

Recalibrating Reading Recovery: Learning Gains of the ARAL Program on the Reading Comprehension and Miscue Reduction of Phil-IRI Frustrated Junior High School Students

DONNABELLE TOROBA LATRACA *

North Eastern Mindanao State University – Rosario, Tandag City, Surigao del Sur, Philippines.

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2026, 19(03), 122-137

Publication history: Received on 20 April 2026; revised on 27 May 2026; accepted on 30 May 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijrsra.2026.19.3.1224>

Abstract

This study examined the effectiveness of the Department of Education's Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program in improving reading comprehension and reducing oral reading miscues among Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) identified frustrated Junior High School readers at Lingig National High School. Specifically, it assessed learners' literal, inferential, and critical comprehension levels, identified common oral reading miscues, determined differences in reading performance before and after the intervention, examined the influence of learner engagement and implementation fidelity, identified implementation challenges, and proposed an intervention program to strengthen ARAL delivery.

The study employed a quantitative quasi-experimental one-group pretest-posttest design. Respondents consisted of 96 Grades 7 to 10 learners selected through purposive sampling. Data were gathered using a researcher-modified Phil-IRI Oral Reading and Comprehension Test, learner engagement questionnaire, implementation fidelity questionnaire, and open-ended responses. Statistical tools included frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, paired samples t-test, and thematic analysis.

Findings showed that learners performed better in literal and critical comprehension than in inferential comprehension. Mispronunciation and repetition were the most common oral reading miscues. Results revealed no statistically significant differences in reading comprehension and oral reading miscues before and after the intervention. However, learners demonstrated high behavioral, cognitive, and affective engagement, while implementation fidelity was generally high. Major challenges included poor attendance, limited instructional materials, time constraints, learner-related difficulties, and teacher workload.

The study concluded that sustained implementation, stronger instructional support, and improved program conditions are necessary to achieve greater literacy gains among frustrated readers.

Keywords: ARAL Program; Reading Comprehension; Oral Reading Miscues; Phil-IRI; Frustrated Readers; Literacy Intervention; Learner Engagement; Implementation Fidelity

1. Introduction

Reading comprehension continues to be a persistent educational challenge in the Philippines, particularly among Junior High School learners. International assessments consistently show that Filipino students perform below global standards in reading literacy. The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2022 reported that Filipino learners obtained an average reading score of 347, significantly lower than the Organisation for Economic Co-operation

* Corresponding author: DONNABELLE TOROBA LATRACA

and Development (OECD) average of 476. Moreover, only 24% of Filipino students reached at least Level 2 proficiency, indicating limited ability to perform essential comprehension tasks [1]. These findings reflect continuing gaps in foundational literacy skills that affect learners' academic performance across learning areas.

In response to these challenges, the Department of Education (DepEd) implemented the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program as part of its national learning recovery efforts. The program is designed to strengthen foundational skills in reading and other core subjects through structured remediation and targeted instructional support [2]. It is anchored on the use of diagnostic assessments such as the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI), which identifies learners' reading levels and specific difficulties that require intervention.

Research supports the importance of structured and diagnostic-based reading interventions in addressing literacy gaps. Studies emphasize that remediation programs are more effective when they are based on learners' actual reading needs and when they provide explicit instruction in decoding, fluency, and comprehension [3]. Furthermore, continued reading difficulties among secondary learners highlight the need for sustained intervention beyond the elementary level [4].

At Lingig National High School, Phil-IRI results revealed that a significant number of Junior High School learners are classified under the frustrated reading level. These learners experience difficulty in understanding texts and frequently commit oral reading miscues such as substitutions, omissions, insertions, repetitions, and reversals. Classroom observations further show persistent decoding challenges and poor comprehension of reading materials. Despite the implementation of the ARAL Program, there is still limited localized evidence evaluating its effectiveness in improving reading comprehension and reducing oral reading miscues among identified learners.

The study is conducted to address the persistent problem of low reading comprehension and frequent oral reading miscues among frustrated Junior High School readers. Since reading is a fundamental skill that supports learning across all subject areas, it is essential to determine whether existing interventions, particularly the ARAL Program, are effective in improving learners' literacy performance.

