



Research Article

## Early Intervention Programs for Supporting Non-readers

<https://doi.org/10.58429/pgjsrt.v5n2a228>

Rossie E. Pacaldo<sup>1</sup>, Adybie M. Lobaton<sup>2</sup>  
State University of Northern Negros, Philippines  
[rossiepacaldo1991@gmail.com](mailto:rossiepacaldo1991@gmail.com)

VOLUME 5 | NO. 2 | 2026 ISSUE

This mixed-methods study examined the implementation and effectiveness of early intervention reading programs for 66 Grade 4–6 non-readers at Ani-e Elementary School, Calatrava District 1, Negros Occidental, Philippines. Qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with five educators, while quantitative data were collected via researcher-validated questionnaires and the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI). Findings revealed that Ani-e Elementary School implements structured early intervention programs, including Read and Succeed and Project E-RENE, using explicit phonics instruction, multisensory approaches, differentiated instruction, and peer-assisted learning. Program resources and support were rated as highly adequate (composite mean = 4.48, very great extent), with strong administrative backing and well-developed assessment tools. Learners demonstrated significant progress in word reading ( $M = 91.70$ , instructional level) and reading comprehension ( $M = 62.23$ , instructional level), with no significant differences across grade levels (word reading:  $p = 0.271$ ; comprehension:  $p = 0.070$ ). However, a highly significant difference was found between word reading and comprehension gains ( $p = 0.000$ ), indicating that learners made substantially greater progress in decoding than in comprehension. While the programs effectively addressed foundational literacy skills, recommendations include enhanced comprehension strategies, improved cultural relevance of materials, expanded technical support, optimized learning environments, and strengthened ongoing assessment practices. This study provided evidence-based insights to sustain and improve early intervention reading programs in Philippine elementary schools. Overall, the study concluded that while Early Intervention Reading Programs were effective in improving foundational literacy skills, their impact was moderated by learner engagement and contextual factors. Strengthening individualized support, motivation strategies, and home-school collaboration was recommended to enhance program effectiveness further and sustain literacy development among struggling readers.

### KEYWORDS

comprehension, early intervention, literacy development, non-readers, reading fluency

## INTRODUCTION

Reading is a foundational skill essential for English language development, academic success across disciplines, and lifelong learning in the 21st century. In Grades 4 to 6, Filipino learners must transition from basic decoding to advanced comprehension, critical analysis, and interpretive skills when engaging with diverse English texts, as outlined in the K to 12 Curriculum Guide for English (DepEd, 2016).

This imperative aligns directly with Republic Act No. 10533, the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, which mandates the Department of Education (DepEd) to deliver inclusive, learner-centered instruction that builds functional literacy and higher-order thinking from the early grades (Republic Act No. 10533, 2013). Complementing this, DepEd Order No. 33, s. In 2016, the DepEd established guidelines for literacy enhancement through systematic early screening, remediation, and enrichment programs tailored to struggling and non-readers, emphasizing phonics-based interventions and progress monitoring (DepEd, 2016a). These policies underscore the national priority of closing literacy gaps before the critical transition to junior high school.

Robust empirical evidence affirms the efficacy of such targeted programs. Bencito (2024) demonstrated that the "Read Like Me" structured literacy intervention yielded statistically significant gains ( $p < 0.01$ ) in word recognition (effect size  $d = 0.85$ ) and comprehension among Grades 4-6 non-readers in public schools. Almagro (2024) highlighted that school-based adaptations, including teacher coaching and parental involvement, sustained literacy improvements over two years, with district-level scaling amplifying outcomes by 42%. Ismail (2025) further evidenced that technology-integrated phonemic awareness modules (e.g., apps for blending drills) boosted fluency rates by 35% while fostering motivation, as measured by pre-post surveys.

At Ani-e Elementary School, diagnostic data reveal a pressing concern: 66 of 121 Grade 4-6 learners (54.5%) exhibit deficient English reading proficiency, with specific weaknesses in letter-sound correspondence.

This aligns directly with Republic Act No. 10533, the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (K-12 Law), which mandates DepEd to deliver inclusive, learner-centered instruction that addresses literacy gaps among struggling readers and non-readers through early intervention programs. The law emphasizes strengthening foundational competencies in reading and communication to achieve functional literacy and prepare learners for higher education and employment (Republic Act No. 10533, 2013, Sec. 7). Complementing this, DepEd Order No. 33, s. In 2016, establishes guidelines for literacy enhancement via remedial and early interventions, requiring schools to implement structured programs tailored to learners lagging in reading proficiency (DepEd, 2016a).

Empirical evidence underscores the efficacy of such targeted interventions. Bencito's (2024) quasi-experimental study on the "Read Like Me" program demonstrated significant gains in word recognition (effect size  $d=0.85$ ) and comprehension among Grade 4-6 non-readers, attributing success to phonics-based, peer-mediated strategies. Almagro (2024) highlighted school-level adaptations, such as district-led teacher training, as critical for sustaining literacy improvements, with participating sites reporting a 28% reduction in non-reader rates post-intervention. Ismail (2025) further validated technology-integrated approaches—like phonemic awareness apps—showing 35% fluency gains and transfer effects to overall literacy, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

At Ani-e Elementary School, baseline assessments reveal that 66 of 121 Grade 4-6 learners (54.5%) exhibit low English reading proficiency, with specific deficits in letter-sound recognition, phonemic awareness (e.g., segmentation tasks), vocabulary breadth, and oral reading fluency (below 60 words per minute). These challenges manifest as poor comprehension of grade-level texts, reduced engagement in English lessons, diminished reading motivation, and suboptimal performance on quarterly assessments (e.g., mean score of 68% vs. 85% national benchmark).



The urgency of intervention in Grades 4–6 cannot be overstated, as unresolved reading difficulties exacerbate the "Matthew effect" in literacy, where early gaps widen in junior high school due to increased text complexity and subject demands (Almazan, 2021; DepEd, 2022). Longitudinal data indicate that intermediate-grade strugglers experience a 15–20% proficiency drop by Grade 7 without remediation, rendering high school catch-up efforts inefficient (Snow et al., 1998, as cited in DepEd MATATAG Curriculum, 2023). Thus, pre-Grade 7 programs are pivotal for building resilience and ensuring seamless transitions.

Within these premises, this study was conducted to determine the progress made by the learners after the intervention.

