

# Remedial Reading Program Activities of Public Elementary School Teachers in District V, Dagupan City Division

Harlene M. Alcantara  
Palaris Colleges, San Carlos City, Pangasinan  
[harlene.alcantara001@deped.gov.ph](mailto:harlene.alcantara001@deped.gov.ph)

Publication Date: March 13, 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19028976

## Abstract

Reading difficulties among primary grade learners continue to be a significant challenge in many public elementary schools, affecting comprehension, academic performance, and overall learning development. Implementing remedial reading program activities effectively is essential to support struggling readers and improve literacy outcomes in the early grades.

This study assessed the extent of implementation of Remedial Reading Program Activities in public elementary schools in District V, Dagupan City Division, for the school year 2025–2026. It focused on five key instructional areas: assessment-based instruction, multi-sensory approach, individualized instruction, small group sessions, and repetition and practice. The study also examined whether significant differences existed between the perceptions of teachers and school heads and determined the degree of seriousness of problems encountered in program implementation.

A descriptive-survey research design was employed, with 52 teachers and 3 school

heads from three public elementary schools included through total enumeration. Data were collected using a validated structured questionnaire adapted from Marti (2023). Analysis involved the Average Weighted Mean to determine the extent of implementation and seriousness of problems, while an independent samples t-test assessed differences in perceptions at the 0.05 level of significance.

Findings revealed that remedial reading program activities were generally implemented at an “often” level across the five areas, with assessment-based instruction, repetition and practice, and individualized instruction rated highest. There was no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers and school heads. Problems encountered were moderately serious, indicating areas for improvement in support, resources, and professional development. These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions to strengthen remedial reading programs and enhance learners’ reading proficiency.

**Keywords:** *remedial reading program activities, assessment-based instruction, multi-sensory approach, individualized instruction, small group sessions, and repetition and practice*



## INTRODUCTION

Reading is a fundamental skill that significantly influences learners' academic success and lifelong learning. In the early grades, the development of reading proficiency is particularly important because it serves as the foundation for learning in all subject areas. However, many pupils experience difficulties in reading comprehension, word recognition, and fluency, which may hinder their ability to keep pace with classroom instruction. These challenges highlight the importance of implementing effective remedial reading programs in public elementary schools to support struggling learners.

The Department of Education has emphasized the need for schools to implement reading interventions that address the diverse needs of learners who demonstrate limited reading proficiency. Remedial reading programs typically involve structured activities such as assessment-based instruction, multi-sensory teaching approaches, individualized instruction, small group sessions, and repeated practice to strengthen learners' reading skills. These strategies are designed to provide targeted support and opportunities for learners to develop confidence and competence in reading.

Teachers and school heads play a critical role in ensuring the successful implementation of remedial reading programs. Teachers are responsible for designing and delivering appropriate interventions, while school heads provide supervision, resources, and administrative support. However, the effective implementation of these programs may be influenced by several factors, including instructional materials, time constraints, training opportunities, and classroom conditions. Understanding how these programs are implemented and identifying the challenges encountered by teachers are essential for improving the quality of reading interventions in schools.

In view of these concerns, this study was conducted to assess the extent of implementation of Remedial Reading Program Activities in public elementary schools in District V, Dagupan City Division. By examining the perceptions of teachers and school heads and identifying the problems encountered in program implementation, the study aims to provide evidence-based information that may contribute to strengthening reading interventions and improving literacy outcomes among primary grade learners.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive-survey research design to determine the extent of implementation of Remedial Reading Program Activities in public elementary schools in District V, Dagupan City Division. The descriptive design was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to systematically describe existing conditions and practices related to the implementation of remedial reading programs without manipulating variables.



## Participants

The respondents consisted of 52 primary grade teachers and 3 school heads from three public elementary schools in District V, Dagupan City Division during the school year 2025–2026. These schools included Sabangan Elementary School, North Central Elementary School, and General Gregorio Del Pilar Elementary School. Total enumeration sampling was employed to include all teachers and school heads who were directly involved in the implementation and supervision of remedial reading activities.

## Instruments

Data were gathered using a validated structured questionnaire adapted from Marti (2023). The instrument consisted of two parts. Part I measured the extent of implementation of remedial reading program activities across five areas: assessment-based instruction, multi-sensory approach, individualized instruction, small group sessions, and repetition and practice. Part II assessed the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by teachers in the implementation of the remedial reading program. A Likert-scale format was used to quantify the perceptions of the respondents.

## Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Schools Division Office of Dagupan City and from the participating school heads. The researcher personally distributed and retrieved the questionnaires from the respondents. Participants were given adequate time to complete the instrument, and clarifications were provided when necessary to ensure accurate responses. Confidentiality of responses and voluntary participation were strictly observed throughout the data collection process.

## Data Analysis

The Average Weighted Mean was used to determine the extent of implementation of the remedial reading program activities and the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by teachers. The independent samples t-test was employed to determine whether significant differences existed between the perceptions of teachers and school heads regarding the implementation of the remedial reading program. All statistical tests were interpreted at the 0.05 level of significance.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF ASSESSMENT-BASED AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 2 shows that the overall Average Weighted Mean of 3.94 indicates that the implementation of assessment-based activities in the Remedial Reading Program is often observed by both teachers and school heads. This suggests that teachers consistently use diagnostic and formative assessments to identify learners' reading strengths and weaknesses, monitor progress, and adjust instruction accordingly. Practices such as administering baseline and post-tests, recording results systematically, grouping learners by reading levels, and involving parents in understanding assessment outcomes are regularly carried out. The findings imply that the assessment component of the program is effectively integrated into daily teaching, providing a solid foundation for targeted and individualized reading interventions. Teachers are actively using assessment data to inform remedial strategies, which enhances the program's responsiveness to learners' specific needs and supports measurable improvements in reading proficiency.

**Table 2. Extent of Implementation of the Remedial Reading Program Activities in terms of Assessment-Based as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads**

Assessment-Based	Teachers		School heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Administer baseline reading assessments at the start of the program to determine each learner's initial reading level.	3.99	O	4.02	O	4.01	O
2. Use diagnostic tools consistently to identify learners' specific strengths and weaknesses in phonics, fluency, and comprehension.	4.01	O	4.02	O	4.02	O
3. Conduct regular monitoring activities such as weekly or monthly checks to track learners' progress in reading.	3.58	O	3.61	O	3.60	O
4. Record all assessment results systematically in a monitoring sheet or digital tracker for reference and analysis.	3.56	O	3.58	O	3.57	O

5. Inform parents and guardians about their child's assessment results to promote home-school collaboration in reading development.	4.11	O	4.12	O	4.12	O
6. Adjust instructional plans and remedial activities based on the outcomes of diagnostic and formative assessments.	3.78	O	3.79	O	3.79	O
7. Administer post-tests or exit assessments after intervention to evaluate learners' improvement and mastery.	4.11	O	4.12	O	4.12	O
8. Ensure that assessment tools and materials are appropriate for the learners' age, grade level, and language background.	3.98	O	3.98	O	3.98	O
9. Group learners according to their assessed reading levels (frustration, instructional, independent) to deliver targeted instruction.	4.01	O	4.02	O	4.02	O
10. Utilize assessment results in preparing individualized action plans and strategies for remedial reading.	4.17	O	4.19	O	4.18	O
Total	3.93	O	3.95	O	3.94	O

### **EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF MULTI-SENSORY APPROACH AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS**

Table 3 shows that the overall Average Weighted Mean of 3.60 indicates that the multi-sensory approach in the Remedial Reading Program is often implemented by teachers and school heads. This suggests that teachers consistently use a variety of sensory modalities—visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic—to enhance learners' reading skills. Activities such as storytelling, read-alouds, tactile tracing, movement-based exercises, and rhymes are regularly applied to engage learners and reinforce letter recognition, phonics, and comprehension. However, some strategies, including the use of digital tools, color-coding, drawings, and combining multiple modalities in each lesson, were implemented slightly less often, showing areas for increased consistency. Overall, the findings imply that teachers recognize the value of multi-sensory instruction in supporting diverse learning styles and are actively integrating these strategies into remedial reading sessions, contributing to more engaging and effective literacy interventions.

