2026 Volume: 02 Issue: 05 www.ijrpa.com ISSN 2456-9995 Research Article

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-09

EFFECTS OF ARAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION ON TEACHING EFFICIENCY AND LEARNER PERFORMANCE IN MATALAM SOUTH DISTRICT

[*1]Berna Joy A. Cañete, [2]Genaro R. Andres, CESE, PhD

[1]DepEd-Cotabato Division-Kilada Elementary School

[2]Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology, Doroluman, Arakan, Cotabato, Philippines

Article Received: 02 April 2026
Article Revised: 22 April 2026
Published on: 12 May 2026

***Corresponding Author: Berna Joy A. Cañete**
DepEd-Cotabato Division-Kilada Elementary School

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.6006

ABSTRACT

This quantitative study examined the effects of the ARAL (Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning) Program implementation on teaching efficiency and learner performance in Matalam South District, Matalam, Cotabato, Philippines for School Year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive-correlational design with complete enumeration, 209 elementary school teachers were surveyed using a validated, researcher-made questionnaire (Cronbach's Alpha = .835, .828, .738). ARAL implementation was assessed across five components: teacher preparedness, learning materials, learner identification process, monitoring, and scheduling. Teaching efficiency was measured through lesson planning and organization, instructional delivery, assessment and feedback, and classroom management. Learner performance was examined in terms of academic achievement, classroom engagement, learning outcomes, and motivation and attitude. Results revealed that all ARAL implementation components were highly implemented (WM range: 4.64–4.84). Teachers were highly efficient in all areas (WM range: 4.81–4.93), and learners demonstrated excellent performance across all dimensions (WM range: 4.75–4.94). Spearman rho analysis found significant relationships between learning materials, learner identification, monitoring, and scheduling with key teaching efficiency indicators. Regression analysis confirmed that scheduling, monitoring, and learner identification significantly predict instructional delivery, lesson planning, assessment, and classroom management. Learning materials significantly influenced classroom engagement ($R^2 = 0.051$), monitoring predicted learning outcomes ($R^2 = 0.040$), and learning materials and scheduling jointly influenced motivation and attitude (R^2

= 0.055). These findings affirm that structured ARAL implementation substantially enhances both teaching efficiency and learner performance in the Philippine public school context.

KEYWORDS: *ARAL program; teaching efficiency; learner performance; descriptive-correlational; Matalam South District; learning recovery; DepEd*

INTRODUCTION

Basic education quality in the Philippines continues to face persistent challenges arising from learning gaps exacerbated by COVID-19 disruptions. The Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program is DepEd's structured initiative to provide targeted tutorials for learners behind grade-level competencies, initially focusing on reading with plans to expand to mathematics and science (Philippine Information Agency, 2025). The program involves tutor training, deployment of learning resources, and stakeholder coordination to help learners achieve foundational skills while improving teaching effectiveness.

Despite initial reports of reading gains—including 30–40% increases in reading proficiency in some schools (Hernando-Malipot, 2026) and 5–9 point increases in reading readiness scores across Grades 3–10 from mid-year assessments (Department of Education, 2026)—empirical evidence on how specific ARAL implementation components affect teaching efficiency and learner academic outcomes remains limited, particularly across diverse school settings. This gap limits efforts to refine and sustain effective implementation (Dianela et al., 2023).

This study, grounded in Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive Theory, Ryan and Deci's (2017) Self-Determination Theory, Urhahne's (2023) Expectancy-Value Theory, and Aquino's (2022) Educational Effectiveness Theory, investigated the levels of ARAL implementation, teaching efficiency, and learner performance, and empirically tested the relationship and influence between these variables in Matalam South District.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design. A descriptive-correlational, cross-sectional design was employed to describe the effects of ARAL program implementation and test its relationship and predictive influence on teaching efficiency and learner performance (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Locale and Respondents. The study was conducted in Matalam South District, Municipality of Matalam, Cotabato, SOCCSKSARGEN Region (Region XII), Philippines. Using complete enumeration, all 209 elementary school teachers with low or emerging readers under the

ARAL Program and who were willing to participate served as respondents. Schools ranged from Matalam Central Elementary School (n = 42) to smaller schools such as Leonard Elementary School (n = 6).