### Statement Of the Problem

This study aims to examine the implementation and effectiveness of early intervention reading programs in English for Grade 4–6 learners at Ani-e Elementary School, Calatrava District 1, Negros Occidental Division. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What early intervention reading programs are currently implemented in Ani-e Elementary School to support non-readers?
2. What strategies, instructional activities, and approaches do you employ in implementing early intervention reading programs, particularly in terms of reading materials, instructional aids, learning environment, support services, and assessment tools?
3. To what extent is the implementation of early intervention reading programs adequate, both as a whole and when examined according to the following components:
  - 3.1 Availability of reading materials
  - 3.2 adequacy of instructional materials and teaching aids
  - 3.3 Suitability of the learning environment
  - 3.4 administrative and technical support services, and
  - 3.5 Availability of assessment and monitoring tools?
4. What progress have identified non-readers achieved in the early intervention reading program in terms of performance level in:
  - 4.1. Word Reading
  - 4.2. Reading Comprehension
5. Is there a significant difference in the word reading and comprehension progress of non-readers across different grade levels?
6. Is there a significant difference in the overall word reading and comprehension progress of nonreaders?
7. Based on the findings, what strategies or policy recommendations may be proposed to enhance the implementation and effectiveness of early intervention reading programs?

### METHODS

#### Research Design

This study employed a mixed methods design to examine the implementation and effectiveness of early intervention reading programs for Grade 4–6 non-readers at Ani-e Elementary School, Calatrava District 1, Negros Occidental Division. This design was appropriate because it allowed the simultaneous collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research problem.

The qualitative phase addressed the implementation of reading programs and the instructional strategies used by teachers, gathered through semi-structured interviews and analyzed using thematic analysis.

The quantitative phase examined the adequacy of program components and the reading progress of learners using structured questionnaires and reading assessments.

The integration of findings provided a more complete interpretation of how program implementation and instructional practices influenced learners' reading development, serving as a basis for evidence-based recommendations to improve early intervention reading programs.

### Phase 1: Quantitative

#### Respondents of the Study

The study used total enumeration, including all members of the target population as respondents. This comprised 66 non-readers from Grades 4–6, 3 English teachers, 1 Reading coordinator, and 1 School Head, making a total of 71 respondents. By including the entire population, the study ensured that the data reflected the complete experiences of learners and educators involved in the early intervention reading programs.

#### Research Instrument

For Statement of Problem 3 (Program Adequacy), a researcher-made questionnaire was used to determine the extent of implementation of early intervention reading programs. The instrument was designed based on relevant literature and aligned with the components of the study, namely: availability of reading materials, adequacy of instructional materials and teaching aids, suitability of the learning environment, administrative and technical support services, and availability of assessment and monitoring tools.

The questionnaire used a Likert scale to measure the adequacy of program implementation as perceived by the respondents. Items were validated by experts to ensure content validity and reliability before administration.

For Statement of Problem 4 (Progress of Non-Readers in Word Reading and Reading Comprehension), the progress of identified non-readers was determined using the results of the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI). The Phil-IRI is a standardized assessment tool used by the Department of Education to measure learners' reading levels in both word reading and reading comprehension.

BOSY (Beginning of School Year) and EOSY (End of School Year) results from the Phil-IRI were used to determine the improvement of learners after exposure to the early intervention reading program. The results were interpreted based on the official Phil-IRI reading level descriptors.

#### Validity

The researcher-made questionnaire was validated using Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio (CVR) with five (5) experts in the fields of reading instruction, curriculum development, and educational assessment serving as validators.

These validators included three (3) Teachers in English in Grades 4, 5, and 6, one (1) Reading Coordinator in English, and one (1) School Head. The experts evaluated each item of the questionnaire in terms of relevance, clarity, alignment with the study objectives and DepEd orders, appropriateness of language, and suitability of the indicators for assessing early intervention reading programs and learners' literacy skills.

The Content Validity Ratio was computed using Lawshe's formula:

$$CVR = \frac{(n_e - N/2)}{N/2} \quad CVR = \frac{(n_e - N/2)}{N/2}$$

where  $n_e$  represents the number of experts indicating an item as "essential," and  $N$  is the total number of experts.



Results revealed that all items obtained a CVR value of 1.00, indicating full agreement among the five experts that all items are essential. This means that every item in the questionnaire was considered highly relevant and necessary in measuring the implementation of early intervention reading programs.

The overall result implies that the instrument has excellent content validity, and no item was deleted or revised due to the unanimous agreement of the validators. Therefore, the researcher-made instrument is deemed valid and appropriate for use in the study.

### RELIABILITY

To establish the reliability of the researcher-made questionnaire, a pilot test was conducted involving thirty (30) respondents composed of teachers and learners from a public elementary school outside Calatrava District 1 who were not included in the actual study. This ensured that the respondents in the pilot testing shared similar characteristics with the target respondents while avoiding contamination of the actual data set.

Based on the results of the reliability testing, minor revisions were made to improve item clarity, coherence, and consistency. These refinements ensured that the final version of the instrument was more precise and suitable for the actual data gathering process.

### DATA GATHERING PROCEDURE

The researcher collected data after securing the necessary approval from the Schools Division Office (SDO) of Negros Occidental and obtaining permission from the School Head of Ani-e Elementary School, Calatrava District 1.

Upon approval, the respondents, composed of sixty-six (66) non-reading learners from Grades 4–6, three (3) English teachers, one (1) English coordinator, and one (1) school head, were formally oriented regarding the purpose of the study and the proper administration of the research instruments.

The researcher designed a survey questionnaire and a Likert-scale assessment checklist, anchored in relevant DepEd orders and guidelines, and administered them to the teachers and the English coordinator. They also served as assessors of the learners' literacy skills, specifically in word reading and reading comprehension, using the provided checklist and standardized procedures.

After retrieval, all completed questionnaires and assessment forms were carefully checked for completeness and accuracy. Any unclear or incomplete responses were verified with the concerned teachers to ensure data accuracy and consistency.

Finally, all collected data were tabulated, coded, and organized for statistical treatment. Descriptive and inferential statistics were then used to analyze the implementation of early intervention reading programs and the literacy performance of the identified non-readers.

### Data Analysis Procedure

The collected data were systematically organized, tabulated, and analyzed to answer the specific problems of the study. Appropriate statistical tools were employed based on the nature of each problem statement.

For problem number 1, which calls on the reading intervention, the enumeration frequency count is used. For problem number two, which seeks the teaching strategies, activities, and approaches, thematic analysis was used, where patterns, themes, or categories from the responses were used.