**Table 3. Extent of Implementation of the Remedial Reading Program Activities in terms of Multi-Sensory Approach as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads**

Multi-Sensory Approach	Teachers		School heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Use visual aids such as flashcards, charts, and posters to support recognition of letters and words.	3.59	O	3.61	O	3.60	O
2. Include listening activities like storytelling, audio recordings, and read-alouds to build comprehension and fluency.	4.01	O	4.02	O	4.02	O
3. Trace letters, syllables, or words using tactile materials (e.g., sand, clay, textured paper) to strengthen memory.	4.02	O	4.02	O	4.02	O
4. Integrate movement-based activities such as acting out words or using gestures to connect learning with physical actions.	4.04	O	4.06	O	4.05	O
5. Incorporate digital tools such as reading apps, videos, and interactive games to make sessions engaging.	3.25	SO	3.26	SO	3.26	SO
6. Apply color-coding techniques to highlight syllables, phonics patterns, or key vocabulary.	3.22	SO	3.25	SO	3.24	SO
7. Use rhymes, jingles, and songs to reinforce phonemic awareness and vocabulary retention.	3.98	O	3.98	O	3.98	O
8. Create drawings, story maps, or illustrations that represent texts and ideas learned in reading sessions.	3.32	SO	3.36	SO	3.34	SO
9. Combine oral, written, visual, and kinesthetic activities in every lesson to cater to different learning styles.	3.21	SO	3.29	SO	3.25	SO

10. Apply multi-sensory strategies consistently across remedial reading sessions to ensure reinforcement of skills.	3.26	O	3.29	O	3.27	O
Total	3.59	O	3.61	O	3.60	O

### EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 4 indicates that the overall Average Weighted Mean of 3.71 shows that individualized instruction in the Remedial Reading Program is often implemented by teachers and school heads. This reflects a consistent effort to tailor reading interventions to the specific needs and abilities of each learner. Teachers are actively setting measurable reading goals, preparing customized materials, allowing learners to progress at their own pace, and providing personalized feedback. Strategies such as peer mentoring and targeted phonics or comprehension exercises are regularly applied to support struggling readers. While most practices are consistently implemented, some differentiated strategies, like providing leveled learning materials and assigning specific targeted tasks, are slightly less frequent, indicating areas for further emphasis. Overall, the findings highlight that teachers prioritize individualized approaches to ensure that each learner receives the necessary support to improve reading proficiency, fostering more effective and learner-centered remedial reading sessions.

**Table 4. Extent of Implementation of the Remedial Reading Program Activities in terms of Individualized Instruction as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads**

Individualized Instruction	Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Tailor lesson plans to match the unique reading needs of each learner, especially those identified as struggling.	3.67	O	3.69	O	3.68	O
2. Provide differentiated learning materials that are leveled and suitable for the learners' reading abilities.	3.39	SO	3.4	SO	3.40	SO
3. Give personalized and constructive feedback to learners after every reading activity to guide improvement.	3.29	SO	3.29	SO	3.29	SO

4. Assign specific tasks and activities, such as phonics drills or comprehension exercises, that target learners' weaknesses.	3.28	SO	3.29	SO	3.29	SO
5. Set clear, measurable, and attainable reading goals for each learner to track individual progress.	4.21	O	4.22	O	4.22	O
6. Allow learners to progress at their own pace, giving extra time and support to those who need it.	3.78	O	3.79	O	3.79	O
7. Prepare customized worksheets, flashcards, or stories that cater to learners' interests and reading levels.	4.11	O	4.12	O	4.12	O
8. Monitor each learner's performance closely through observation and progress charts.	3.42	O	3.43	O	3.43	O
9. Pair struggling readers with peer mentors or tutors for additional support and encouragement.	4.21	O	4.22	O	4.22	O
10. Adjust remedial sessions regularly depending on the learner's improvement and emerging needs.	3.71	O	3.72	O	3.71	O
Total	3.71	O	3.72	O	3.71	O

### **EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF SMALL GROUP SESSIONS AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS**

Table 5 shows that the overall Average Weighted Mean of 3.49 indicates that small group sessions in the Remedial Reading Program are often implemented by teachers and school heads. Grouping learners by ability and rotating groups to ensure equal opportunities are practices consistently applied, reflecting a strong effort to provide focused instruction and targeted support. Teachers also give immediate feedback and prepare materials specifically for small group and one-on-one sessions, demonstrating attention to individual learner needs. However, some practices, such as limiting group sizes, maximizing interaction for all learners, and dedicating extra time for slower learners, are implemented slightly less frequently, indicating areas that could be strengthened. Overall, the findings suggest that small group sessions are effectively utilized to provide personalized attention, support struggling readers, and enhance overall reading

proficiency, while highlighting opportunities to further optimize session management and learner engagement.