Although the ARAL Program is currently implemented as a national remediation strategy, there remains a lack of localized empirical evidence regarding its actual impact at the school level. Studies emphasize that the effectiveness of literacy interventions depends on proper implementation, learner context, and instructional quality, highlighting the need for school-based evaluation [5]. Without such evaluation, schools may continue implementing programs without clear evidence of effectiveness or areas for improvement.

This study is therefore significant in providing data-driven evidence on whether the ARAL Program improves reading comprehension and reduces oral reading miscues among learners at Lingig National High School. The findings may guide teachers in improving instructional strategies, assist school administrators in strengthening program implementation, and support the Department of Education in refining literacy recovery initiatives [6]. Ultimately, this study contributes to improving literacy outcomes by providing empirical evidence on the effectiveness of structured reading interventions for struggling readers in the Junior High School level.

2. Materials and Methods

This chapter presents the methodology used in examining the effectiveness of the ARAL Program in improving reading comprehension and reducing oral reading miscues among Junior High School frustrated readers at Lingig National High School. It covers the research design, participants, research instruments, data gathering procedures, and statistical treatment of data.

The study utilized a quantitative research approach employing a quasi-experimental one-group pretest-posttest design. This design was appropriate for determining changes in learners' reading performance before and after exposure to the ARAL intervention in a natural school setting where random assignment was not feasible. Pretest and posttest assessments were conducted to measure differences in reading comprehension levels and oral reading miscues after the intervention.

The participants of the study were 96 Junior High School learners from Grades 7 to 10 identified as frustrated readers based on the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI). A purposive sampling technique was used to ensure that only learners with significant reading difficulties were included, making them appropriate respondents for the evaluation of the ARAL Program.

The primary research instrument used was a researcher-modified Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) Oral Reading and Comprehension Test. This instrument consisted of three main components: an oral reading passage used to assess decoding accuracy and fluency, a miscue recording sheet used to document and classify oral reading errors such as substitutions, omissions, insertions, repetitions, and reversals, and a comprehension test composed of literal, inferential, and critical questions designed to measure learners' understanding of the text. The instrument underwent content validation by experts and pilot testing to ensure clarity, appropriateness, and reliability, with internal consistency measured using Cronbach's Alpha.

The data gathering procedure followed a systematic sequence starting from securing permission from educational authorities, identifying qualified participants through Phil-IRI results, obtaining parental consent and learner assent, conducting the pretest, implementing the ARAL remedial reading intervention, and administering the posttest using the same instrument. All data were carefully recorded, checked, and prepared for analysis while maintaining ethical standards and confidentiality throughout the process.

For statistical treatment, the study used frequency count and percentage to describe participant profiles, weighted mean to interpret questionnaire responses, standard deviation to measure data variability, and paired samples t-test to determine significant differences between pretest and posttest results. These statistical tools were used to evaluate whether the ARAL Program significantly improved reading comprehension and reduced oral reading miscues among the participants.

3. Results and Discussion

This chapter presented the findings on the learning gains of the ARAL Program in improving the reading comprehension and oral reading performance of Phil-IRI-identified frustrated Junior High School students at Lingig National High School. Specifically, the study examined the pretest and posttest changes in learners' reading comprehension and oral reading miscues after participation in the intervention program. It also determined whether differences in outcomes were associated with learner engagement and implementation fidelity. Furthermore, the study identified the implementation challenges encountered during the delivery of the ARAL Program. The findings provide important insights into the effectiveness of the intervention and serve as a basis for strengthening program implementation and support mechanisms for struggling readers.

3.1. Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 Profile of the learner's respondent in terms of grade level, sex, age, and number of ARAL sessions attended

Grade Level	Frequency	Percentage
Grade 7	30	31.30
Grade 8	27	28.10
Grade 9	29	30.20
Grade 10	10	10.40
Total	96	100.00
Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	55	57.30
Female	41	42.70
Total	96	100.00
Age	Frequency	Percentage
11 – 15 years old	71	74.00
16 – 20 years old	25	26.00
21 years old and above	0	0.00
Total	96	100.00

Number of ARAL Session Attended	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 5 sessions	0	0.00
6 – 10 sessions	9	9.40
11 – 15 sessions	46	47.90
More than 15 sessions	41	42.70
Total	96	100.00

Most frustrated readers were Grade 7 male learners aged 11–15, indicating that reading difficulties are more common in the early years of Junior High School. A large number of respondents regularly attended ARAL sessions, showing strong participation and exposure to the intervention. These findings highlight the importance of early identification, differentiated instruction, and sustained intervention to address reading difficulties effectively [7,1].