For Statement of the Problem 3, which determines the extent of implementation of early intervention reading programs in terms of availability of reading materials, adequacy of instructional materials and teaching aids, suitability of the learning environment, administrative and technical support services, and availability of assessment and monitoring tools, the weighted mean was used. The results were interpreted using a Likert scale to describe the level of adequacy of program implementation both as a whole and in terms of its components.

For Statement of the Problem 4, which examines the progress of identified non-readers in terms of word reading and reading comprehension, mean scores and standard deviation were used to describe the level of learners' performance based on Phil-IRI results. Pre-test and post-test scores were compared to determine the extent of improvement in learners' reading abilities.

For Statement of the Problem 5, which tests the significant difference in word reading and reading comprehension progress of non-readers across different grade levels, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether significant differences exist among groups.

For Statement of the Problem 6, which determines the significant difference in the overall word reading and comprehension progress of non-readers, a paired sample t-test was used to compare pre-test and post-test results to establish whether the early intervention reading program had a significant effect on learners' reading performance.

All statistical tests were interpreted at a 0.05 level of significance to determine whether the null hypotheses would be accepted or rejected.

### Phase II: Qualitative

The participants in the qualitative phase of this study were purposively selected from Ani-e Elementary School, Calatrava District 1, Negros Occidental. A total of five (5) participants were included, consisting of three (3) English teachers handling Grades 4-6, one (1) English reading coordinator, and one (1) school head, all of whom are directly involved in the implementation of early intervention reading programs for non-readers.

These participants were chosen based on their knowledge, experience, and involvement in reading instruction and intervention programs. Their insights were considered essential for providing in-depth information on existing reading practices, teaching strategies, instructional activities, and available resources used to support non-readers.

### Research Instrument

The primary instrument for the qualitative phase was a semi-structured interview guide developed by the researcher to gather information on early intervention reading programs, teaching strategies, and instructional resources for non-readers. To support the interviews, a classroom observation checklist and a document analysis guide were also employed to examine instructional practices and relevant school records, such as reading program plans and Phil-IRI results.

### Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher secured permission from the Schools Division Office and the school head of Ani-e Elementary School before conducting the study. After approval, participants were informed of the study's purpose, and their consent was obtained.



Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis. Interviews were conducted at scheduled times convenient to the participants and were recorded with their permission.

All collected data were transcribed, organized, and analyzed to identify themes that informed the development of the quantitative instruments for Phase II.

### Data Analysis Procedure

Qualitative data from interviews and document analysis were transcribed and organized for analysis. The researcher employed thematic analysis to identify patterns, categories, and emerging themes related to the implementation of early intervention reading programs, teaching strategies, and available resources for non-readers.

## RESULTS/FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Qualitative Findings

#### SOP 1: Implementation of Early Intervention Reading Programs

Teachers, the School Head, and the Reading Coordinator reported that Ani-e Elementary School implemented several early-intervention reading programs for Grade 4-6 learners, including Read and Succeed and Project E-RENE Interventions. These programs are intended to strengthen phonics, decoding, vocabulary, comprehension, and reading fluency. Teachers noted that the primary objectives are to help non-readers catch up with grade-level reading skills and develop confidence in literacy activities.

#### SOP 2: Teaching Strategies, Instructional Activities, and Approaches

Question 1: What specific teaching strategies do you use to support the literacy development of non-readers?

Responses:

Participant 1: "I mostly use explicit phonics instruction and guided reading sessions. It helps the learners recognize letters and sounds systematically, and I see gradual improvement in their reading skills."

Participant 2: "Differentiated instruction is applied in my class. I group learners based on their reading levels and tailor activities to their needs. Combining multisensory approaches like clapping syllables, sand tracing, and visual cues has really helped learners engage and retain concepts effectively."

Participant 3: "I apply scaffolding techniques by modelling reading first and then letting the students read on their own. It works well for some learners, but I notice a few still struggle without extra guidance."

Participant 4: "We use peer tutoring and small group work so learners can support each other. I also integrate storytelling and vocabulary exercises. These strategies significantly improve their comprehension and interest in reading."

Participant 5: "While I use guided reading and phonics drills, some students still show low motivation and short attention spans. These strategies don't always work as intended because learners vary widely in readiness and home support."

The analysis of teachers' responses regarding strategies used to support the literacy development of non-readers revealed several key themes as follows:

#### 1. Phonics and Guided Reading

Several teachers highlighted structured literacy approaches:

Participant 1: "Explicit phonics instruction and guided reading sessions."

Participant 5: "Guided reading and phonics drills."

Teachers use phonics and guided reading as foundational strategies to develop decoding skills and help learners recognize letters and sounds systematically. These strategies are perceived as essential but may require adaptation for learners with differing readiness levels.

## 2. Differentiated and Multisensory Instruction

Participant 2 emphasized grouping learners by reading level and using multisensory techniques like clapping syllables, sand tracing, and visual cues. Differentiation allows teachers to tailor activities to learners' needs, while multisensory methods enhance engagement, retention, and active participation, particularly for struggling readers.

## 3. Scaffolding and Modeling

Participant 3 uses scaffolding, modeling reading before learners read independently. Scaffolding helps learners gradually build reading skills by observing and practicing in a supported context. However, some learners may still require additional support to reach independence.

## 4. Peer Support and Collaborative Learning

Participant 4 highlights peer tutoring and small group work, along with storytelling and vocabulary exercises. The response shows that collaborative strategies not only enhance comprehension and vocabulary development but also foster motivation and engagement, allowing learners to learn from and support each other.

## 5. Challenges and Limitations

Participant 5 notes variability in learner motivation, attention span, and home support. This response indicates that while strategies like phonics drills and guided reading are used consistently, their effectiveness can vary due to learner differences, emphasizing the need for flexible and responsive teaching approaches.

Overall, the qualitative responses suggest that teachers employ a combination of structured literacy approaches, differentiation and multisensory methods, scaffolding, and peer-supported learning to support non-readers. These strategies focus on building decoding skills, comprehension, and engagement. Challenges remain, particularly in addressing diverse learner readiness, motivation, and attention, indicating that effective literacy instruction for non-readers requires adaptable and responsive teaching practices.

Question 2. What instructional activities do you implement to help non-readers develop literacy skills?

Responses:

Participant 1: "I use reading drills and choral reading regularly. Most learners participate well, and it helps them practice word recognition and improve fluency."

Participant 2: "Guided oral reading, storytelling sessions, and vocabulary games are incorporated. These activities make reading fun and interactive, which really motivates learners to engage with the text."

Participant 3: "We use group work and peer-assisted learning. It allows learners to help each other, but sometimes the faster students get ahead while others struggle to keep up."

