

Responsive Classroom Pedagogy and Learner Development Support in Public Elementary Education

Karen Joyce P. Pilando^{1*} and Glenda G. Mina^{1,2}

¹Northeastern College

*kai16joyce@yahoo.com, ²minaglenda@yahoo.com

Date Submitted:

March 17, 2026

Date Accepted:

July 29, 2026

Date Published:

September 22, 2026

DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.22901329

ABSTRACT

This study determined how responsive classroom pedagogy contributed to learner development support among public elementary school teachers in Santiago City. An explanatory-predictive cross-sectional survey design with latent-variable modeling was employed among 90 teachers selected through proportionate stratified random sampling. Data were gathered using the 32-item Responsive Pedagogy and Learner Development Support Scale and analyzed through descriptive statistics and partial least squares structural equation modeling. Responsive classroom pedagogy obtained an overall mean of 4.15, with responsive classroom management emerging as the strongest dimension and assessment-responsive adjustment as the weakest. Learner development support recorded an overall mean of 4.02, with academic progress assistance

ranking highest and family-linked learning support lowest. Measurement-model assessment supported reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity of the constructs. Structural analysis showed that responsive classroom pedagogy significantly predicted learner development support, $\beta = .607$, $p < .001$, with a substantial effect size of $f^2 = .582$. The model explained 36.8% of the variance in learner development support and demonstrated predictive relevance, $Q^2 = .247$. The findings indicated that responsive teaching strengthened academic, socioemotional, and intervention-related support, although gaps remained in assessment follow-through, intervention monitoring, referral coordination, documentation, and sustained family communication. Strengthening these areas may help transform classroom responsiveness into more continuous and coordinated learner development support.

Keywords: *adaptive instruction; elementary education; learner development support; partial least squares structural equation modeling; responsive classroom pedagogy; teacher support*

INTRODUCTION

Elementary classrooms bring together learners who differ in readiness, pace, interests, behavior, confidence, and access to support beyond school. Effective teaching therefore requires more than the consistent delivery of prescribed lessons. Teachers must be able to notice how learners respond, interpret evidence of learning, and adjust instruction while maintaining clear expectations and meaningful participation. Responsive pedagogy captures this form of teaching by emphasizing continuous interaction among instruction, assessment, feedback, and learner response. It positions learners as active participants whose understanding, self-regulation, and confidence can be strengthened when teachers respond deliberately to emerging learning needs (Smith et al., 2016).

Such responsiveness becomes especially important during the elementary years because learning is closely connected with children's cognitive, social, emotional, and behavioral development. Classroom experiences can either strengthen or weaken a learner's willingness to participate, persist through difficulty, seek

assistance, and develop productive relationships with others. Research on learning and development underscores the importance of supportive relationships, purposeful instructional practices, opportunities for active learning, and systems of assistance that address individual differences and barriers to progress. These elements suggest that learner development support should not be treated as separate from classroom instruction but as part of the teacher's everyday pedagogical work (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020).

Learner support also extends beyond academic remediation. Children need classroom environments that develop emotional regulation, social competence, responsible decision-making, and constructive engagement with peers and adults. Evidence synthesized from primary school research indicates that social and emotional learning has an important place in education, although its effectiveness depends on the quality of implementation and the characteristics of learners and schools. This reinforces the need for teachers to combine instructional responsiveness with practices that attend to the broader developmental needs of children rather than relying solely on academic performance as an indicator of progress (Wigelsworth et al., 2022).

For Philippine public elementary schools, these responsibilities are reflected in national efforts to strengthen teaching quality, assessment, learner diversity responses, socioemotional development, and systems for learning support. The Basic Education Development Plan 2030 identifies teacher competence in pedagogy, assessment, responding to learner diversity, and learner well-being as important areas for improving educational quality (Department of Education, 2022). Within Santiago City, examining how teachers practice responsive classroom pedagogy may therefore offer useful evidence on how everyday instructional decisions relate to the support provided for learners' academic, social, emotional, and developmental needs. Guided by this concern, the study examines responsive classroom pedagogy and learner development support among public elementary school teachers in Santiago City.

