

---

**TEACHERS' IMPLEMENTATION OF THE READING REMEDIATION  
PROGRAM AND THE LEARNER'S READING LEVEL**

---

**\*Mary Grace O. Daton**

---

Valencia Colleges(Bukidnon) Incorporated

---

Article Received: 25 February 2026 \*Corresponding Author: Mary Grace O. Daton

Article Revised: 15 March 2026 Valencia Colleges(Bukidnon) Incorporated

Published on: 05 April 2026 DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.8191>

---

**ABSTRACT**

This study was conducted to find the relationship between the level of implementation of the reading remediation program and the learners' reading level in District III of Valencia City Division, School Year 2023-2024. Specifically, it described the profile of respondents in terms of age, sex, position, highest educational attainment, and training attended; determined the level of implementation of the reading remediation program; described the oral reading level and reading skill of the learner after the reading remediation was performed; checked the significant relationship between the level of implementation of reading remediation and oral reading skills of the learners. This study uncovered the following findings: The majority of the respondents were aged 31 to 40 years old, females, Teacher 1, have completed a Baccalaureate Degree along with Master of Arts (MA) units, and have attended 1 to 2 training sessions, The reading remediation program were Very Highly Implemented. The majority of learners were categorized as having an instructional reading level. There was a significant relationship between the level of implementation of reading remediation in all aspects of the remediation program and the oral reading skills of the learners. The following recommendations are offered: Teachers may consider the demographic attributes of the learners, including age and gender, as well as their educational experience while creating and executing the reading remediation program. Teachers may prioritize and uphold the rigorous implementation of the reading remediation program. Parents may further enhance their children's reading development by offering advice and support during their interactions with texts. School heads may prioritize and assist in thoroughly implementing the reading remediation program.

**KEYWORDS:** *Effectiveness, Teachers' Reading Remediation, Struggling Readers, Learners' Reading Level.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

In contemporary society, characterized by reliance on knowledge-driven innovations, advancements, and transformations, acquiring proficient reading and writing abilities is pivotal in enabling individuals to enhance their quality of life. The instruction and inclusion of reading skills and reading comprehension within training programs and educational instruction are crucial components that greatly contribute to the overall meaningfulness of an individual's life.

Difficulties related to automaticity and fluency manifest as challenges in dysfluent word reading and reading comprehension. These challenges may include reading slowly and laboriously and frequently pausing when encountering unfamiliar words. Oral reading needs to be improved in conveying the intended message due to a lack of proper expression. The decoding of unfamiliar words may be characterized by inefficiency or inaccuracy.

According to Lynch (2021), one of the foundational skills pupils acquire in their early educational experiences is comprehending written text. Nevertheless, instructing children in reading proves to be a challenging endeavor. The acquisition of reading skills is a complex process that cannot be effectively imparted within a limited number of instructional sessions. Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge that no universally applicable pedagogical approach to teaching reading can cater to all students' diverse needs and abilities.

The reading problem among learners is of primary concern in the Department of Education, specifically in District III of Valencia City Division. According to the Phil-IRI Pretest Result, some learners can hardly utter the letter sounds or give the letter names at the primary grade levels; in contrast, other learners at the intermediate level can decode the words but cannot comprehend them. They still fall under the frustrated category or struggling readers. To this end, teachers are encouraged to perform remedial reading to resolve such an academic dilemma.

The primary objective of Remedial Reading is to significantly diminish the population of students who encounter significant challenges in acquiring proficient reading and writing skills. The practice of Remedial Reading involves providing targeted and intensive tutoring to students who are experiencing difficulties in reading. This intervention is implemented through personalized instruction and in small group settings. It has been proven to be highly effective in addressing the needs of struggling readers within a relatively short period.

Remedial Reading educators are extensively trained experts who actively collaborate with students and develop tailored and strategic training to target specific student requirements effectively. Once students have achieved proficiency in meeting grade-level standards and can operate autonomously within the educational setting, they are discharged from Remedial Reading. However, ongoing vigilance is maintained to ensure their sustained academic progress.

Table 2 shows the profile of the respondents in terms of age.