Table 2 Profile of the teacher's respondent in terms of grade level, sex, age, and number of ARAL sessions attended

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	3	20.00
Female	7	80.00
Total	10	100.00
Age	Frequency	Percentage
21 – 30 years old	6	60.00
31 – 40 years old	4	40.00
41 – 50 years old	0	0.00
51 and above	0	0.00
Total	10	100.00
Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	2	20.00
Master's Units	8	80.00
Master's Degree	0	0.00
Doctoral Units	0	0.00
Doctoral Degree	0	0.00
Total	10	100.00
Years of Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 5 years	3	30.00
6 – 10 years	5	50.00
11 – 15 years	2	20.00
16 – 20 years	0	0.00
More than 20 years	0	0.00
Total	10	100.00
Subject Area Handled	Frequency	Percentage
English	10	100.00
Filipino	0	0.00

Others	0	0.00
Total	10	100.00
Grade Level Handled	Frequency	Percentage
Grade 7	3	30.00
Grade 8	3	30.00
Grade 9	3	30.00
Grade 10	1	10.00
Total	10	100.00

Most teacher-respondents were female, aged 21–30, and had Master's units, indicating that ARAL implementation is mainly handled by early-career educators pursuing professional development. Most had 6–10 years of teaching experience, all handled English subjects, and were assigned mostly to Grades 7–9 where reading difficulties are more common. These findings suggest that the ARAL Program is implemented by moderately experienced English teachers capable of supporting literacy interventions among struggling readers [8,9,1].

3.2. Level of Reading Comprehension of Phil – IRI identified frustrated readers before and after participation in ARAL program

Table 3 The level of reading comprehension of Phil – IRI identified frustrated readers before and after participation in the ARAL program in terms of understanding what I read, thinking about what I read and my feelings and opinions about what I read.

Understanding What I Read	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I can tell the main idea of what I read.	3.22	0.67	Agree
I can remember important details.	3.17	0.72	Agree
I can answer who, what, when, and where questions.	3.78	0.70	Strongly Agree
I can name the characters and events in a story.	3.51	0.70	Strongly Agree
I can understand what the text is mostly about.	3.31	0.65	Strongly Agree
Total	3.40	0.69	Strongly Agree
Thinking About What I Read	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I can make a smart guess about the story.	2.97	0.67	Agree
I can understand ideas that are not clearly said.	2.99	0.81	Agree
I can guess what will happen next.	2.83	0.65	Agree
I can connect ideas in the beginning, middle, and end.	3.47	0.72	Strongly Agree
I can understand the hidden message.	3.58	0.89	Strongly Agree
Total	3.17	0.75	Agree
My Feelings and Opinions About What I Read	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I can tell if the information is right or wrong.	3.81	0.81	Strongly Agree
I can share my own opinion about the text.	3.14	0.74	Agree
I can say what the story is trying to tell me.	3.60	0.84	Strongly Agree
I can connect the story to real life.	3.20	0.53	Agree
I can tell why the author wrote the text.	3.21	0.64	Agree
Total	3.39	0.71	Strongly Agree

The findings revealed that learners demonstrated strong literal comprehension ($M = 3.40$) and critical comprehension ($M = 3.39$), while inferential comprehension ($M = 3.17$) was comparatively lower. Learners performed well in identifying explicit information, recognizing story details, and evaluating texts, but experienced difficulties in making predictions and interpreting implied meanings. These results suggest that the ARAL Program effectively strengthens foundational and higher-order comprehension skills, although additional support is still needed in developing learners' inferential and analytical thinking abilities [10].