Literature Review

Responsive and Differentiated Classroom Pedagogy

Responsive classroom pedagogy begins with recognizing that learners do not enter the classroom with identical levels of readiness, understanding, or learning needs. Teachers respond to these differences by adjusting tasks, instructional pacing, grouping, materials, and assistance rather than relying on a uniform approach. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Deunk et al. (2018) found that well-structured differentiation practices in primary education can produce positive effects on language and mathematics performance, particularly when differentiation is embedded within a broader instructional approach. At the same time, differentiation requires careful professional judgment because practices grouped under the term vary considerably across classrooms. Graham et al. (2021) observed that research on differentiation has often focused on elementary education and teacher practice, while also showing considerable variation in how responsive adjustments are understood and implemented. Together, these findings frame responsiveness as deliberate adaptation based on observable learner needs rather than simply providing different activities.

Assessment, Feedback, and Instructional Adjustment

Assessment becomes part of responsive teaching when information about learner performance is used to decide what should happen next in instruction. Formative assessment allows teachers to identify misconceptions, recognize progress, determine who requires additional assistance, and adjust classroom activities before learning difficulties become persistent. Wisniewski et al. (2020), drawing from 435 studies involving more than 61,000 learners, found an overall positive effect of feedback on student learning, although its effectiveness depended strongly on the quality and type of information provided. A broader review of meta-analyses by Sortwell et al. (2024) likewise reported positive effects of formative assessment across K to 12 settings while noting differences according to assessment strategy. These findings support an approach in which assessment records, classroom observations, learner outputs, and feedback are not merely documentation requirements but sources of evidence that guide responsive instructional decisions and targeted learner support.

Teacher Support and Learner Development

Learner development is shaped not only by the content taught but also by how learners experience their interactions with teachers. Supportive relationships can encourage participation, persistence, confidence, and willingness to seek help when difficulties arise. Roorda et al. (2017), in a meta-analysis covering 189 studies and 249,198 learners, found that affective teacher-student relationships were associated with student engagement and achievement, with engagement partly explaining the relationship between these variables. The pattern was evident in both primary and secondary education. Similarly, Tao et al. (2022) found that perceived teacher support was positively associated with academic achievement and that behavioral, cognitive, and emotional engagement partially mediated this relationship. For elementary teachers, learner development support therefore involves academic assistance alongside attentive classroom management, encouragement, constructive interactions, and timely responses to behavioral or emotional concerns that may influence learning.

Family Engagement and Continuity of Learner Support

Support for elementary learners often extends beyond classroom hours, making communication between teachers and families an important part of understanding and responding to learner needs. Ma et al. (2016) found a strong positive relationship between parental involvement and learning outcomes during early childhood and early elementary education, with home supervision, home-school connection, and the capacity to engage families emerging as meaningful elements of support. Evidence also suggests that the form of parental involvement matters. Kim (2022), synthesizing 23 meta-analyses encompassing 1,177 primary studies, found an overall positive association between parental involvement and academic achievement, with parental expectations and aspirations showing particularly consistent effects while homework involvement produced mixed findings. Teacher-parent communication can therefore serve a practical purpose beyond reporting grades by helping teachers understand learner circumstances, coordinate appropriate interventions, monitor progress, and maintain continuity between classroom support and learning experiences at home.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed an explanatory-predictive cross-sectional survey design with latent-variable modeling. This design allowed responsive classroom pedagogy to be examined as an instructional construct associated with and predictive of learner development support. Data were gathered at one point in time, while the analytical structure permitted simultaneous examination of the dimensions comprising both constructs and the strength of the pathway between them. Responsive classroom pedagogy was specified as the exogenous construct, while learner development support served as the endogenous construct. This approach was selected because the study sought not only to describe existing practices but also to determine how variation in responsive pedagogy accounted for differences in learner development support.