**Table 5. Extent of Implementation of the Remedial Reading Program Activities in terms of Small Group sessions as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads**

Small Group session	Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Group learners according to their ability levels to ensure instruction is appropriate and manageable.	4.18	O	4.19	O	4.19	O
2. Conduct small group reading sessions to provide focused attention and targeted activities.	3.42	O	3.43	O	3.43	O
3. Provide one-on-one support for non-readers or severely struggling readers to address their specific difficulties.	3.28	SO	3.29	SO	3.29	SO
4. Maximize teacher-student interaction by ensuring each learner participates actively during sessions.	3.01	SO	3.05	SO	3.03	SO
5. Limit group size to three to five learners for more effective instruction and monitoring.	3.12	SO	3.16	SO	3.14	SO
6. Give immediate corrective feedback during reading exercises to help learners avoid repeating errors.	3.79	O	3.79	O	3.79	O
7. Rotate reading groups so that all learners receive equal opportunities for guided implementation.	4.18	O	4.19	O	4.19	O
8. Prepare specific materials and activities suited for small group and one-on-one sessions.	3.47	O	3.48	O	3.48	O
9. Dedicate additional time to learners who show very slow progress despite group instruction.	3.15	SO	3.18	SO	3.17	SO

10. Schedule regular remedial sessions outside the normal class period to strengthen reading skills.	3.23	SO	3.25	SO	3.24	SO
Total	3.48	O	3.50	O	3.49	O

### EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF REPETITION AND PRACTICE AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 6 indicates that the overall Average Weighted Mean of 3.93 reflects that repetition and practice activities in the Remedial Reading Program are consistently implemented by teachers and school heads. Daily drills, repeated reading of texts, guided oral reading, and reinforcement of phonics and decoding skills are applied regularly to build learners' accuracy, fluency, and confidence in reading. Practices such as reviewing previous lessons, assigning homework, and engaging learners in interactive games also support retention and mastery of reading skills. The high level of implementation suggests that teachers prioritize repeated practice as a key strategy to strengthen reading proficiency, providing learners with multiple opportunities to consolidate learning. This consistent use of repetition and practice contributes significantly to improving reading outcomes and ensuring that struggling readers receive the structured support they need to develop foundational literacy skills.

**Table 6. Extent of Implementation of the Remedial Reading Program Activities in terms of Repetition and Practice as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads**

Repetition and Practice	Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Conduct daily drills of sight words to improve recognition and automaticity in reading.	3.68	O	3.69	O	3.69	O
2. Implementation reading short texts repeatedly until learners achieve accuracy and fluency.	3.99	O	3.98	O	3.99	O
3. Guide learners through oral reading activities that build confidence and fluency.	3.91	O	4.01	O	3.96	O

4. Reinforce phonics and decoding skills through repeated sound and word exercises.	4.01	O	4.02	O	4.02	O
5. Review previous lessons frequently to ensure mastery and retention of learned skills.	3.63	O	3.63	O	3.63	O
6. Read aloud regularly at home and in school to strengthen oral language and comprehension.	3.78	O	3.79	O	3.79	O
7. Provide structured opportunities for both oral and silent reading implementation.	4.09	O	4.12	O	4.11	O
8. Strengthen spelling and vocabulary mastery through repetition and varied implementation activities.	3.98	O	3.98	O	3.98	O
9. Assign daily seatwork or homework that reinforces reading tasks practice in class.	4.11	O	4.12	O	4.12	O
10. Engage learners in fun and interactive games that require repetition of reading skills.	4.01	O	4.02	O	4.02	O
Total	3.92	O	3.94	O	3.93	O

### **SUMMARY OF THE EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS**

Table 7 shows that the overall Average Weighted Mean of 3.72 indicates that the Remedial Reading Program Activities are generally implemented often by both teachers and school heads. Among the five key instructional areas, Assessment-Based instruction and Repetition and Practice are the most consistently applied, reflecting a strong focus on monitoring learner progress and providing repeated opportunities for skill mastery. Individualized Instruction and the Multi-Sensory Approach are also implemented regularly, supporting learners' diverse needs and learning styles. Small Group Sessions, while practiced often, have slightly lower implementation, suggesting room for more targeted attention in group instruction. Overall, the findings demonstrate that teachers are actively applying a variety of instructional strategies to enhance reading proficiency, providing structured, consistent, and evidence-based support to struggling readers in primary grades.