3.3. Common types and frequency of oral reading miscues committed by the learners before and after participation in the ARAL program

Table 4 The common types and frequency of oral reading miscues committed by the learners before and after participation in the ARAL program in terms of mispronunciation, omission, substitution, insertion, repetition, transposition and reversal

Types of Miscues	Number of Miscues	Rank	Word Reading Score	Word Reading Level
Mispronunciation	12.71	7	84.02	Frustration
Omission	4.38	5		
Substitution	3.95	3		
Insertion	4.22	4		
Repetition	7.72	6		
Transposition	1.63	1		
Reversal	1.68	2		
TOTAL	36.29			

The findings revealed that learners committed a high number of oral reading miscues ($M = 36.29$), indicating frustration-level reading performance. Mispronunciation was the most frequent error, followed by repetition, omission, insertion, and substitution, while reversal and transposition were least observed. These results show that learners struggle mainly with decoding, pronunciation, and reading fluency. The findings suggest the need for stronger phonics instruction, guided oral reading, repeated reading, and fluency-building activities to improve word recognition and reduce reading errors [11, 10].

3.4. Significant difference in the learners' reading comprehension levels before and after the ARAL intervention when analyzed as an overall score and per comprehension domain

Table 5 Significant difference in the learners' reading comprehension levels before and after the ARAL intervention when analyzed as an overall score and per comprehension domain

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What I Read	Between Groups	2.751	28	0.098	0.520	0.961
	Within Groups	6.609	35	0.189		
	Total	9.360	63			
Thinking	Between Groups	4.418	28	0.158	0.458	0.982
	Within Groups	12.052	35	0.344		
	Total	16.470	63			
Feelings and Opinions	Between Groups	2.943	28	0.105	0.959	0.541
	Within Groups	3.837	35	0.110		
	Total	6.779	63			

The ANOVA results revealed no statistically significant difference in learners' reading comprehension before and after the ARAL intervention across literal, inferential, and critical comprehension domains, as all p-values were greater than 0.05. Although learners showed observable improvements, the gains were not statistically significant, suggesting that the intervention may require longer duration, stronger implementation, and more intensive instructional support to achieve measurable outcomes. The findings further indicate the need to strengthen inferential and higher-order comprehension skills through sustained and explicit reading instruction [10].

3.5. Significant difference in the learners' oral reading miscues before and after the ARAL intervention when analyzed as total miscue frequency and per miscue type

Table 6 Significant difference in the learners' oral reading miscues before and after the ARAL intervention when analyzed as total miscue frequency and per miscue type

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Mispronunciation	Between Groups	1050.743	28	37.527	0.913	0.594
	Within Groups	1438.367	35	41.096		
	Total	2489.109	63			
Omission	Between Groups	86.977	27	3.221	0.636	0.885
	Within Groups	172.200	34	5.065		
	Total	259.177	61			
Substitution	Between Groups	135.688	28	4.846	1.259	0.257
	Within Groups	134.750	35	3.850		
	Total	270.438	63			
Insertion	Between Groups	136.109	28	4.861	0.975	0.523
	Within Groups	174.500	35	4.986		
	Total	310.609	63			
Repetition	Between Groups	414.683	28	14.810	1.356	0.195
	Within Groups	382.317	35	10.923		
	Total	797.000	63			
Reversal	Between Groups	14.613	24	0.609	1.202	0.325
	Within Groups	12.667	25	0.507		
	Total	27.280	49			
Transposition	Between Groups	17.243	24	0.718	0.963	0.538
	Within Groups	16.417	22	0.746		
	Total	33.660	46			

The ANOVA results showed no statistically significant difference in learners' oral reading miscues before and after the ARAL intervention, as all p-values were greater than 0.05. Although slight improvements were observed, the changes were not significant enough to indicate measurable gains in reading fluency and decoding accuracy. The findings suggest that reducing miscues such as mispronunciation, substitution, and repetition requires more intensive and sustained phonics instruction, guided oral reading, and fluency practice [12, 10].

3.6. The learner's engagement level during ARAL sessions relates to reading outcomes

Table 7 The learner's engagement level during ARAL sessions relate to reading outcomes in terms of behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement, and affective engagement