Research Locale

The research was conducted in public elementary schools in Santiago City. The locale was appropriate because elementary teachers carried responsibilities involving classroom instruction, assessment, intervention, classroom management, parent communication, and documentation of learner progress. These functions provided a suitable setting for examining how responsive teaching practices were connected with the support extended to learners.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants consisted of 90 public elementary school teachers who were actively involved in classroom teaching and learner support during the conduct of the study. Eligibility required direct responsibility for instruction, assessment, classroom management, intervention, progress monitoring, or related learner-support

activities. Proportionate stratified random sampling was applied to distribute the sample across the eligible teaching population, after which participants were randomly selected from the corresponding teaching rosters. The resulting sample remained manageable while providing sufficient cases for the planned statistical analysis.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using the researcher-developed Responsive Pedagogy and Learner Development Support Scale (RPLDSS). The instrument contained 32 statements divided equally between the two major constructs. Responsive classroom pedagogy consisted of four dimensions: adaptive instruction, assessment-responsive adjustment, responsive classroom management, and learner participation support. Learner development support covered academic progress assistance, socioemotional support, targeted intervention and monitoring, and family-linked learning support. Each dimension contained four statements. Responses were recorded on a five-point frequency scale ranging from 1, *never*, to 5, *consistently*.

Five qualified experts in elementary education, pedagogy, educational assessment, and research methodology evaluated the instrument for relevance, clarity, construct alignment, and suitability. The resulting S-CVI/Ave was .95, indicating strong content validity. The revised instrument was pilot-tested with 30 public elementary teachers from a comparable setting who were excluded from the final sample. Reliability analysis produced an overall Cronbach's alpha of .942, demonstrating high internal consistency.

Data Gathering Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was secured from the appropriate education authorities. Coordination was then made with the concerned school administrators to identify eligible participants and arrange questionnaire administration without interfering with instructional activities. Participants received the study information and consent form before completing the instrument. Accomplished questionnaires were retrieved, checked for completeness, coded, encoded into the statistical database, screened for data-entry errors, and prepared for analysis.

Data Analysis

Means, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals were used to summarize responsive classroom pedagogy and learner development support. The principal analysis employed partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) to examine the explanatory and predictive relationship between the two latent constructs. The measurement model was assessed using indicator loadings, composite reliability, average variance extracted, and the heterotrait-monotrait ratio. The structural path from responsive classroom pedagogy to learner development support was tested using 5,000 bootstrap resamples at the .05 significance level. The path coefficient indicated the magnitude and direction of the effect, while R^2 measured explained variance, f^2 represented effect size, and Q^2 assessed predictive relevance.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical safeguards were observed throughout the study. Participants provided informed consent and joined voluntarily, with the right to decline participation or withdraw without penalty. No personally identifying information was included in the analytical dataset, and responses were treated confidentially in accordance with data privacy principles. Research records were stored securely, and the collected information was used exclusively for legitimate scholarly purposes and reported only in aggregated form.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. *Overall Level of Responsive Classroom Pedagogy*

Dimension	Mean	SD	95% CI	Rank
Responsive classroom management	4.25	0.42	4.16, 4.34	1
Adaptive instruction	4.18	0.46	4.08, 4.28	2
Learner participation support	4.11	0.47	4.01, 4.21	3
Assessment-responsive adjustment	4.04	0.50	3.94, 4.14	4
Overall	4.15	0.38	4.07, 4.22	

The overall mean of 4.15 indicated that responsive classroom pedagogy was strongly evident among the teachers. Responsive classroom management ranked first, suggesting that teachers were most consistent in regulating classroom conditions, maintaining supportive routines, and modifying classroom processes when necessary. Adaptive instruction followed, indicating that teachers also adjusted explanations, pacing, grouping, and task difficulty in response to learner needs. Assessment-responsive adjustment obtained the lowest mean, showing that the systematic use of assessment evidence for succeeding instructional decisions was less consistent than immediate classroom adaptation. This pattern suggested that teachers were more responsive during actual classroom interaction than in practices requiring continuous documentation, analysis of learner errors, and structured instructional follow-up.

Table 2. *Indicators of Adaptive Instruction*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank
Adjusted explanations when learners showed difficulty	4.26	0.55	1
Varied task difficulty according to emerging learner needs	4.21	0.58	2
Regrouped learners when differences in understanding became evident	4.14	0.61	3
Modified lesson pacing according to learner progress	4.11	0.63	4
Dimension Mean	4.18	0.46	

Teachers were particularly strong in changing explanations when learners experienced difficulty. This indicated that instructional responsiveness commonly occurred through immediate clarification and modification of teaching approaches. Adjusting task difficulty also received a strong rating, showing that teachers attempted to match learning activities with differences in readiness. Regrouping and modifying lesson pacing were somewhat less consistently practiced. These two strategies often required broader restructuring of planned instruction and could therefore be more difficult to apply regularly. The findings were consistent with Deunk et al. (2018), who emphasized that differentiation became more effective when instructional adaptations were systematically connected with evidence of learner needs.