**Table 7. Summary of the Extent of Implementation of the Remedial Reading Program Activities as Perceived by Teachers and School Heads**

	Teachers		School Heads		Overall	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	AWM	DE
1. Assessment-Based	3.93	O	3.95	O	3.94	O
2. Multi-Sensory Approach	3.59	O	3.61	O	3.6	O
3. Individualized Instruction	3.71	O	3.72	O	3.71	O
4. Small Group Sessions	3.48	O	3.5	O	3.49	O
5. Repetition and Practice	3.92	O	3.94	O	3.93	O
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>O</b>

### SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Table 8 indicates that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers and school heads regarding the extent of implementation of the Remedial Reading Program Activities. The computed t-value is lower than the critical value, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This finding suggests a shared understanding and consistent observation between teachers and school heads on how frequently the program activities are being applied in classrooms. Both groups recognize that the key instructional strategies—Assessment-Based instruction, Multi-Sensory Approach, Individualized Instruction, Small Group Sessions, and Repetition and Practice—are generally implemented often, reflecting a cohesive approach to supporting struggling readers and enhancing literacy outcomes in the primary grades.

**Table 8. Significant Differences in the Extent of Implementation of the Remedial Reading Program Activities between the Perception of Teachers and School Heads**

	Teachers		School Heads	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE
1. Assessment-Based	3.93	O	3.95	O

2. Multi-Sensory Approach	3.59	O	3.61	O
3. Individualized Instruction	3.71	O	3.72	O
4. Small Group Sessions	3.48	O	3.5	O
5. Repetition and Practice	3.92	O	3.94	O
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.71</b>	O	<b>3.72</b>	O

Computed t-value: 0.890@ df 4

Alpha: @ 0.05 level of significance

Critical Value: 2.571 , df 4

Decision: accept the null hypothesis

Interpretation: No significant difference

### EXTENT OF SERIOUSNESS OF PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY TEACHERS

Table 9 shows that the problems encountered by teachers in implementing the Remedial Reading Program Activities are generally rated as moderately serious, with an overall AWM of 2.30. The most pressing issues include inadequate training in remedial strategies, insufficient time allocation for reading sessions, low learner motivation, and limited access to instructional materials and technology. These challenges highlight how both resource constraints and learner-related factors can affect the smooth delivery of reading interventions.

The moderately serious rating suggests that while teachers are actively implementing remedial reading activities, the effectiveness of these interventions can be compromised by logistical and instructional difficulties. Challenges such as managing large class sizes, diverse learning needs, and limited parental and administrative support further emphasize the need for structured support systems and targeted capacity-building measures.

Overall, the findings underscore the importance of addressing these barriers through professional development, provision of instructional resources, improved scheduling, and stakeholder engagement. Doing so can enhance the implementation fidelity of remedial reading programs and ultimately improve reading proficiency and learner engagement in primary grade classrooms.

**Table 9. Degree of Seriousness of Problems Encountered**

Indicators	Teachers		Rank
	Mean	DE	
1. Experience a lack of instructional materials such as storybooks, phonics resources, flashcards, and other tools needed for effective remedial activities.	2.39	S	5
2. Struggle with insufficient time allocation for remedial reading sessions due to overloaded class schedules and competing responsibilities.	2.47	S	2
3. Face challenges in managing large class sizes, which reduce opportunities for individualized instruction and small-group remediation.	2.35	S	6
4. Observe limited parental support since many parents are unable to provide follow-up reading implementation at home because of work demands or low literacy levels.	2.06	MS	8
5. Encounter inadequate training in remedial strategies, making it difficult to apply evidence-based interventions effectively.	2.67	S	1
6. Note low learner motivation as struggling readers often feel discouraged, embarrassed, or uninterested in remedial activities.	2.59	S	3.5
7. Report insufficient administrative support, as remedial reading is not always prioritized in terms of funding, scheduling, or recognition.	1.67	MS	10
8. Deal with limited access to technology, which hampers the integration of digital tools and multi-sensory approaches in reading remediation.	2.59	S	3.5
9. Encounter difficulties in addressing diverse learning needs, since reading challenges vary in phonics, fluency, and comprehension.	1.88	MS	9



