Santos, 2021; Wang & Li, 2025; Taher et al., 2025).

Problems Encountered and Proposed RISE Intervention

Problems encountered in both major components were generally assessed as least encountered. The grand mean for problems in the familial support system was 2.31, while the grand mean for program-delivery problems was 2.24. Although these findings indicate that difficulties were manageable overall, the variation among stakeholder groups and the significant perceptual differences in familial support suggest that communication, resource access, and family participation still require attention.

Table 6. *Summary of Problems Encountered*

Area	Administrators	Receiving Teachers	SNED Teachers	Parents	Grand Mean
Familial Support System	2.08	2.50	3.19	1.47	2.31
Program Delivery	2.12	2.64	2.98	1.23	2.24

In response, the study proposed the RISE Intervention: Reinforcing Inclusive Support Through Family Engagement. The intervention combines quarterly parent empowerment seminars and family-school partnership days, monthly socio-emotional workshops, semester-based partnerships with local government units and non-government organizations for economic and nutritional support, parent education modules on cultural and spiritual values, creative and artistic activities, and continuous behavior monitoring with parent coaching. These components directly reflect the study's identified support domains and developmental outcomes and are consistent with the literature's emphasis on family empowerment, coordinated special education services, and multidimensional support (Ahmad, 2023; Sinco, 2022; Paderes & Marasigan, 2024; Pascual, 2024).

Table 7. *Core Components of the RISE Intervention*

Component	Key Activity	Schedule/Focus
Parent Empowerment	Parent empowerment seminars and family-school partnership days	Quarterly
Socio-Emotional Support	Learner and family socio-emotional workshops	Monthly
Community Resource Linkage	Partnerships with LGUs and NGOs for economic and nutritional needs	Per semester
Cultural and Spiritual Support	Parent education modules on cultural and spiritual values	Integrated sessions
Aesthetic and Creative Development	Creative and artistic programs for self-expression	School-based activities
Behavior Support	Behavior monitoring and parent coaching	Continuous

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that familial support for learners with special needs is generally evident across academic, social, economic, life skills, cultural, and spiritual dimensions, while school program delivery is delivered to highly delivered across socio-emotional, cognitive, aesthetic and creative, and behavioral domains. Parents consistently assessed familial support and program delivery more favorably than school personnel, and the significant differences across all familial-support dimensions demonstrate that stakeholders do not share identical perceptions of the support being provided. These differences make alignment and communication an important practical concern even when support is generally present.

Familial support showed only limited significant relationships with program delivery. Most correlations were not significant, with significant associations appearing only between economic support and cognitive development and between spiritual support and cognitive development. The findings therefore indicate that family support is important but does not independently account for all aspects of school program delivery. The RISE Intervention provides a relevant contribution by translating the identified gaps into coordinated activities that strengthen family engagement, home-school communication, community resource linkage, and holistic learner support.

Recommendation

The Schools Division Office–Manila and participating schools may consider adopting the RISE Intervention and integrating its activities into existing special education priorities and school improvement mechanisms. School administrators, SPED coordinators, Special Education teachers, and receiving teachers may establish regular communication structures with families, clarify stakeholder roles, integrate family participation into individualized educational support, and monitor implementation using agreed school-based indicators. Parents may be supported through capability-building activities that strengthen academic, emotional, behavioral, cultural, spiritual, and life-skills support at home.

Community stakeholders, including barangay units, local government units, and non-government organizations, may be engaged to extend economic, referral, therapy, counseling, nutritional, and other resource support where needed. Future research may examine the same variables using broader samples, additional school divisions, or designs that can better explain why stakeholder perceptions differ and why only selected familial-support dimensions were associated with cognitive program delivery. Continued monitoring and evaluation are recommended so that interventions remain responsive to the developmental and educational needs of learners with special needs.