Table 3. *Indicators of Assessment-Responsive Adjustment*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank
Used learner outputs to determine succeeding instructional actions	4.13	0.60	1
Provided timely corrective feedback based on learner performance	4.09	0.62	2
Revisited concepts according to patterns of learner errors	4.01	0.66	3
Maintained systematic assessment records for instructional follow-up	3.93	0.71	4
Dimension Mean	4.04	0.50	

Assessment-responsive adjustment was the weakest dimension of responsive classroom pedagogy. Teachers frequently used learner outputs and corrective feedback, but systematic tracking of assessment evidence

was less consistent. The lowest mean was recorded for maintaining assessment records for instructional follow-up. This suggested that teachers could respond to assessment information immediately but were less consistent in carrying that evidence forward into documented instructional planning. The relatively higher variability in this indicator also showed differences in how teachers managed assessment information. Wisniewski et al. (2020) noted that feedback was most useful when it provided information that could guide subsequent learning. The present finding therefore pointed to a need for stronger continuity between assessment, documentation, and instructional adjustment.

Table 4. *Indicators of Responsive Classroom Management*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank
Maintained supportive and orderly classroom routines	4.34	0.54	1
Redirected learner behavior without interrupting learning	4.28	0.56	2
Maintained a classroom climate where learners could participate safely	4.22	0.58	3
Modified routines when classroom conditions required adjustment	4.16	0.61	4
Dimension Mean	4.25	0.42	

Responsive classroom management emerged as the strongest pedagogical dimension. Teachers were particularly consistent in maintaining orderly routines and addressing behavior while minimizing disruption to learning. The results suggested that classroom management was not practiced merely as behavioral control but as a means of sustaining participation and instructional continuity. Modifying routines according to changing classroom conditions received the lowest mean within the dimension, although the result remained strong. This indicated that flexibility in established routines occurred less frequently than maintaining predictable structures. The overall pattern showed that teachers viewed a stable yet supportive classroom environment as an important foundation for responsive teaching.

Table 5. *Indicators of Learner Participation Support*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank
Encouraged learners to ask questions and seek clarification	4.20	0.59	1
Provided meaningful choices during learning activities	4.15	0.62	2
Organized peer support when learners needed additional assistance	4.07	0.65	3
Deliberately involved quieter or less confident learners	4.02	0.68	4
Dimension Mean	4.11	0.47	

Teachers frequently encouraged questioning and clarification, suggesting that learner participation was generally supported through open classroom interaction. Providing choices also received a strong rating, indicating some degree of learner agency in classroom tasks. Peer support and deliberate involvement of quieter learners were comparatively weaker. The lowest result indicated that learners who did not actively express difficulty could receive less instructional attention than those who openly participated. This pattern showed that participation support was strongest when learners-initiated engagement, while more deliberate inclusion of hesitant or less confident learners remained an area for improvement.

Table 6. *Overall Level of Learner Development Support*

Dimension	Mean	SD	95% CI	Rank
Academic progress assistance	4.22	0.44	4.13, 4.31	1
Socioemotional support	4.17	0.45	4.08, 4.26	2
Targeted intervention and monitoring	3.88	0.54	3.77, 3.99	3
Family-linked learning support	3.79	0.58	3.67, 3.91	4

Overall	4.02	0.41	3.93, 4.10
---------	------	------	------------

Learner development support was generally strong, with an overall mean of 4.02. Academic progress assistance ranked first, followed by socioemotional support. These findings indicated that teachers were most consistent when support could be provided directly during classroom interaction. In contrast, targeted intervention and monitoring and family-linked learning support obtained lower means. Both dimensions required sustained follow-up, documentation, coordination, or communication beyond immediate lesson delivery. The results therefore suggested that the main weakness was not the identification of learner needs but the continuity and organization of support after difficulties had been identified.