10. It is challenging to monitor and evaluate learners' progress consistently because of the absence of standardized tools and heavy workloads.	2.29	MS	7
Total	<b>2.30</b>	MS	

## Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that both teachers and school heads perceived the extent of implementation of Remedial Reading Program Activities in public elementary schools to be generally high, indicating that key instructional strategies—particularly assessment-based approaches, individualized instruction, and repetition and practice—are consistently applied in remedial reading sessions. The perceptions of teachers and school heads did not significantly differ, reflecting a shared understanding and coordinated effort in delivering remedial reading interventions across instructional and administrative levels. Despite this, the problems encountered in implementing the program were rated as moderately serious, especially in areas such as teacher training, learner motivation, availability of instructional resources, time allocation, and monitoring of learner progress, which can influence the effectiveness and responsiveness of remedial instruction. In response to these findings, a proposed action plan was developed to address these challenges, strengthen program implementation, and enhance the overall delivery and impact of remedial reading activities in primary grade classrooms.

## REFERENCES

- Acita, M., Dacalos, M., & Datulayta, G. (2022). Challenges, difficulties, and effective enactment of remedial reading programs: A qualitative-phenomenological approach. *Psychology and Education Journal*, 5(1), 553–564. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7325200>
- Alayon, R. (2024). Reading difficulties among Filipino learners: Causes and interventions. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 93(2), 45–57.
- Alcantara, A. C., Villamin, A. T., & Cabanilla, F. G. (2016). *Teaching strategies for the thinking classroom*. Quezon City: Katha Publishing.
- Alumbro, A. (2021). Perspectives on literacy instruction in the Philippines. *Philippine Normal University Journal of Education*, 45(1), 100–115.
- Almutairi, N. (2018). The effectiveness of remedial reading interventions in primary schools. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 92(3), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2018.09.004>
- Arevalo, J. (2023). Remedial reading instructions and literacy outcomes among Grade 4 pupils. Unpublished master's thesis, [University Name], Philippines.
- Atkinson-Cornthwaite, M. (2022). Remedial reading programs and student improvement in comprehension. *Journal of Literacy Studies*, 8(2), 111–130.
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2016). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.



- Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. E. (2025). Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy. Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Birsh, J. R., & Carreker, S. (2018). Multisensory teaching of basic language skills (4th ed.). Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Boom, L. (2016). Principles of reading instruction. In A. Alumbro (Ed.), *Perspectives on literacy instruction in the Philippines* (pp. 112–130). Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing.
- Calderon, J. F., & Gonzales, E. C. (2022). *Methods of research and thesis writing*. National Book Store.
- Calhoun, M. B. (2026). Effects of a peer-mediated phonological skill and reading comprehension program. *Learning Disabilities Research & Implementation*, 20(1), 20–32.
- Castillo, M. (2023). Challenges in implementing remedial reading programs in public elementary schools. *Philippine Normal University Research Journal*, 12(1), 55–70.
- Chapman, J. W. (2023). The influence of social and cultural factors on reading difficulties. *Educational Psychology Review*, 15(4), 351–377.
- Cristobal, M. (2015). Reading proficiency and student outcomes in Philippine schools. *Journal of Literacy and Development*, 8(2), 13–27.
- Crowe, C. (2026). Effects of feedback on reading accuracy, comprehension, and fluency. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 290–301. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.290>
- Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1997). Early reading acquisition and its relation to reading experience and ability 10 years later. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(6), 934–945.
- Dacalos, M., Datulayta, G., & Davis, R. (2016). Reading difficulties in the K–12 curriculum: A spiral challenge. *Journal of Philippine Education*, 90(3), 101–120.
- DepEd (Department of Education). (2020). DepEd Order No. 45, s. 2020: Reading literacy program in elementary schools. Department of Education, Philippines.
- DepEd (Department of Education). (2026). DepEd Order No. 27, s. 2026: Remedial instruction programs in high schools. Department of Education, Philippines.
- DepEd (Department of Education). (2023). DepEd Memorandum No. 244, s. 2023: Every Child a Reader Program (ECARP). Department of Education, Philippines.
- DepEd (Department of Education). (2018). DepEd Order No. 14, s. 2018: Policy guidelines on the administration of the Revised Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI). Department of Education, Philippines.
- Feleo, R. (2022). *Developing effective reading programs in Philippine schools*. Manila: Rex Book Store.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Generó, L. (2015). Remedial reading implementations in Philippine elementary and high schools. *Philippine Education Quarterly*, 18(2), 77–91.