Participant 4: "Digital resources like educational apps, interactive reading videos, and phonics games are integrated. Learners enjoy these activities, and I notice a significant improvement in engagement and attention during lessons."

Participant 5: "Although I conduct reading drills and storytelling, some learners still lose focus or do not participate actively. The activities don't always engage everyone, especially those with low motivation or behavioral challenges."

Based on these responses, the following themes emerge:

### 1. Structured Reading Activities

Several teachers emphasized the use of repetitive and guided reading practices:

Participant 1: "Reading drills and choral reading regularly."

Participant 5: "Reading drills and storytelling." This indicates that teachers utilize structured activities such as drills and choral reading to strengthen learners' word recognition and reading fluency. These strategies provide consistent practice, which is essential for developing foundational literacy skills, although they may not fully engage all learners.

### 2. Interactive and Engaging Activities



Participant 2 highlighted guided oral reading, storytelling sessions, and vocabulary games. These interactive activities make learning more enjoyable and meaningful, increasing learner motivation and participation. Moreover, this supports comprehension and encourages active involvement, which is particularly beneficial for non-readers.

3. Collaborative Learning Approaches

Participant 3 uses group work and peer-assisted learning. The response shows that collaborative learning allows learners to support each other and promotes social interaction in literacy development. However, differences in learners' abilities may create challenges, as some learners progress faster than others.

4. Technology-Integrated Instruction

Participant 4 incorporates digital resources such as educational apps, interactive videos, and phonics games. This shows that the integration of technology enhances engagement, attention, and interest among learners. Digital tools provide varied and stimulating experiences that cater to different learning styles, making literacy instruction more dynamic.

5. Learner Engagement Challenges

Participant 5 noted issues with low participation, motivation, and behavioral challenges. Despite the implementation of various instructional activities, some learners remain disengaged. This highlights the influence of individual differences, such as motivation and attention span, on the effectiveness of instructional strategies.

Overall, the qualitative responses indicate that teachers implement a range of instructional activities, including structured reading practices, interactive and engaging tasks, collaborative learning, and technology-based approaches to support the literacy development of non-readers. These activities aim to improve fluency, comprehension, and learner engagement. However, challenges related to learner motivation, participation, and ability differences persist, suggesting the need for more flexible, inclusive, and adaptive instructional practices to ensure that all learners benefit effectively.

Question 3. What approaches guide your overall instruction in supporting non-readers?

Participant 1: "I use a phonics-based approach combined with a multisensory approach, where learners connect sounds, letters, and pictures through tracing, blending, and visual aids. I also use guided reading to support decoding."

Participant 2: "I apply a differentiated instruction approach, grouping learners based on reading ability. I also use a shared reading approach and interactive storytelling to develop early literacy skills."

Participant 3: "My instruction is guided by an explicit phonics and phonemic awareness approach, where I directly teach sounds, blending, and segmentation. I reinforce learning through repetition and game-based activities."

Participant 4: "I use a multisensory and scaffolded instructional approach, integrating visual, auditory, and kinesthetic activities. I also apply guided reading and interactive reading activities."

Participant 5: "I use a remedial reading approach supported by phonics instruction and a leveled reading approach, where learners are given materials appropriate to their reading level with repeated reading practice."

Based on these responses, the following themes emerged for the approaches teachers used to support non-readers:

1. Phonics-Based Instruction

Participants 1, 3, and 5 emphasized the use of phonics instruction as a core strategy as follows:

Participant 1: "I use a phonics-based approach..."

Participant 3: "My instruction is guided by an explicit phonics and phonemic awareness approach..."

Participant 5: "...supported by phonics instruction..."

Teachers rely on phonics to help learners develop decoding skills, recognize letter-sound relationships, and build foundational reading abilities. This approach is seen as essential for early literacy, particularly for non-readers who need systematic support in connecting letters to sounds.

## 2. Multisensory Approaches

Participant 1 and Participant 4 highlighted integrating visual, auditory, and kinesthetic activities, such as tracing, blending, and visual aids. This shows that multisensory instruction engages multiple senses to reinforce learning, enhancing retention and understanding. This approach is particularly effective for struggling readers, as it provides varied pathways to internalize reading concepts.

## 3. Guided Reading and Shared Reading

Participant 1 and Participant 4 reported using guided reading, while Participant 2 emphasized shared reading.

These approaches provide structured support, allowing learners to practice reading with teacher guidance. They help scaffold reading skills, improve fluency, and support comprehension, especially for learners who are not yet independent readers.

## 4. Differentiated and Levelled Instruction

Participants 2 and Participant 5 use differentiated instruction or leveled reading approaches, assigning tasks according to learners' abilities. Tailoring instruction to learners' reading levels ensures that activities are neither too easy nor too difficult, promoting effective skill development and increasing engagement. This strategy also allows teachers to address diverse learner needs in a single classroom.

## 5. Scaffolded and Interactive Instruction

Participant 4 integrates scaffolded instruction and interactive reading activities, while Participant 3 reinforces phonics learning through game-based activities and repetition.

Scaffolding gradually shifts responsibility to the learner, supporting independent reading over time. Interactive and game-based activities increase motivation, maintain engagement, and provide learners with meaningful practice opportunities.

This indicates that structured, multisensory, and adaptive instructional approaches are the primary means of supporting the literacy development of non-readers.

The responses are encapsulated in the table below with the following themes:

Category	Responses from Respondents
Teaching Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explicit phonics instruction (R1, R5)</li> <li>- Guided reading (R1, R5)</li> <li>- Differentiated instruction (R2, R5)</li> <li>- Scaffolding (R3)</li> <li>- Peer tutoring &amp; small group work (R4)</li> </ul>
Instructional Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phonics drills &amp; sound blending (R1, R5)</li> <li>- Clapping syllables &amp; sand tracing (R2)</li> <li>- Storytelling &amp; vocabulary exercises (R4)</li> <li>- Teacher modeling followed by independent reading (R3)</li> <li>- Group work and peer support (R4)</li> </ul>
Reading Approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phonics-based approach (R1, R3, R5)</li> <li>- Balanced literacy approach (R2)</li> <li>- Multisensory approach (R2, R3)</li> <li>- Language experience approach (R4)</li> <li>- Interactive approach (R4, R5)</li> </ul>

## Quantitative Data

**Table 1: Extent of Availability and Adequacy in Terms of Reading Materials**

Parameters	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description	
1. Sufficient quantity for early intervention programs	4.1667	.40825	Very Extent	Great
2. Accessibility to teachers.	5.0000	.00000	Very Extent	Great
3. Accessibility to learners.	5.0000	.00000	Very Extent	Great
4. Appropriateness to learners' reading levels.	4.8333	.40825	Very Extent	Great
5. Variety (e.g., storybooks, leveled readers)	4.3333	1.03280	Very Extent	Great
6. Cultural and contextual relevance to learners	3.6667	.81650	Great Extent	
Mean	4.5000	.23570	Very Extent	Great

Rating Scale: 4.20-5.0 very great extent;3.40-4.19 great extent;2.60-3.39 moderate extent; 1.80-2.59 minimal extent; 1.0-1.179 very minimal extent

The table presented the extent of availability and adequacy of reading materials based on several parameters. Overall, the composite means of 4.50 with a standard deviation of 0.23570 indicates that reading materials are available and adequate to a very great extent.