Table 7. *Indicators of Academic Progress Assistance*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank
Identified learners who needed additional academic assistance	4.31	0.55	1
Provided targeted follow-up when learners did not master a lesson	4.25	0.58	2
Used scaffolds to help learners complete challenging tasks	4.20	0.59	3
Monitored learners' academic progress after classroom assistance	4.12	0.61	4
Dimension Mean	4.22	0.44	

Academic progress assistance was the strongest dimension of learner development support. Teachers were particularly consistent in recognizing learners requiring additional assistance and providing follow-up after unsuccessful learning experiences. Monitoring after assistance received the lowest mean within the dimension. Although still favorable, this result suggested that support was stronger at the point of intervention than during subsequent verification of whether improvement had been sustained. The finding reinforced the need to treat learner assistance as an ongoing process rather than a single response to difficulty.

Table 8. *Indicators of Socioemotional Support*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank
Responded respectfully to learners experiencing difficulty	4.28	0.56	1
Encouraged learners to persist after errors or unsuccessful attempts	4.19	0.60	2
Supported learners in managing emotions during classroom difficulties	4.14	0.62	3
Responded to signs of withdrawal, frustration, or behavioral difficulty	4.07	0.65	4
Dimension Mean	4.17	0.45	

The results indicated that teachers generally provided a supportive emotional environment for learners. Respectful responses to difficulty received the highest mean, while recognizing and responding to withdrawal, frustration, or behavioral difficulty ranked lowest. The pattern suggested that visible academic struggles received stronger attention than subtler emotional or behavioral signals. Roorda et al. (2017) showed that positive teacher-student relationships were associated with learner engagement and achievement. The present findings supported this connection while also showing that socioemotional responsiveness required greater attention to learners whose difficulties were expressed indirectly.

Table 9. *Indicators of Targeted Intervention and Monitoring*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank
-----------	------	----	------

Conducted follow-up after providing an intervention	4.02	0.67	1
Documented learner progress during intervention	3.94	0.70	2
Modified interventions according to monitoring results	3.84	0.72	3
Coordinated additional support or referral when classroom intervention was insufficient	3.72	0.77	4
Dimension Mean	3.88	0.54	

Targeted intervention and monitoring showed a more noticeable weakness than the two preceding learner support dimensions. Teachers generally conducted follow-up after intervention, but modifying interventions according to monitoring results and coordinating additional support were less consistently practiced. The lowest result occurred in referral or support coordination when classroom intervention was insufficient. This suggested that teachers were more capable of initiating intervention than escalating support when learner difficulties persisted. The findings pointed to a need for clearer intervention pathways, documentation procedures, and coordination mechanisms that could connect classroom support with additional educational services when necessary.

Table 10. *Indicators of Family-Linked Learning Support*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Rank
Communicated important learning concerns to families	3.96	0.69	1
Provided families with specific suggestions for supporting learning at home	3.85	0.72	2
Documented parent communication and subsequent learner progress	3.73	0.76	3
Sustained two-way follow-up with families regarding continuing learner needs	3.62	0.81	4
Dimension Mean	3.79	0.58	

Family-linked learning support was the weakest learner development dimension. Teachers generally communicated important concerns to families, but sustained two-way communication obtained the lowest mean among all learner support indicators. Documentation of parent communication and subsequent learner progress was also comparatively weak. This indicated that communication was more likely to occur as an initial notification than as a continuing partnership around learner development. Kim (2022) emphasized that parental involvement was associated with academic achievement, although its effects varied according to the form of involvement. The present findings suggested that more sustained and purposeful teacher-family interaction could strengthen continuity between classroom interventions and support provided at home.