**Table 2 Profile of the Respondents in terms of Age.**

Age	f	%
21 – 30 Years Old	32	22.5
31 – 40 Years Old	47	33.1
41 – 50 Years Old	45	31.7
51 – 65 Years Old	18	12.7
Total	142	100.0

Table 2 presents a study's breakdown of respondents' ages, showing the distribution across various age brackets. Among the respondents, individuals aged 31 to 40 constitute the largest proportion at 33.1%, followed closely by those aged 41 to 50 at 31.7%. The respondents aged 21 to 30 comprise 22.5% of the total, indicating a significant but slightly smaller portion. Those aged 51 to 65 represent the smallest segment, comprising 12.7% of the respondents.

Table 3 presents the profile of the respondents in terms of sex.

**Table 3 Profile of the Respondents in terms of Sex.**

Sex	f	%
Male	10	7.0
Female	132	93.0
Total	142	100.0

Table 3 illustrates the distribution of respondents based on their sex. Among the participants, females comprise the overwhelming majority at 93.0%, while males represent only 7.0% of the total respondents.

Table 4 shows the profile of the respondents in terms of position.

**Table 4 Profile of the Respondents in terms of Position.**

Position	f	%
Teacher 1	81	57.0
Teacher 2	12	8.5
Teacher 3	42	29.6

Master Teacher 1	6	4.2
Master Teacher 2	1	.7
Total	142	100.0

Table 4 outlines the composition of respondents based on their positions within the educational context. Most participants hold the position of Teacher 1, accounting for 57.0% of the total respondents. Following this, Teacher 3 represents a substantial portion at 29.6%, indicating a significant presence of mid-level teaching staff. Teacher 2 comprises a smaller yet notable percentage at 8.5%, while Master Teachers in levels 1 and 2 constitute 5.0% combined.

Table 5 presents the respondents' profiles regarding the highest educational attainment.

**Table 5 Profile of the Respondents in terms of Highest Educational Attainment.**

Highest Educational Attainment	f	%
Baccalaureate Degree	33	23.2
Baccalaureate Degree + MA Units	67	47.2
MA Degree	31	21.8
MA Degree + Doctoral Units	10	7.0
Doctorate Degree	1	.7
Total	142	100.0

Table 5 provides insights into the highest educational attainment of the respondents. Most participants have completed a Baccalaureate Degree and Master of Arts (MA) units, comprising 47.2% of the total respondents.

Following closely, individuals with a Baccalaureate Degree constitute 23.2%, indicating a significant portion of the sample with undergraduate education. Those who have obtained a Master of Arts (MA) degree without additional doctoral units represent 21.8% of the respondents, suggesting a considerable number of participants with postgraduate qualifications. Moreover, a smaller yet notable percentage of respondents have completed MA degrees alongside doctoral units (7.0%), while only a minimal proportion possess a Doctorate Degree (0.7%).

Table 6 shows the respondents' profile regarding the number of training.

**Table 6 Profile of the Respondents in terms of Number of Training.**

No of Training	f	%
1 – 2	52	36.6
3 – 4	39	27.5
5 – 6	27	19.0
7 Above	24	16.9
Total	142	100.0

Table 6 shows the number of training undergone by the respondents. The largest proportion of participants, comprising 36.6% of the total, attended 1 to 2 training sessions. Following this, 27.5% of respondents have attended 3 to 4 training courses, representing a substantial yet slightly smaller segment. Additionally, 19.0% of participants have undergone 5 to 6 training, indicating a notable portion with a more extensive training background. Moreover, 16.9% of respondents have attended seven or more training sessions, signifying a smaller yet significant group with considerable training experience.

The following are the impact of training in reading remediation: Training programs for educators and professionals involved in reading remediation can enhance their effectiveness in supporting struggling readers; educators equipped with evidence-based strategies and approaches can better address the needs of diverse learners; continuous professional development and training opportunities are vital for staying updated on the latest research and best practices in reading instruction. Torgesen, et., al. (2010) on "The Role of Professional Development in Effective Reading Programs" highlights the significance of high-quality professional development in improving reading outcomes for struggling readers.

The following sections will delve into the presentation and discussion of the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of phonics instruction, sight word recognition, vocabulary development, reading comprehension strategies, fluency-building exercises, guided reading, reading aloud, reading practice, multisensory approaches, and assessments and progress monitoring.

Table 7 presents the level of implementation of the reading remediation program regarding Phonics Instruction.