Instrument. A validated, three-part self-developed questionnaire measured: (1) ARAL implementation across five components (teacher preparedness, learning materials, learner identification, monitoring, scheduling; five items each) on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Very Slightly Implemented to 5 = Highly Implemented); (2) teaching efficiency across four dimensions (lesson planning, instructional delivery, assessment and feedback, classroom management) on a parallel scale (1 = Least Efficient to 5 = Highly Efficient); and (3) learner performance across four dimensions (academic achievement, classroom engagement, learning outcomes, motivation and attitude) on a scale of 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent). Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients were .835, .828, and .738 respectively.

Statistical Analysis. Weighted means described variable levels. Spearman rho correlation coefficients identified significant relationships between ARAL implementation components and teaching efficiency/learner performance dimensions. Multiple linear regression analysis determined significant predictors of each teaching efficiency and learner performance indicator at $\alpha = 0.05$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effects of ARAL Program Implementation

All five ARAL implementation components were rated Highly Implemented. Monitoring received the highest mean (WM = 4.84), followed by scheduling (WM = 4.78), learner identification process (WM = 4.72), learning materials (WM = 4.69), and teacher preparedness (WM = 4.64). The high monitoring rating reflects teachers' systematic use of formative assessments, regular record updating, and data-informed instructional decisions consistent with DepEd's (2025) mandate for regular learner progress tracking and Palingcod's (2022) findings on formative assessment as a key driver of student achievement.

Table 1. Summary of ARAL Program Implementation Levels.

Component	Weighted Mean	Description
Teacher Preparedness	4.64	Highly Implemented
Learning Materials	4.69	Highly Implemented
Learner Identification Process	4.72	Highly Implemented
Monitoring	4.84	Highly Implemented
Scheduling	4.78	Highly Implemented

Level of Teaching Efficiency

Teachers demonstrated Highly Efficient performance across all four dimensions. Classroom management received the highest mean (WM = 4.93), followed by instructional delivery (WM = 4.83), lesson planning and organization (WM = 4.82), and assessment and feedback (WM = 4.81). The dominant classroom management rating is consistent with Alimahan (2025), who found that effective classroom management creates structured environments essential for targeted interventions like ARAL, and with Jayme (2025), who linked strong management to increased learner engagement and reduced behavioral disruptions.

Table 2. Summary of Teaching Efficiency Levels.

Dimension	Weighted Mean	Description
Lesson Planning and Organization	4.82	Highly Efficient
Instructional Delivery	4.83	Highly Efficient
Assessment and Feedback	4.81	Highly Efficient
Classroom Management	4.93	Highly Efficient

Level of Learner Performance

Learners demonstrated Excellent performance across all four dimensions. Academic achievement posted the highest mean (WM = 4.94), followed by classroom engagement (WM = 4.93), motivation and attitude (WM = 4.89), and learning outcomes (WM = 4.75). These results affirm Hernando-Malipot's (2026) reports of substantial ARAL-linked reading gains and are consistent with Descartin et al. (2023) and Montecillo et al. (2025), who found that well-designed remedial programs significantly improve foundational academic outcomes.

Table 3. Summary of Learner Performance Levels.

Dimension	Weighted Mean	Description
Academic Achievement	4.94	Excellent
Classroom Engagement	4.93	Excellent
Learning Outcomes	4.75	Excellent
Motivation and Attitude	4.89	Excellent

Relationship Between ARAL Implementation and Teaching Efficiency

Spearman rho analysis identified significant relationships between several ARAL implementation components and teaching efficiency dimensions. Teacher preparedness showed no significant relationship with any teaching efficiency indicator. Learning materials significantly correlated with instructional delivery ($r = 0.270$, $p < .01$) and assessment and feedback ($r = 0.154$, $p < .05$). Learner identification process significantly correlated with lesson planning ($r = 0.236$, $p < .01$), instructional delivery ($r = 0.218$, $p < .01$), and assessment and feedback ($r = 0.197$, $p < .01$). Monitoring significantly correlated with lesson planning ($r = 0.252$, $p < .01$), instructional delivery ($r = 0.288$, $p < .01$), and assessment and feedback ($r = 0.179$, $p < .01$). Scheduling showed the strongest and most consistent correlations with all four teaching efficiency dimensions: lesson planning ($r = 0.385$, $p < .01$), instructional delivery ($r = 0.447$, $p < .01$), assessment and feedback ($r = 0.373$, $p < .01$), and classroom management ($r = 0.247$, $p < .01$).