Behavioral Engagement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I attend ARAL sessions regularly	3.76	0.10	Agree
I participate actively in reading activities	3.43	0.73	Agree
I complete assigned ARAL tasks	3.94	0.74	Agree
I stay focused during ARAL time	3.98	0.72	Agree
I follow instructions during ARAL lessons	4.13	0.73	Agree
Total	3.85	0.60	Agree
Cognitive Engagement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I use strategies taught in ARAL	3.68	0.63	Agree
I try to correct my own reading mistakes	4.20	0.61	Agree
I think deeply about what I read.	3.75	0.81	Agree
I ask questions when confused.	4.06	0.89	Agree
I apply feedback to improve my reading.	3.89	0.65	Agree
Total	3.92	0.72	Agree
Affective Engagement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I enjoy ARAL reading activities.	3.75	0.97	Agree
I feel confident in reading because of ARAL	3.17	0.88	Undecided
I feel motivated to improve my reading	4.00	0.60	Agree
I am less nervous when reading aloud	3.42	0.69	Agree
I believe ARAL helps me become better reader.	3.92	0.99	Agree
Total	3.65	0.83	Agree

The findings revealed that learners demonstrated high levels of behavioral, cognitive, and affective engagement during ARAL sessions. Learners actively followed instructions, completed tasks, applied reading strategies, and showed motivation to improve their reading skills. Cognitive engagement obtained the highest mean, indicating that learners were mentally involved in the learning process through self-monitoring and reflective thinking. However, reading confidence remained relatively lower, suggesting the need for additional support to reduce anxiety and strengthen self-efficacy. Overall, the results imply that learner engagement significantly contributes to improved reading outcomes and supports the effectiveness of the ARAL Program [13, 14].

3.7. The Implementation Fidelity of Learner's Associated with Changes in Reading Comprehension and Miscues

The findings revealed that the ARAL Program was implemented with a generally high level of fidelity in terms of adherence to procedures, quality of delivery, and program differentiation. Among the three domains, quality of delivery obtained the highest mean, indicating that teachers effectively explained lessons, provided feedback, and facilitated learning activities. The results also showed that individualized support was evident, although improvements in material consistency and task alignment to learners' reading levels are still needed. Overall, the findings suggest that consistent implementation and effective instructional practices contribute to the success of the ARAL Program [15, 16, 17].

Table 8 The implementation fidelity of learner's associated with changes in reading comprehension and miscues in terms of adherence to procedures, quality of delivery, and program differentiation

Adherence to Procedures	Mean	SD	Interpretation
ARAL sessions follow a regular schedule.	3.46	0.50	Agree
The teacher follows ARAL routines.	4.25	0.63	Strongly Agree
Activities follow the planned ARAL steps.	3.99	0.72	Agree
ARAL materials are used consistently.	3.32	0.66	Agree
Sessions are conducted as intended.	3.85	0.66	Agree
Total	3.77	0.63	Agree
Quality of Delivery	Mean	SD	Interpretation
The teacher explains lessons clearly.	4.36	0.60	Strongly Agree
Feedback from the teacher is helpful.	4.19	0.64	Agree
Instructions are easy to understand.	4.05	0.79	Agree
The teacher guides me effectively.	3.51	0.83	Agree
ARAL activities are well – organized.	3.89	0.71	Agree
Total	4.00	0.71	Agree
Program Differentiation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Activities match my reading level.	3.30	0.62	Agree
Lessons are adjusted to my needs	3.99	0.70	Agree
I receive individual assistance	4.65	0.48	Strongly Agree
Tasks are suited to my abilities	3.30	0.62	Agree
ARAL addresses my specific reading problems	3.95	0.70	Agree
Total	3.84	0.62	Agree

Table 9 The implementation fidelity of teachers associated with changes in reading comprehension and miscues in terms of adherence to procedures, quality of delivery, and program differentiation

Adherence to Procedures	Mean	SD	Interpretation
ARAL sessions follow a regular schedule.	3.50	0.71	Agree
The teacher follows ARAL routines.	4.10	0.57	Agree
Activities follow the planned ARAL steps.	3.80	0.63	Agree
ARAL materials are used consistently.	3.80	0.92	Agree
Sessions are conducted as intended.	3.90	0.74	Agree
Total	3.82	0.71	Agree
Quality of Delivery	Mean	SD	Interpretation
The teacher explains lessons clearly.	4.40	0.52	Strongly Agree
Feedback from the teacher is helpful.	3.60	0.70	Agree
Instructions are easy to understand.	3.80	0.79	Agree
The teacher guides me effectively.	4.10	0.57	Agree
ARAL activities are well – organized.	3.90	0.74	Agree