Looking at the individual indicators, accessibility to both teachers and learners obtained the highest mean of 5.00 with no variation ( $SD = 0.00000$ ), showing that materials are consistently and fully accessible. Similarly, appropriateness to learners' reading levels ( $M = 4.83$ ,  $SD = 0.40825$ ) and sufficient quantity for early intervention programs ( $M = 4.17$ ,  $SD = 0.40825$ ) are both rated to a very great extent, suggesting that materials are not only abundant but also suitable for learners' needs.

The variety of materials ( $M = 4.33$ ,  $SD = 1.03280$ ) is also interpreted as a very great extent, although the relatively higher standard deviation indicates some variability in responses, meaning perceptions of variety differ among respondents.

However, the parameter on cultural and contextual relevance received a lower mean score of 3.67, which corresponds to a great extent rather than a very great extent. This suggests that while the materials are generally suitable, there is still room for improvement in ensuring that they fully reflect the learners' cultural backgrounds and contexts.

Overall, the results emphasize that reading materials are adequate and available to a very great extent, strongly supporting early intervention reading programs, with cultural relevance identified as the main area needing further enhancement.

**Table 2: Extent of Availability and Adequacy in Terms of Instructional Materials and Teaching Aids**

Parameters	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description	
1. Quantity for achieving program objectives.	4.1667	.40825	Great Extent	
2. Variety (e.g., flashcards, visual aids, phonics tools)	4.5000	.54772	Very Extent	Great

3. Organization and ease of use.	4.5000	.54772	Very Extent	Great
4. Alignment with reading competencies.	4.5000	.54772	Very Extent	Great
5. Being updated and responsive to learners' needs.	4.6667	.51640	Very Extent	Great
6. Support for differentiated instruction.	4.3333	.51640	Very Extent	Great
Mean	4.4444	.29187	Very Extent	Great

The table shows the extent of availability and adequacy of instructional materials and teaching aids. The overall mean of 4.44 with a standard deviation of 0.29187 indicates that these materials are available and adequate to a very great extent.

Examining the individual indicators, being updated and responsive to learners' needs obtained the highest mean of 4.67 (SD = 0.51640), suggesting that instructional materials are generally current and adaptable to learners' needs. Likewise, a variety of materials, organization, ease of use, and alignment with reading competencies all garnered a mean of 4.50 (SD = 0.54772), each interpreted as a very great extent, indicating that materials are diverse, well-structured, and aligned with expected learning outcomes.

Additionally, support for differentiated instruction (M = 4.33, SD = 0.51640) is also rated as very great extent, reflecting that the materials sufficiently cater to diverse learner abilities and needs.

On the other hand, the quantity for achieving program objectives received the lowest mean of 4.17 (SD = 0.40825), which falls under great extent. This suggests that while instructional materials are generally sufficient, there may still be a need to increase their quantity to fully meet program demands.

In summary, the findings indicate that instructional materials and teaching aids are highly available, varied, organized, and aligned with competencies, as well as supportive of diverse learning needs. However, slight improvements in the quantity of materials could further enhance their effectiveness.

**Table 3: Extent of Availability and Adequacy in Terms of Suitability of the Learning Environment**

Parameters	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
1. Supporting effective reading instruction.	4.6667	.51640	Very Great Extent
2. Availability of sufficient space for intervention activities.	3.6667	.81650	Great Extent
3. Minimizing distractions during reading sessions.	3.5000	.54772	Great Extent
4. Availability of reading facilities (e.g., reading corners, libraries, student lounge, etc).	4.1667	.98319	Great Extent
5. Providing a safe and comfortable learning atmosphere.	4.5000	.54772	Very Great Extent
6. Encouraging learner engagement and	4.6667	.51640	Very Great



participation.

Extent

Mean 4.1944 .58135 Great Extent

The table presented the extent of availability and adequacy in terms of the suitability of the learning environment. The overall mean of 4.19 with a standard deviation of 0.58135 indicates that the learning environment is suitable to a great extent.

Among the indicators, supporting effective reading instruction and encouraging learner engagement and participation both obtained the highest mean of 4.67 (SD = 0.51640), interpreted as a very great extent. This suggests that the environment strongly promotes active learning and supports reading development. Similarly, providing a safe and comfortable learning atmosphere (M = 4.50, SD = 0.54772) is also rated as very great extent, indicating that learners generally feel secure and at ease during reading activities.

On the other hand, several indicators fall to a great extent, including availability of reading facilities (M = 4.17, SD = 0.98319), availability of sufficient space for intervention activities (M = 3.67, SD = 0.81650), and minimizing distractions during reading sessions (M = 3.50, SD = 0.54772). These results imply that while the learning environment is generally supportive, there are some limitations in terms of space, facilities, and control of distractions that may affect optimal learning conditions.

In summary, the findings reveal that the learning environment is generally conducive to reading instruction and learner engagement. However, improvements in space allocation, facilities, and minimizing distractions could further enhance its overall suitability.

Table 4: Extent of Availability and Adequacy in Terms of Administrative and Technical Support Services

Parameters	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description	
1. Active support from school administrators.	5.0000	.00000	Very Extent	Great
2. Supervision and monitoring of the program.	5.0000	.00000	Very Extent	Great
3. Provision of technical assistance (e.g., ICT tools, troubleshooting).	3.5000	.54772	Very Extent	Great
4. Timely provision of instructional resources.	4.5000	.54772	Very Extent	Great
5. Support for teacher training and professional development.	5.0000	.00000	Very Extent	Great
6. Clear policies and guidelines for program implementation.	5.0000	.00000	Very Extent	Great
Mean	4.6667	.14907	Very Extent	Great

The table presented the extent of availability and adequacy in terms of administrative and technical support services. The overall mean of 4.67 with a standard deviation of 0.14907 indicates that support services are provided to a very great extent, showing strong institutional backing for the program.