Table 4. Spearman Rho Correlations: ARAL Implementation and Teaching Efficiency

ARAL Component	Lesson Planning	Instructional Delivery	Assessment & Feedback	Classroom Mgt.
Teacher Preparedness	0.048	0.073	0.044	0.096
Learning Materials	0.134	0.270**	0.154*	0.015
Learner Identification	0.236**	0.218**	0.197**	0.124
Monitoring	0.252**	0.288**	0.179**	0.075
Scheduling	0.385**	0.447**	0.373**	0.247**

**p < .01; *p < .05

Influence of ARAL Implementation on Teaching Efficiency

Multiple regression analyses confirmed significant predictive effects. For lesson planning and organization, scheduling was the sole significant predictor ($\beta = 0.273$, $t = 4.063$, $p < .01$; $R^2 = 0.144$). For instructional delivery, monitoring ($\beta = 0.280$, $t = 3.845$, $p < .01$) and scheduling ($\beta = 0.350$, $t = 5.479$, $p < .01$) were significant predictors ($R^2 = 0.330$). For assessment and feedback, learner identification ($\beta = 0.131$, $t = 2.023$, $p < .05$) and scheduling ($\beta = 0.266$, $t = 3.828$, $p < .01$) were significant ($R^2 = 0.138$). For classroom management, teacher preparedness ($\beta = 0.079$, $t = 2.303$, $p < .05$), learner identification ($\beta = 0.086$, $t = 2.130$, $p < .05$), and scheduling ($\beta = 0.084$, $t = 1.935$, $p < .05$) were significant ($R^2 = 0.075$).

Relationship Between ARAL Implementation and Learner Performance

For learner performance, teacher preparedness significantly correlated with classroom engagement ($r = 0.159$, $p < .05$), and learning materials correlated with classroom engagement ($r = 0.154$, $p < .05$). Learner identification process, monitoring, and scheduling showed no significant correlations with any learner performance dimension, suggesting that these implementation components affect performance indirectly—consistent with Villanueva and Santos (2023), who noted that identification must be integrated into pedagogical practice to meaningfully affect student outcomes.

Influence of ARAL Implementation on Learner Performance

Regression analyses identified significant but modest predictive relationships. Academic achievement was not significantly influenced by any ARAL component ($F = 1.009$, $p = .413$; $R^2 = 0.024$). Learning materials significantly predicted classroom engagement ($\beta = 0.157$, $t = 1.990$, $p < .05$; $R^2 = 0.051$, $F = 2.185$, $p = .047$). Monitoring significantly predicted learning outcomes ($\beta = 0.103$, $t = 2.092$, $p < .05$; $R^2 = 0.040$, $F = 1.707$, $p = .050$). Learning materials ($\beta = 0.100$, $t = 1.886$, $p < .05$) and scheduling ($\beta = 0.158$, $t = 2.662$, $p < .01$) jointly predicted motivation and attitude ($R^2 = 0.055$, $F = 2.370$, $p = .041$). The relatively small R^2 values suggest that other unmeasured factors also shape learner performance, consistent with McLaughlin's (2021) observation that well-structured materials and van Leeuwen's (2023) finding on monitoring must be integrated with broader instructional improvements to maximize student outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The ARAL Program is highly implemented across all five components in Matalam South District, with monitoring and scheduling demonstrating the most consistent and robust