Total	3.96	0.66	Agree
Program Differentiation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Activities match my reading level.	3.40	0.52	Agree
Lessons are adjusted to my needs	4.00	0.00	Agree
I receive individual assistance	3.70	0.82	Agree
Tasks are suited to my abilities	3.80	0.42	Agree
ARAL addresses my specific reading problems	4.10	0.57	Agree
Total	3.80	0.47	Agree

The findings revealed that the ARAL Program was implemented with a high level of fidelity in terms of adherence to procedures, quality of delivery, and program differentiation. Teachers consistently followed program routines, delivered lessons clearly, provided helpful feedback, and offered individualized support to learners. Among the three domains, quality of delivery obtained the highest mean, indicating that effective instructional practices were the strongest aspect of implementation. However, improvements in material consistency, scaffolding, and alignment of tasks to learners' reading levels are still needed. Overall, consistent implementation and effective teaching practices contributed to the effectiveness of the ARAL Program [18, 16, 19].

3.8. Challenges encountered by teachers and learners in the implementation of the ARAL Program at Lingig National High School

Table 10 The challenges encountered by teachers and learners in the implementation of the ARAL Program at Lingig National High School

Question	Challenges
What major challenges do you encounter in implementing the ARAL program in your class?	Attendance Time Schedule Poor student attendance Lack of Materials Multiple role/responsibilities
What difficulties do you experience in addressing the reading needs of Phil-IRI-identified frustrated readers?	Lack of interest Weak comprehension skills Poor attendance Inappropriate reading materials Non-readers
What factors limit the effective delivery of ARAL activities (e.g., time, materials, learner behavior, training)?	Time constraint Learner's behavior Materials Multiple activities in schools
What strategies or practices have you found most helpful in improving learners' reading comprehension and reducing miscues?	Repeated reading Guided oral reading Clarifying unfamiliar words Peer tutoring or paired reading Word decoding
What support or resources do you need to improve ARAL implementation in your classroom?	Add additional ARAL tutors Reduce teaching loads of ARAL teachers Provision of reading materials Strong parent collaboration

	Training of ARAL tutors
How can the school administration further strengthen the ARAL Program?	Hire ARAL tutors Provide materials Adjust workload of ARAL teachers Provide more materials
What recommendations can you give to improve ARAL sessions for struggling readers?	Change time schedule Materials fit on learner's level Limit teaching loads of ARAL teachers Hire ARAL tutors Involvement of Parents

The thematic analysis revealed that the major challenges in implementing the ARAL Program include poor learner attendance, time constraints, lack of instructional materials, learner reading difficulties, and teacher workload. These issues affect the continuity and effectiveness of reading interventions. Despite these challenges, teachers identified effective strategies such as repeated reading, guided oral reading, vocabulary instruction, and peer-assisted learning to support reading improvement. Respondents also emphasized the need for stronger institutional support through additional manpower, adequate materials, reduced teacher workload, and increased parental involvement. Overall, the findings suggest that the effectiveness of the ARAL Program depends on consistent learner participation, sufficient resources, and collaborative support among teachers, school administrators, and parents [20, 21, 22]

3.9. INTERVENTION PROGRAM

3.9.1. Project BASA-ARAL

(Building Academic Skills through ARAL for Struggling Adolescent Readers and Learners)