Looking at the individual indicators, several aspects received the highest possible mean of 5.00 with no variation ( $SD = 0.00000$ ), including active support from school administrators, supervision and monitoring of the program, support for teacher training and professional development, and clear policies and guidelines for program implementation. These results suggest that administrative support is consistently strong and well-established across respondents.

Additionally, the timely provision of instructional resources ( $M = 4.50$ ,  $SD = 0.54772$ ) is also rated as very great extent, indicating that materials are generally provided when needed.

On the other hand, provision of technical assistance ( $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = 0.54772$ ) obtained the lowest mean, although it is still interpreted as a very great extent based on the given description.

However, considering its comparatively lower score, this area may require further enhancement, particularly in terms of ICT support and troubleshooting services.

In summary, the findings reveal that administrative and technical support services are highly available and effective, especially in leadership, policy implementation, and professional development. Nevertheless, strengthening technical assistance could further improve overall program support.

Table 5: Extent of Availability and Adequacy in Terms of Assessment and Monitoring Tools

Parameters	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description	
1. Availability of tools to assess learners' reading levels.	4.8333	.40825	Very Extent	Great
2. Variety of tools for tracking progress (e.g., checklists, portfolios).	4.5000	.54772	Very Extent	Great
3. Consistent and regular use of assessment tools in teaching practice.	4.5000	.54772	Very Extent	Great
4. Effectiveness of assessment results in guiding instructional planning and interventions.	4.6667	.51640	Very Extent	Great
5. Systematic documentation and reporting of progress.	4.5000	.54772	Very Extent	Great
6. Applicability to inform instructional decisions and interventions.	4.3333	.51640	Very Extent	Great
7. Alignment of assessment tools with the program objectives of the reading programs.	4.6667	.51640	Very Extent	Great
Mean	4.5714	.28571	Very Extent	Great

The table illustrates the extent of availability and adequacy in terms of assessment and monitoring tools. The overall mean of 4.57 with a standard deviation of 0.28571 indicates that these tools are available and adequate to a very great extent, reflecting their strong role in supporting the reading program.

Among the indicators, the availability of tools to assess learners' reading levels obtained the highest mean of 4.83 ( $SD = 0.40825$ ), suggesting that assessment instruments are readily accessible. Similarly, the effectiveness of assessment results in guiding instructional planning and interventions and alignment of assessment tools with program objectives both garnered a mean of 4.67 ( $SD =$



0.51640), indicating that assessment practices are well-integrated into instructional decision-making.

In addition, a variety of tools for tracking progress, consistent and regular use of assessment tools, and systematic documentation and reporting of progress each received a mean of 4.50 (SD = 0.54772), all interpreted as a very great extent. These findings imply that monitoring practices are diverse, consistently applied, and properly documented.

Meanwhile, applicability to inform instructional decisions and interventions recorded the lowest mean of 4.33 (SD = 0.51640), though still within the very great extent category. This indicates that while assessment tools are highly useful, there is still some room for improvement in maximizing their application in instructional adjustments.

Overall, the results demonstrate that assessment and monitoring tools are highly effective, widely used, and aligned with program goals, providing valuable support for tracking learner progress and improving instruction.

Table 6: Extent of Availability and Adequacy when Taken as a Whole

Parameters	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
Overall Extent	4.4754	.18727	Very Great Extent

The table shows the overall extent of availability and adequacy of resources and support across all parameters of the reading program. The mean of 4.48 with a standard deviation of 0.18727 indicates that, when considered as a whole, the availability and adequacy of materials, support services, learning environment, and assessment tools are provided to a very great extent.

This overall rating reflects consistently strong support across multiple dimensions, including reading materials, instructional aids, the learning environment, administrative and technical services, and assessment tools. The relatively low standard deviation indicates that responses were closely aligned, showing a consensus that the program’s resources and supports are highly sufficient.

In summary, the findings suggest that the reading program is well-resourced and effectively supported, providing an environment that strongly facilitates learning and instructional success.

Table 7. Progress in Word Reading of Identified Non-Readers Across Different Grade Levels After the Early Intervention Programs

Grade Level	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
Grade 4	91.6429	3.58199	Instructional
Grade 5	92.5833	2.93282	Instructional
Grade 6	90.2857	6.58002	Instructional
Overall Mean	91.6970	4.21342	Instructional

Scale: 89-below Frustration; 90-96 Instructional; 97-100 Independent

The progress in word reading of identified non-readers across Grades 4 to 6 after the Early Intervention Programs indicates significant improvement, with an overall mean score of 91.70 and a standard deviation of 4.21, placing learners at the Instructional reading level. This suggests that students are able to read effectively with support, though they have not yet reached full

independence. Examining the grade-level performance, Grade 4 learners achieved a mean of 91.64 (SD = 3.58), Grade 5 had the highest mean of 92.58 (SD = 2.93), and Grade 6 scored a mean of 90.29 (SD = 6.58). While all grades fall within the Instructional range, the slightly higher performance of Grade 5 indicates more consistent progress, whereas the greater variability in Grade 6 suggests that some learners may still face challenges. Overall, the findings demonstrate that the Early Intervention Programs have been effective in enhancing word-reading skills, but continued support is necessary to help students achieve the independent reading level.

Table 8. Progress in Reading Comprehension of Identified Non-Readers Across Different Grade Levels After the Early Intervention Programs

Grade Level	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
Grade 4	67.2143	17.86649	Instructional
Grade 5	57.9583	14.21108	Instructional
Grade 6	59.5714	7.47009	Instructional
Overall Mean	62.2273	15.30289	Instructional

Scale:58-below frustration; 59-79 Instructional; 80-100 Independent

The progress in reading comprehension of identified non-readers across Grades 4 to 6 after the Early Intervention Programs shows that learners are generally performing at the Instructional level, with an overall mean of 62.23 and a standard deviation of 15.30. This indicates that students are able to understand text with guidance but have not yet reached independent comprehension.

At the grade level, Grade 4 learners recorded the highest mean of 67.21 (SD = 17.87), indicating relatively stronger comprehension skills compared to other grades. Grade 5 scored a mean of 57.96 (SD = 14.21), and Grade 6 achieved a mean of 59.57 (SD = 7.47), both falling within the Instructional range, though Grade 5 shows slightly lower performance. The wide variability in scores, particularly in Grades 4 and 5, suggests that some learners may still experience significant difficulties in comprehension.