References

- Agbayani, J. R., & Singson, M. P. (2024). Parental involvement in students' academic performance and life skills: A basis for collaborative training program. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 14(4), 214–229.
- Ahmad, S. Z. (2023). Collaborative models: Examining the efficacy of family-school partnerships in individualized education program (IEP) outcomes for students with autism spectrum disorder [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Ancheta, O., & Casem, R. Q. (2025). Parental support: Its influence to the learners' academic performance. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 4(3), 82–95.
- Avital, D., & Ben Shlomo, S. (2026). The role of attachment in emotional support provision in adult child–parent relationships: A dyadic response surface analysis. *Behavioral Sciences*, 16(1), 106. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs16010106>
- Bautista, R. J., & Mendoza, L. C. (2024). The role of familial support systems in the academic and emotional resilience of Filipino learners: A mixed-methods analysis. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research and Innovation*, 2(1), 45–58.
- Bendijo, M. J., Pinili, L., Mangubat, R., & Calasang, V. (2025). Influence of family attributes on academic outcomes for children with special educational needs. *International Journal of Social Sciences and English Literature*, 9(1), 34–38.
- Caparas, M. V., & Atienza, C. J. (2024). Social support and mental health: The mediating role of perceived stress. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1330720. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1330720>
- Carter, L. M., & Jenkins, R. B. (2022). 'We are the bridge': A phenomenological study of low-income parents navigating special education program delivery systems [Master's thesis, University of Texas at Austin]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Del Rosario, M. K., & Santos, P. L. (2024). Perceived social support and its relationship to the quality of life among Filipino young adults: A correlational study. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(4), 182–195.
- Esplana, M. K. S. (2022). Parental involvement, essential life skills, struggles and coping strategies in assisting primary pupils. *International Review of Social Sciences Research*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/10.53378/352905>
- Garcia, A. M., & Tolentino, E. J. (2024). The impact of familial economic scaffolding on the academic resilience of Filipino tertiary students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(2), 412–425.
- Hassani, S., & Schwab, S. (2021). Social-emotional learning interventions for students with special educational needs: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 808566. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.808566>
- Juguilon. (2023). Impact of family support system in the academic performance of Grade 3 pupils at a public elementary school in Rizal, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(1), 174–187. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.01.16>
- Liquigan, R. M. (2025). The influence of home environment and social support on motivation to learn of senior high school students. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(4).
- Macalino, M. D. (2021). Transitional challenges and proposed psychoeducational strategies for learners with special needs [Master's thesis, De La Salle University]. https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/etdm_elmd/4
- Magallanes, K. R., & Tanhueco, L. M. (2024). Perceived social support and psychological well-being among Filipino students: A correlational study. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(1), 55–68.
- Paderes, K. J., & Marasigan, L. V. (2024). Family support and career decision self-efficacy among senior high school students: Basis for a life skills enhancement program. *Journal of Psychology and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 115–128.
- Pascual, N. T. (2024). Predictors of career decision self-efficacy among senior high school students: The role of family support and life skills modeling. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(3), 882–895.
- Reyes, J. D., & Reyes, J. B. (2023). Effect of social support from family on an individual's loneliness when mediated by one's sense of belongingness. *International Journal of Advances in Social and Economics*, 5(1).
- Santos, M. L. (2021). The role of family economic support in the academic performance of senior high school students in the Philippines. *Journal of Philippine Education and Development*, 5(2), 45–60.
- Sayeski, K. L., Reno, E. A., & Thoele, J. M. (2022). Specially designed instruction: Operationalizing the delivery of special education services. *Exceptionality*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09362835.2022.2158087>

- Sinco, R.-M. F. (2022). Cultivating family empowerment in schools: The experiences of marginalized families in special education [Honors thesis, Colby College]. Digital Commons @ Colby.
<https://digitalcommons.colby.edu/honorstheses/2360>
- Taher, M., Abedi, M., & Pourahmadi, E. (2025). Exploring the role of perceived social support and spiritual well-being in predicting the family caregiving burden among the parents of disabled children. *BMC Public Health*, 25(1), 567.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-025-21654-2>
- Wang, Q., & Li, H. (2025). Family support more strongly associated with academic performance in collectivist and economically less developed societies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 238, 113118.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2025.113118>