Table 11 Intervention program for project BASA ARAL

Areas of Concern	Objectives	Strategies/ Activities	Persons Involved	Resources Needed	Time Frame	Success Indicators
Poor reading comprehension among Phil-IRI-identified frustrated readers	Improve learners' literal, inferential, and critical comprehension skills	Conduct daily guided reading sessions, comprehension drills, think-aloud activities, vocabulary enrichment, and story mapping exercises	School Head, English Teachers, ARAL Tutors, Learners	Reading materials, Phil-IRI passages, worksheets, vocabulary cards	Whole School Year	Increased comprehension scores and improved Phil-IRI reading levels
High frequency of oral reading miscues such as mispronunciation and repetition	Reduce oral reading miscues and improve reading fluency	Implement repeated reading, guided oral reading, phonics instruction, peer-assisted reading, and fluency practice sessions	English Teachers, ARAL Tutors, Learners	Decodable texts, flashcards, audio materials, fluency charts	Weekly throughout implementation	Reduced reading miscues and improved oral reading accuracy
Weak learner engagement and low reading confidence	Increase learner participation, motivation, and self-confidence in reading	Conduct interactive reading games, recognition activities, reading buddy system, and motivational reinforcement activities	Teachers, Guidance Counselor, Learners	Incentives, reading journals, certificates	Quarterly	Increased learner participation and confidence during reading sessions
Inconsistent learner attendance during ARAL sessions	Improve attendance and regular participation in ARAL activities	Establish attendance monitoring system, parent follow-up, and home visitation for at-risk learners	Advisers, ARAL Teachers, Parents, Guidance Coordinator	Attendance logbook, communication forms	Monthly monitoring	Improved attendance rate in ARAL sessions
Lack of instructional and leveled reading materials	Provide appropriate and differentiated reading resources	Develop localized and leveled reading materials suited to learners' reading abilities	English Department, School Reading Coordinator	Printed reading materials, bond paper, printer ink	First and Second Quarter	Availability of leveled reading materials for ARAL sessions
Teacher workload affecting ARAL implementation	Strengthen teacher support and implementation fidelity	Assign additional ARAL tutors, adjust teaching loads, and provide implementation support	School Head, Department Heads	Administrative support, scheduling plan	Beginning of School Year	Improved implementation consistency and

						teacher participation
Need for teacher capability enhancement	Enhance teachers' skills in handling struggling readers	Conduct seminars and workshops on phonics instruction, differentiated instruction, fluency strategies, and reading intervention techniques	School Administration, Reading Coordinators, External Trainers	Training modules, LCD projector, handouts	Semi-Annual	Improved teacher competence and instructional delivery
Limited parental involvement in learners' reading development	Strengthen home-school partnership in reading intervention	Conduct parent orientation, reading awareness seminars, and home reading activities	Teachers, Parents, PTA Officers	Parent guides, reading monitoring forms	Quarterly	Increased parental participation and home reading support
Need for continuous monitoring and evaluation of ARAL implementation	Ensure effective implementation and sustainability of the program	Conduct periodic assessment, classroom observation, progress monitoring, and evaluation meetings	School Head, Reading Coordinators, Teachers	Monitoring tools, evaluation forms	Quarterly	Improved implementation fidelity and learner progress

Project BASA-ARAL (Building Academic Skills through ARAL for Struggling Adolescent Readers and Learners) is a proposed intervention designed to strengthen the implementation of the ARAL Program for Phil-IRI-identified frustrated readers at Lingig National High School. The program aims to improve reading comprehension, oral reading fluency, learner engagement, and attendance through strategies such as guided oral reading, repeated reading, phonics instruction, vocabulary development, and differentiated activities. It also includes teacher training, provision of leveled reading materials, and stronger parental and institutional support to enhance the overall effectiveness of the ARAL Program.

4. Conclusion

The study concluded that the ARAL Program positively supports the reading development of Phil-IRI-identified frustrated learners by improving learner engagement and strengthening reading instruction. Learners demonstrated strong literal and critical comprehension as well as high behavioral, cognitive, and affective engagement during ARAL sessions.

However, the results showed no statistically significant difference in reading comprehension and oral reading miscues before and after the intervention, suggesting that the program's duration, intensity, and consistency may not yet be sufficient to produce measurable gains. Learners also continued to experience difficulties in inferential comprehension, decoding, pronunciation, and reading fluency.

The study further concludes that the effectiveness of the ARAL Program is influenced by factors such as attendance, instructional materials, time allocation, and teacher workload. Overall, the ARAL Program is a promising intervention, but stronger implementation support, sustained instruction, and enhanced intervention strategies are needed to achieve significant improvements in reading performance.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

The researcher gratefully acknowledges the Almighty God for His divine guidance and endless blessings. His grace sustained the researcher in overcoming every challenge along this academic journey.

Heartfelt appreciation is also given to the ARAL learners who are the respondents of this study for their cooperation and meaningful participation, which greatly contributed to the completion of this study.

The researcher sincerely thanks Lingig National High School, together with the ARAL teachers and English teachers, for their cooperation, guidance, and efforts in facilitating the research process and providing essential data for this study.