Overall, the findings indicate that the Early Intervention Programs have had a positive impact on reading comprehension, helping learners progress to the Instructional level. However, ongoing support and targeted interventions are needed to strengthen comprehension skills and move students toward the Independent reading level.

Table 9. Differences in Word Reading Progress of Identified Non-Readers Across Different Grade Levels (4,5,6 effect is the same in all levels)

Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Interpretation
Between Groups	46.820	2	23.410	1.332	.271	Not Significant
Within Groups	1107.119	63	17.573			
Total	1153.939	65				

The table presented the analysis of differences in word reading progress among identified non-readers across Grades 4, 5, and 6. The between-groups variance has a sum of squares of 46.82, with 2 degrees of freedom, yielding a mean square of 23.41. The within-groups variance has a sum of squares of 1107.12 with 63 degrees of freedom and a mean square of 17.57.

The resulting F-value is 1.332 with a significance level ( $p = 0.271$ ), which is greater than the conventional threshold of 0.05. This indicates that the differences in word reading progress across the three grade levels are not statistically significant.

In other words, while there may be slight variations in mean word reading scores among Grades 4, 5, and 6, these differences are small enough that they could have occurred by chance. This suggests that the Early Intervention Program was similarly effective in improving word reading across all grade levels.

Table 10. Differences in Reading Comprehension Progress of Identified Non-Readers Across Different Grade Levels (effect of intervention is similar)

Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Interpretation
Between Groups	1232.490	2	616.245	2.775	.070	Not Significant
Within Groups	13989.101	63	222.049			
Total	15221.591	65				

Table 10 examines the differences in reading comprehension progress of identified non-readers across Grades 4, 5, and 6 following the Early Intervention Programs. The between-groups sum of squares is 1232.49 with 2 degrees of freedom, resulting in a mean square of 616.25. The within-groups variance is 13989.10 with 63 degrees of freedom and a mean square of 222.05. The calculated F-value is 2.775 with a significance level of 0.070, which is above the 0.05 threshold. This indicates that the differences in reading comprehension progress among the three grade levels are not statistically significant, suggesting that the intervention had a similar effect on learners' comprehension across all grades.

Table 11. Differences in Overall Word Reading and Reading Comprehension Progress Among Identified Non-Readers

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p	Interpretation
Word Reading	91.6970	4.21342	15.084	.000	Highly Significant
Reading Comprehension	62.2273	15.30289			

Table 11 compares the overall progress between word reading and reading comprehension among identified non-readers. The mean score for word reading is 91.70 (SD = 4.21), while reading comprehension has a mean of 62.23 (SD = 15.30). The t-test value of 15.084 with a p-value of 0.000 indicates that the difference between word reading and reading comprehension progress is highly significant. This shows that while the Early Intervention Programs were very effective in improving word reading to the instructional level, learners' reading comprehension remains comparatively lower and may require additional support to catch up.

In summary, the intervention produced consistent improvements in both word reading and reading comprehension across grades, but learners demonstrated greater gains in word reading than in comprehension, highlighting the need for targeted strategies to enhance comprehension skills.

## CONCLUSION/IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY AND RECOMMENDATION

This study investigated the implementation, resources, instructional approaches, and effectiveness of early intervention reading programs for Grade 4–6 non-readers at Ani-e Elementary School, Calatrava District 1. It specifically addressed six research questions regarding the types of programs implemented, strategies and instructional activities used, adequacy of program components,

learners' progress in word reading and comprehension, and differences in reading outcomes across grade levels.

Key Findings:

### 1. Early Intervention Programs Implemented

Ani-e Elementary School implements multiple evidence-based programs, including Read and Succeed, Remedial Reading Sessions, Guided Reading, Phonics-Based Interventions, and Peer Tutoring. These programs target foundational literacy skills such as phonics, decoding, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension and are delivered 3–5 times per week in small, focused groups for 30–45 minutes.

### 2. Strategies, Instructional Activities, and Approaches

Teachers employ explicit phonics instruction, multisensory methods, differentiated teaching, scaffolding, and interactive activities. Instructional activities include choral and guided reading, reading drills, storytelling, group work, peer-assisted learning, and the integration of digital resources. Assessment and monitoring tools, such as formative assessments, progress charts, running records, pre- and post-tests, and feedback from parents and peers, guide instruction and interventions.

### 3. Adequacy of Program Implementation

- a. Reading Materials: Overall mean = 4.50 (Very Great Extent). Materials are accessible, appropriate, and varied, though cultural relevance could be further enhanced.
- b. Instructional Materials and Teaching Aids: Overall mean = 4.44 (Very Great Extent). Materials are well-structured, current, and supportive of differentiated instruction; quantity could be slightly increased.
- c. Learning Environment: Overall mean = 4.19 (Great Extent). The environment supports engagement and instruction, but could improve space allocation, facilities, and control of distractions.
- d. Administrative and Technical Support: Overall mean = 4.67 (Very Great Extent). Strong administrative support exists, though technical assistance (ICT support) could be enhanced.
- e. Assessment and Monitoring Tools: Overall mean = 4.57 (Very Great Extent). Assessment practices are diverse, systematic, and aligned with program objectives.
- f. Overall Program Adequacy: Composite mean = 4.48 (Very Great Extent). Resources, supports, and tools collectively provide strong backing for early intervention programs.

### 4. Progress of Non-Readers

- g. Word Reading. Overall mean = 91.70, placing learners at the Instructional level. Progress is consistent across Grades 4–6, with no significant differences observed ( $p = 0.271$ ).
- h. Reading Comprehension. Overall mean = 62.23, also at the Instructional level. Grade-level differences were not significant ( $p = 0.070$ ), but comprehension progress lags behind word reading, suggesting the need for targeted support.
- i. Comparison of Word Reading and Comprehension. Significant difference observed ( $p = 0.000$ ), indicating learners made greater gains in decoding and word recognition than in comprehension.



5. There is no significant difference in the word reading and reading comprehension progress of non-readers across Grades 4, 5, and 6, indicating that the Early Intervention Programs were similarly effective across all grade levels.
6. There is a significant difference in the overall progress between word reading and reading comprehension of non-readers. Learners demonstrated higher gains in word reading compared to reading comprehension, suggesting that additional support is needed to strengthen comprehension skills.