Table 11. *Reliability and Convergent Validity of the First-Order Constructs*

Construct	Loading Range	Cronbach's α	Composite Reliability	AVE
Adaptive instruction	.742 to .821	.783	.861	.608
Assessment-responsive adjustment	.693 to .802	.747	.837	.562
Responsive classroom management	.748 to .852	.815	.878	.642
Learner participation support	.712 to .812	.771	.847	.580
Academic progress assistance	.741 to .842	.801	.871	.628
Socioemotional support	.721 to .831	.784	.860	.607
Targeted intervention and monitoring	.681 to .792	.724	.823	.539
Family-linked learning support	.672 to .781	.707	.816	.526

The measurement model demonstrated adequate internal consistency and convergent validity. Composite reliability values ranged from .816 to .878, while AVE values ranged from .526 to .642. Responsive classroom

management demonstrated the strongest measurement properties, while family-linked learning support showed the lowest reliability and AVE. Several indicators in the two weaker support dimensions produced loadings below .70, but they were retained because their removal did not materially improve construct reliability and because they represented theoretically important components of learner support. Overall, the results supported the adequacy of the measurement model for structural analysis.

Table 12. *Higher-Order Construct Assessment*

Higher-Order Construct and Dimension		Loading	SE	t	p
Responsive Classroom Pedagogy					
Adaptive instruction		.861	.032	26.906	<.001
Assessment-responsive adjustment		.812	.041	19.805	<.001
Responsive classroom management		.883	.029	30.448	<.001
Learner participation support		.836	.036	23.222	<.001
Learner Development Support					
Academic progress assistance		.872	.030	29.067	<.001
Socioemotional support		.842	.035	24.057	<.001
Targeted intervention and monitoring		.793	.045	17.622	<.001
Family-linked learning support		.752	.052	14.462	<.001
Higher-Order Construct	Cronbach's α	Composite Reliability AVE			
Responsive classroom pedagogy	.868	.911	.719		
Learner development support	.831	.887	.662		

All dimensions loaded significantly on their respective higher-order constructs. Responsive classroom management contributed most strongly to responsive classroom pedagogy, while academic progress assistance had the strongest loading on learner development support. Family-linked learning support had the lowest loading within learner development support, consistent with its weaker descriptive results. Nevertheless, its statistically significant contribution indicated that family engagement remained an important component of the broader construct.

Table 13. *Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratios Among First-Order Constructs*

Construct	AI	ARA	RCM	LPS	APA	SES	TIM	FLS
AI								
ARA	.780							
RCM	.730	.700						
LPS	.810	.760	.790					
APA	.710	.730	.660	.720				
SES	.680	.650	.740	.760	.770			
TIM	.640	.700	.590	.630	.810	.720		
FLS	.580	.610	.550	.600	.680	.650	.820	

Note. AI = adaptive instruction; ARA = assessment-responsive adjustment; RCM = responsive classroom management; LPS = learner participation support; APA = academic progress assistance; SES = socioemotional support; TIM = targeted intervention and monitoring; FLS = family-linked learning support.

All HTMT ratios remained below .85, supporting discriminant validity among the eight first-order constructs. The highest coefficient, .820, occurred between targeted intervention and monitoring and family-

linked learning support. This relationship was theoretically reasonable because sustained learner intervention frequently required communication and coordination with families. The higher-order HTMT coefficient between responsive classroom pedagogy and learner development support was .742, showing that the two major constructs were related but empirically distinct.

Table 14. *Structural Path Analysis*

Structural Path	β	Bootstrap Mean	SE	t	p	95% CI	f ²
Responsive classroom pedagogy → Learner development support	.607	.611	.076	7.987	<.001	.448, .739	.582

Responsive classroom pedagogy had a positive and statistically significant effect on learner development support, $\beta = .607$, $p < .001$. The bootstrap confidence interval excluded zero, supporting the stability of the estimated effect. The f² value of .582 indicated a substantial practical contribution. Teachers who demonstrated stronger adaptive instruction, assessment-responsive adjustment, classroom management, and participation support also tended to provide stronger academic, socioemotional, intervention, and family-linked learner support.

The result suggested that responsive pedagogy functioned as more than an instructional strategy. It also provided a foundation for recognizing learner needs and organizing appropriate support. However, the relationship was not absolute. The weaker results for intervention monitoring and family-linked support showed that responsive classroom practice alone did not guarantee sustained support outside immediate instruction. Other organizational conditions, including documentation processes, referral mechanisms, workload, and opportunities for family coordination, could influence whether support was maintained over time.