**Table 7 Level of Implementation of the Reading Remediation Program in terms of Phonics Instruction.**

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Effective phonics instruction is not isolated but integrated into meaningful reading contexts. Teachers provide opportunities for students to apply their phonics skills in authentic reading experiences.	4.40	0.63	Very Highly Implemented
Effective phonics instruction requires explicit teaching of phonics rules and strategies. Teachers provide clear explanations, model the application of phonics skills, and guide students through structured practice activities.	4.39	0.64	Very Highly Implemented
Effective phonics instruction takes into account students' diverse needs and abilities. Teachers differentiate instruction by assessing students' phonics skills and providing targeted interventions.	4.34	0.61	Very Highly Implemented

Teachers who deeply understand phonics instruction and its underlying principles are better equipped to deliver effective remediation.			4.33	0.72	Very Highly Implemented
Phonics instruction should follow a systematic and sequential approach, introducing phonics skills logically. Teachers structure their lessons to build upon previously learned skills, gradually introducing new concepts and providing ample practice opportunities.			4.25	0.66	Very Highly Implemented
Overall			4.34	0.57	Very Highly Implemented
<b>Scale</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Indicator</b>			
5	4.20-5.00	<i>Very Highly Implemented</i>			
4	3.40-4.19	<i>Highly Implemented</i>			
3	2.60-3.39	<i>Moderately Implemented</i>			
2	1.80-2.59	<i>Less Implemented</i>			
1	1.00-1.79	<i>Not Implemented</i>			

In Table 7, the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Phonics Instruction is evaluated across several indicators, each with a mean score and standard deviation (SD). The indicator with the highest mean score is *Effective phonics instruction is not isolated but integrated into meaningful reading contexts*, with a mean of 4.40 and an SD of 0.63, indicating *Very Highly Implemented*. Conversely, the indicator with the lowest mean score is *Phonics instruction should follow a systematic and sequential approach*, with a mean of 4.25 and an SD of 0.66, also classified as *Very Highly Implemented*.

In general, the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Phonics Instruction was *Very High*, with a Mean of 4.34 and an SD of 0.57.

A study conducted by Tomelden (2019) noted that students who are not active fans of reading are said to have improved their vocabulary by re-reading the materials they have read through their teacher. It has been effective to the learners even those who are not constantly reading. It does not only improve their vocabulary but also their reading ability.

Strategies were used to help the students effectively improve their reading skills; one was utilizing flashcards as drills to practice the words they believed were hard to comprehend.

Pretests and post-tests were also conducted to test whether remedial reading is effective for the students, and it has been found that there is a significant difference in students' reading ability. This supports their conclusion that remedial reading is effective for the learners. It also depends on the teacher's strategy to help their students. Using technology is one of the strategies that helps catch the students' interest and make the reading session more engaging and enjoyable for the learners and the teacher.

Table 8 shows the level of implementation of the reading remediation program regarding Sight Word Recognition.

**Table 8 Level of Implementation of the Reading Remediation Program in Terms of Sight Word Recognition.**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Teachers utilize high-frequency word lists, such as the Dolch or Fry word lists, to prioritize sight words that students need to learn. These lists are compiled based on the frequency of word usage in texts, ensuring that students focus on words they are likely to encounter frequently in their reading.	4.69	4.21	Very Highly Implemented
Regular assessment and monitoring of students' sight word recognition progress are essential. Teachers can use formative assessments, such as sight word assessments, running records, or reading fluency checks, to evaluate students' sight word mastery and identify areas that require further support.	4.46	0.60	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers provide explicit instruction on sight words, introducing them systematically and explicitly teaching their spelling, pronunciation, and meaning. They can use strategies like word walls, flashcards, and word games to help students learn and practice sight words in meaningful contexts.	4.41	0.59	Very Highly Implemented
Effective sight word instruction takes into account students' diverse needs and abilities. Teachers differentiate instruction by assessing students' sight word knowledge and providing targeted interventions.	4.39	0.66	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers used sight word instruction that goes beyond rote memorization. Teachers should provide opportunities for students to encounter and use sight words in authentic reading and writing contexts.	4.27	0.66	Very Highly Implemented
Overall	4.44	0.98	Very Highly Implemented
<b>Scale</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	
5	4.20-5.00	Very Highly Implemented	
4	3.40-4.19	Highly Implemented	
3	2.60-3.39	Moderately Implemented	
2	1.80-2.59	Less Implemented	
1	1.00-1.79	Not Implemented	

Table 8 shows the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Sight Word Recognition is evaluated across several indicators, each with a mean score and standard deviation (SD). The indicator with the highest mean score is *Teachers utilize high-frequency word lists*, with a mean of 4.69 and an SD of 4.21, indicating *Very Highly Implemented*.