associations with teaching efficiency. Teachers are highly efficient across all instructional dimensions, and ARAL learners demonstrate excellent performance in all four areas. Scheduling emerges as the strongest and most pervasive predictor of teaching efficiency, while learning materials and monitoring are the key predictors of learner performance outcomes. These findings affirm that structured, systematic ARAL implementation significantly enhances both teacher effectiveness and student academic outcomes in rural Philippine public elementary schools. School administrators should prioritize optimizing scheduling structures, ensuring adequate learning material supply, strengthening monitoring systems, and providing teachers with consistent administrative support to sustain program effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher extends sincere gratitude to the school administrators and teachers of Matalam South District for their cooperation. Special thanks to the Schools Division Office of Cotabato for granting permission to conduct the study, and to the thesis adviser, Dr. Genaro R. Andres, CESE, PhD, for his invaluable guidance.

REFERENCES

1. Acido, J. V., & Caballes, D. G. (2024). Assessing educational progress: A comparative analysis of PISA results and HDI correlation in the Philippines. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 21(1), 462–474.
2. Alimahan, G. A. (2025). Classroom management practices and learning environment in select districts. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 8(05).
3. Aquino, J. M. (2022). Teaching effectiveness: Basis for the development of an assessment tool. Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers and Teacher Education.
4. Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice Hall.
5. Batistisa, I. A. D. (2025). Experiences of teachers in the implementation of the ARAL Program. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews.
6. Cabural, M. A. (2024). Instructional materials and learner proficiency in DepEd remedial programs. Philippine Journal of Education, 103(1), 45–62.

7. Casingal, R. B., Flores, J. A., & Santos, L. P. (2025). Differentiated learning materials in ARAL: Design and implementation. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 13(2), 34–48.
8. Chavez, M. T., & Tadena, A. G. (2021). Use of supplementary learning materials in Philippine alternative education. International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 13(1), 89–105.
9. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
10. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140.
11. Department of Education. (2025). ARAL Program guidelines and implementation memoranda. DepEd.
12. Department of Education. (2026). Mid-year assessment results under the ARAL Program. DepEd Monitoring and Evaluation Division.
13. Descartin, R. A., Castillo, J. M., & Marasigan, A. C. (2023). Remedial instruction and learning outcomes in Philippine elementary schools. Journal of Education and Practice, 14(3), 56–70.
14. Dianela, A. B., Fernandez, C. L., & Ramos, J. T. (2023). Implementation of learning recovery programs: Gaps and prospects. Journal of Philippine Basic Education Research, 5(1), 12–28.
15. Embodo, J. S., & Villanueva, M. T. (2024). Lesson planning and its effect on student achievement and engagement. Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 16(2), 45–58.
16. Hernando-Malipot, M. (2026). DepEd reports reading gains under fully funded ARAL Program. Daily Tribune.
17. Jayme, M. B. (2025). Classroom management and student behavior in public elementary schools. International Journal of Research in Education, 5(2), 28–41.
18. Mallillin, L. L., & Dollison, R. D. (2025). Classroom design and its impact on academic performance. Journal of Educational Research, 118(1), 45–58.
19. Montecillo, A. C., Vidal, J. T., & Santos, R. P. (2025). Formative monitoring and student achievement in Philippine schools. Philippine Educational Research Journal, 27(1), 34–50.

20. Palingcod, L. T. (2022). Formative assessment and student achievement: Evidence from Philippine public schools. Journal of Educational Assessment, 8(1), 14–28.
21. Philippine Information Agency. (2025). ARAL Program overview and implementation scope. PIA.
22. Rini, R. A., Sumarni, W., & Khusniati, M. (2025). Scheduling strategies in school-based remedial programs: A systematic review. Journal of Educational Strategies, 12(1), 78–92.
23. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness. Guilford Press.
24. Tofail, M. (2025). Assessment and feedback for learning: A reflective analysis. International Journal of Education and Research, 13(2), 34–52.
25. Urhahne, D. (2023). Expectancy-value theory and its applications in educational settings. Educational Psychology Review, 35(1), 23–41.
26. van Leeuwen, A. (2023). Monitoring student progress and its effect on learning outcomes. Educational Research Review, 38, 100–113.