Table 15. *Explained Variance and Predictive Relevance*

Endogenous Construct	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Q ²
Learner development support	.368	.361	.247

Responsive classroom pedagogy explained 36.8% of the variance in learner development support. The adjusted R² of .361 showed that the explanatory capacity remained stable after accounting for model complexity. The Q² value of .247 was above zero, indicating meaningful predictive relevance.

The model therefore showed that responsive pedagogy provided substantial explanatory information regarding how teachers supported learner development, although a considerable portion of variance remained attributable to factors outside the model. The descriptive and structural results converged on the same pattern. Teachers were strongest in immediate classroom responsiveness, academic assistance, and socioemotional support, but less consistent in assessment follow-through, intervention monitoring, referral coordination, documentation, and sustained family communication. These weaker areas represented the most important practice gaps identified by the study and provided a clear basis for strengthening systems that connect responsive teaching with continuous learner development support.

CONCLUSION

Responsive classroom pedagogy played a significant role in strengthening learner development support among public elementary school teachers in Santiago City. Teachers showed their strongest practices in responsive classroom management, adaptive instruction, academic progress assistance, and socioemotional support, while weaker areas were observed in assessment-based follow-through, intervention monitoring, referral coordination, documentation, and sustained family-linked support. The structural model further showed that responsive classroom pedagogy significantly predicted learner development support, explaining 36.8% of its variance, which indicated that teachers who were more adaptive, assessment-responsive, participatory, and supportive in managing classroom learning were also more likely to provide broader and more sustained assistance to learners. Based on

these findings, schools should strengthen systems that help teachers connect assessment evidence with documented instructional adjustments, monitor intervention outcomes more consistently, and establish clearer referral and follow-up procedures for learners requiring additional assistance. Greater attention should also be given to sustained two-way communication with families so that learner support continues beyond initial classroom intervention. Professional learning activities may therefore focus on assessment-informed teaching, intervention planning, progress monitoring, inclusive participation strategies, and family-school coordination to make responsive pedagogy more systematic and developmentally supportive.

References

- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 24*(2), 97–140.
- Department of Education. (2022). *Basic Education Development Plan 2030*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
- Deunk, M. I., Jacobse, A. E., de Boer, H., Doolaard, S., & Bosker, R. J. (2018). Effective differentiation practices: A systematic review and meta-analysis of studies on the cognitive effects of differentiation practices in primary education. *Educational Research Review, 24*, 31–54.
- Graham, L. J., de Bruin, K., Lassig, C., & Spandagou, I. (2021). A scoping review of 20 years of research on differentiation: Investigating conceptualisation, characteristics, and methods used. *Review of Education, 9*(1), 161–198.
- Kim, S. (2022). Fifty years of parental involvement and achievement research: A second-order meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 37*, 100463.
- Ma, X., Shen, J., Krenn, H. Y., Hu, S., & Yuan, J. (2016). A meta-analysis of the relationship between learning outcomes and parental involvement during early childhood education and early elementary education. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*(4), 771–801.
- Roorda, D. L., Jak, S., Zee, M., Oort, F. J., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2017). Affective teacher-student relationships and students' engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic update and test of the mediating role of engagement. *School Psychology Review, 46*(3), 239–261.
- Smith, K., Gamlem, S. M., Sandal, A. K., & Engelsen, K. S. (2016). Educating for the future: A conceptual framework of responsive pedagogy. *Cogent Education, 3*(1), 1227021.
- Sortwell, A., Trimble, K., Ferraz, R., Geelan, D. R., Hine, G., Ramirez-Campillo, R., Carter-Thuiller, B., Gkintoni, E., & Xuan, Q. (2024). A systematic review of meta-analyses on the impact of formative assessment on K-12 students' learning: Toward sustainable quality education. *Sustainability, 16*(17), 7826.
- Tao, Y., Meng, Y., Gao, Z., & Yang, X. (2022). Perceived teacher support, student engagement, and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology, 42*(4), 401–420.
- Wigelsworth, M., Verity, L., Mason, C., Qualter, P., & Humphrey, N. (2022). Social and emotional learning in primary schools: A review of the current state of evidence. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(3), 898–924.
- Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 3087.