- Graney, S. (2020). Early reading difficulties and long-term literacy outcomes. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(3), 336–356. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.35.3.5>
- Habagat, M., & Rizon, R. (2022). Reading remediation for slow learners in Philippine classrooms. *Mindanao Education Journal*, 6(1), 15–29.
- Hock, M. F., & Deshler, D. D. (2023). Adolescents with learning disabilities: Preventing school dropout through reading instruction. *Learning Disabilities Research & Implementation*, 18(3), 157–167.
- International Reading Association. (2018). *Standards for reading professionals*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Kinberg, M. (2016). *Guided reading the four-blocks® way: Grades 1–3*. Carson-Dellosa Publishing.
- Klingner, J. K., Vaughn, S., & Boardman, A. (2017). *Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties*. Guilford Press.
- Lalunio, R. (1994). Literacy difficulties among Filipino elementary pupils. *Philippine Journal of Reading*, 24(1), 33–42.
- Linnakylä, P., Malin, A., & Taube, K. (2025). Literacy as a foundation for lifelong learning. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 48(2), 123–138.
- McCardle, P., Scarborough, H. S., & Catts, H. W. (2021). Predicting, explaining, and preventing children’s reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research & Implementation*, 16(4), 230–239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0938-8982.00023>
- McKee, A. (2022). *Textual analysis: A beginner’s guide*. Sage.
- McNamara, D. S. (2017). *Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, interventions, and technologies*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Miguel, C. (2017). Reading performance of Filipino students: A longitudinal study. *Asian Education Journal*, 18(2), 67–82.
- Montalban, J. (2019). Addressing literacy gaps through remedial instruction. *Philippine Educational Forum*, 12(3), 44–56.
- Nichols, W. D. (2024). Adolescent literacy: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 57(4), 293–301. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.244>
- Oakhill, J., Cain, K., & Elbro, C. (2015). *Understanding and teaching reading comprehension: A handbook*. Routledge.
- Rio, A. (2024). Teachers’ workload and remedial responsibilities in Philippine schools. *Philippine Educational Review*, 54(1), 21–38.
- Samuels, S. J. (2020). Reading fluency: Its development and assessment. In A. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 166–183). International Reading Association.
- Sancada, R. T. (2022). Quality reading instruction in Philippine schools: A grounded theory approach. *Psychology and Education Journal*, 5(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6957238>

- Scanlon, D. M., & Vellutino, F. R. (2023). The interactive strategies approach to early literacy intervention. In B. Foorman (Ed.), *Preventing and remediating reading difficulties: Bringing science to scale* (pp. 51–91). York Press.
- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Chambers, B., Cheung, A., & Davis, S. (2023). Effective reading programs for elementary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(4), 1391–1466. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311420184>
- Snow, C. E. (2020). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. RAND.
- Therrien, W. J. (2025). Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of repeated reading: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education*, 25(4), 252–261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325040250040801>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2024). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Torgesen, J. K., Alexander, A. W., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K. K. S., & Conway, T. (2021). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 34(1), 33–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002221940103400104>
- Travers, R. M. W. (1978). *An introduction to educational research* (4th ed.). Macmillan Publishing.
- Valencia, S. W., & Buly, M. R. (2025). Behind test scores: What struggling readers really need. *The Reading Teacher*, 57(6), 520–531. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20205391>
- Umali, M. (2016). Remedial reading programs in Philippine public schools: An evaluation. *Asian Journal of Literacy Studies*, 5(2), 89–104.
- Wolf, M. (2017). *Proust and the squid: The story and science of the reading brain*. HarperCollins.
- Woolley, G. (2023). *Reading comprehension: Assisting children with learning difficulties*. Springer.
- Zunguze, E. (2023). Socioeconomic and linguistic factors affecting literacy development. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(3), 278–285.