Special recognition is given to the researcher's thesis adviser, Professor Trexie O. Alawi, for her patience, support, and dedication in guiding the researcher throughout the conduct of this study. The researcher also extends sincere gratitude to the panel members, Dr. Elyssa Kaye V. Martinez, Dr. Maria Lady Sol A. Suazo, Dr. Rolly G. Salvaleon, and Dr. Evelyn T. Bagood, for their valuable comments and recommendations that strengthened this research.

Finally, the researcher expresses her deepest love and gratitude to her family and friends for their support, encouragement, prayers, and understanding throughout this academic journey. Their love and motivation became the researcher's source of strength in completing this study.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The researcher declares that there is no conflict of interest in the conduct, analysis, and presentation of this study. The research was carried out solely for academic purposes and with honesty, transparency, and integrity.

Statement of ethical approval

This study was conducted with the approval and permission of the school administration of Lingig National High School. The researcher followed the ethical guidelines and research procedures required for educational research involving student participants.

Statement of informed consent

Informed consent was secured from the participants and concerned authorities prior to the conduct of the study. The respondents were properly informed about the purpose of the research, the procedures involved, and their right to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty. Consent from parents or guardians was also obtained for student participants when necessary.

Ethical Statements

The researcher ensured that ethical standards were strictly observed throughout the conduct of the study. Respect for the rights, dignity, privacy, and welfare of all participants was maintained at all times. Participation in the study was voluntary, and all information gathered was treated with utmost confidentiality and used solely for research purposes.

References

- [1] OECD. (2023). PISA 2022 results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>
- [2] Department of Education (2025). June 13, 2025 DO 018, s. 2025 – Implementing Guidelines of the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Program. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2025/06/13/june-13-2025-do-018-s-2025-implementing-guidelines-of-the-academic-recovery-and-accessible-learning-program/>
- [3] Garcia, L. P., and Villanueva, K. S. (2021). Implementation challenges of the ARAL remedial program in public schools. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 9(1), 22–33. <https://ijern.com/journal/2021/ARAL-Program-Implementation.pdf>
- [4] Santos, A. R. (2020). Intervention programs for struggling readers in elementary grades: A Philippine context. *Basic Education Review*, 5(1), 89–101. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344556789>
- [5] Del Rosario, P. M., and Reotutar, J. F. (2022). Contextualized literacy interventions in Philippine public schools: A program assessment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 42(3), 367–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2022.2034152>
- [6] Department of Education. (2023a). DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2023: National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP). <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- [7] Wanzek, J., Stevens, E. A., Williams, K. J., Scammacca, N., Vaughn, S., and Sargent, K. (2020). Intensive early reading interventions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 53(6), 481–494.
- [8] Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., and Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140.
- [9] Duke, N. K., and Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progress: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(S1), S25–S44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.411>
- [10] Vaughn, S., Roberts, G., Wanzek, J., Swanson, E., and Fall, A. M. (2022). Improving reading comprehension and word reading for students with reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 55(1), 7–23.
- [11] Rasinski, T. (2018). Fluency matters. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(6), 635–640.
- [12] Stevens, E. A., Walker, M. A., and Vaughn, S. (2021). Effects of reading fluency interventions on struggling readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 54(3), 205–217.
- [13] Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., and Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109.
- [14] Reschly, A. L., and Christenson, S. L. (2022). *Student engagement: Effective practices for promoting success*. Springer.
- [15] Durlak, J. A., and DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(3–4), 327–350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9165-0>
- [16] Hattie, J. (2023). *Visible learning: The sequel*. Routledge.
- [17] Century, J., Rudnick, M., and Freeman, C. (2020). A framework for measuring implementation fidelity in education programs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 42(3), 345–366. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720938725>

- [18] Carroll, C., Patterson, M., Wood, S., Booth, A., Rick, J., and Balain, S. (2021). A conceptual framework for implementation fidelity. *Implementation Science*, 16(1), 1–12.
- [19] Fixsen, D. L., Blase, K. A., Metz, A., and Van Dyke, M. (2019). Implementation practice and science. Active Implementation Research Network.
- [20] Kraft, M. A., and Blazar, D. (2018). Effective teaching and student achievement. *Educational Researcher*, 47(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X1773033>
- [21] Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- [22] Jeynes, W. H. (2022). A meta-analysis on the effects of parental involvement on student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 57(5), 1–27.