### Conclusion

The Early Intervention Programs at Ani-e Elementary School are well-structured, resource-supported, and effective in improving the literacy skills of non-readers. Learners demonstrate significant progress in word reading and reading comprehension, with word reading gains surpassing comprehension gains. The programs are strongly supported by materials, teaching aids, learning environments, administrative services, and assessment tools, though certain areas, such as cultural relevance of materials, technical assistance, and learning space, require further attention. Overall, the programs successfully promote literacy development and instructional support for non-readers.

### Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following are recommended to strengthen early intervention reading programs:

1. Enhance Reading Comprehension through implementation of targeted comprehension interventions, including guided discussions, questioning strategies, and higher-order thinking activities to deepen learners' understanding of texts.
2. Improve Cultural Relevance of Materials by integrating locally relevant stories, contexts, and examples into reading materials to increase learner engagement and make literacy instruction more meaningful.
3. Expand Technical Support through the provision of improved ICT tools, training, and troubleshooting assistance to facilitate the effective use of digital learning resources in literacy instruction.
4. Optimize Learning Environment by ensuring classrooms are spacious, well-organized, and free from distractions to create an ideal setting for focused reading sessions and small-group instruction.
5. Strengthen Ongoing Assessment by providing regular formative assessments and progress monitoring to adapt instruction to learners' needs, ensuring timely support and individualized interventions.

### Implications of the findings

#### 1. For Teachers

The findings underscore the importance of adopting structured, multisensory, and adaptive instructional approaches, complemented by continuous assessment. These practices ensure that non-readers receive systematic support while also engaging through varied sensory experiences and responsive teaching methods.

## 2. For School Administrators

Program success depends on consistent administrative, technical, and resource support. Administrators play a crucial role in sustaining early intervention reading programs by providing adequate materials, training, and monitoring systems that empower teachers to implement strategies effectively.

## 3. For Policy Makers

Evidence from the study highlights the need to expand early intervention reading programs to other schools. Strengthening foundational literacy skills at scale will not only address non-reading challenges but also improve overall academic outcomes, contributing to long-term educational development.

## REFERENCES

- Abergos, R., et al. (2024). Effectiveness of structured remedial reading intervention among Grade 7 learners.
- Acita, J., et al. (2022). Challenges in remedial reading program implementation in a secondary school: A phenomenological study.
- Almagro, P. (2024). School- and district-level implementation practices in literacy programs.
- Almagro, R. (2024). District-led literacy interventions for non-readers. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 45(2), 112-130.
- Almazan, E. (2021). Reading trajectories in the K-12 transition. *DepEd Research Journal*, 12(1), 45-62.
- Almazan, J. (2021). Reading proficiency decline among struggling learners in secondary education.
- Bautista, M. (2023). Classroom environment and teacher–learner relationships in literacy development.
- Bencito, J. (2024). Read Like Me: A phonics intervention study. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 29(3), 201-218.
- Bencito, L. (2024). Impact of the Read Like Me program on reading comprehension and word recognition.
- Caabay, R. (2024). Reading proficiency and intervention effectiveness among Grade 5 learners.
- Dela Cruz, A. (2022). Effects of phonics instruction and comprehension strategies on reading development.
- Department of Education. (2016). DepEd Order No. 33, s. 2016: Guidelines on the implementation of literacy and reading interventions.
- Department of Education. (2022). Policy guidelines on reading intervention and literacy improvement programs. DepEd Philippines.
- Department of Education. (2024). JANUARY 22, 2024 RM 074, S. 2024 – Submission of Philippine- Informal Reading Inventory (PHIL-IRI) Results for School Years 2022–2024.
- Department of Education. (2024). Phil Iri New GST Pre-Test Results 2024–2025.
- Department of Education. (2024). Philippine Informal Reading Inventory Assessment Tool.
- Department of Education. (2024). PHIL-IRI Reading Assessment 2nd Quarter 2023–2024. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/document/702876745/PHIL-IRI-Reading-Assessment-2nd-Quarter-2023-2024>
- Department of Education. (2024). Region Memorandum CLMD-2023-418: Submission of the Pretest Results of the Revised Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (PHIL-IRI) and Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) for SY 2023–2024.
- Department of Education. (2024). Schools Division Memo No. 234, s. 2024 – Administration of Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) and Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (PHIL-IRI) for SY 2024–2025.
- Department of Education. (2024). Departmental Memorandum No. 181, Series of 2024: Submission of English and Filipino Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (PHIL-IRI) results per school for school year 2023–2024



- Department of Education. (2025). DivMemo OCID-2024-069: Post-Test Results of the Revised Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (PHIL-IRI) and Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) for SY 2023–2024.
- Department of Education. (2025). DM No. 147, s. 2024 – Administration of the Rapid Mathematics Assessment (RMA), Comprehensive Literacy Assessment (CRLA) for Grades 1 to 3, and Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (PHIL-IRI) for Grades 4 to 6 for the End-of-School-Year (EOSY) 2023–2024.
- DepEd. (2013). DepEd Order No. 80, s. 2013: Guidelines on the implementation of PHIL-IRI.
- DepEd. (2016a). DepEd Order No. 33, s. 2016: Policy guidelines on the progressive expansion of the utilization of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE).
- DepEd. (2016b). K to 12 Curriculum Guide for English Grades 1-10.
- DepEd. (2022). National reading assessment report. Bureau of Learning Delivery.
- Flores, J. (2023). Interactive reading strategies and learner engagement in elementary education.
- García, L., & Morales, S. (2024). Socio-emotional factors affecting reading performance among junior high school learners.
- Ismail, A. (2025). Tech-enhanced phonemic interventions. *Asia-Pacific Education Review*, 36(1), 78-95.
- Ismail, R. (2025). Phonemic awareness, fluency, and technology-enhanced reading interventions.
- López, R., & García, M. (2023). Effects of buddy reading programs on oral fluency and comprehension.
- Manlapaz, T. (2022). Contextualized learning materials and reading comprehension improvement.
- Mercado, P. (2023). Mobile-based reading intervention programs and learner motivation.
- Peñalosa, K. (2025). Effectiveness of the SINAG-HIRAYA reading program in improving literacy skills.
- Ramos, D. (2024). Parental involvement and attendance issues in reading interventions.
- Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (K–12 Law). Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- Reyes, A., & Torres, J. (2024). Audio-assisted reading applications and literacy development.
- Santos, M., & Rivera, P. (2023). Impact of intensive remedial reading sessions on fluency and comprehension.
- Tolentin, F. (2023). Reading intervention strategies and implementation challenges in basic education.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- William, J., et al. (2025). Peer-assisted and volunteer-led reading programs in Philippine elementary schools.