Conversely, the indicator with the lowest mean score is *Sight word instruction goes beyond rote memorization*, with a mean of 4.27 and an SD of 0.66, also classified as very highly implemented. The high mean scores across all indicators suggest a robust implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Sight Word Recognition.

On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest mean score highlights the need for sight word instruction to extend beyond rote memorization, emphasizing the importance of providing opportunities for students to encounter and use sight words in authentic reading and writing contexts.

Sight word recognition is the capacity to rapidly and effortlessly identify and read frequently occurring words without relying on phonetic decoding. These words are frequently taught using direct instruction and repeated practice to assist students in acquiring fluency and improving reading comprehension.

The research finding indicates that the reading remediation program assessed in the study had a strong level of implementation in terms of recognizing sight words. The indicator with the highest mean score, "Teachers utilize high-frequency word lists," suggests that the program successfully integrated high-frequency word lists to enhance students' ability to recognize sight words. This method is consistent with research highlighting the significance of directly instructing sight words to enhance reading fluency (Ehri, 2005; Rasinski, 2009).

In contrast, the indicator with the lowest average score, "Sight word instruction goes beyond rote memorization," implies a need to enhance sight word instruction beyond simple memorization. This discovery emphasizes the need to provide students with chances to come across and utilize sight words in genuine reading and writing situations. Studies indicate that incorporating sight words into purposeful and genuine literacy tasks can improve students' comprehension and utilization of these terms (Bear et al., 2019; Reutzel & Cooter, 2016).

The level of implementation of the reading remediation program regarding Sight Word Recognition was *Very High*, with a Mean of 4.44 and an SD of 0.98. These results indicate a strong foundation in sight word recognition instruction within the program, with evidence of effective practices such as utilizing high-frequency word lists and conducting regular assessments.

According to Herrera (2021), students in a remedial reading program are said to have improved their reading abilities greatly and how they can comprehend the reading material. In their study, they sought to find out whether teachers who administer a reading remediation show an improvement as reflected in their students' performance in terms of reading. Students

were tested by having a test after reading the material once and reading the material after a remedial reading.

Table 9 presents the level of implementation of the reading remediation program regarding Vocabulary Development.

**Table 9** *Level of Implementation of the Reading Remediation Program in terms of Vocabulary Development.*

Indicator		Mean	SD	Interpretation
Effective reading remediation programs often incorporate explicit vocabulary instruction, directly teaching students the meanings of words and how to use them in context.		4.36	0.73	Very Highly Implemented
When students understand and make connections between words, sentences, and paragraphs, they can better grasp the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary words encountered in texts.		4.32	0.75	Very Highly Implemented
providing students with rich and varied reading materials. When students are exposed to a wide range of texts, they encounter new words in context, which helps reinforce their understanding and usage.		4.31	0.74	Very Highly Implemented
Effective reading remediation programs often focus on improving students' reading comprehension skills, as comprehension and vocabulary development are closely intertwined.		4.28	0.71	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers can facilitate vocabulary growth by selecting appropriately challenging texts and by incorporating vocabulary-building activities, such as word games, discussions, and writing exercises		4.27	0.73	Very Highly Implemented
Overall		4.31	0.67	Very Highly Implemented
Scale	Range	Indicator		
5	4.20-5.00	Very Highly Implemented		
4	3.40-4.19	Highly Implemented		
3	2.60-3.39	Moderately Implemented		
2	1.80-2.59	Less Implemented		
1	1.00-1.79	Not Implemented		

Table 9 reveals the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Vocabulary Development is assessed across several indicators, each with a mean score and standard deviation (SD). The indicator with the highest mean score is *Effective reading remediation programs often incorporate explicit vocabulary instruction*, with a mean of 4.36 and an SD of 0.73, indicating *Very Highly Implemented*. Conversely, the indicator with the lowest mean score is *Teachers can facilitate vocabulary growth by selecting texts*, with a mean of 4.27 (SD = 0.73), also classified as *Very Highly Implemented*.

The high mean scores across all indicators suggest a robust implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Vocabulary Development. On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest mean score highlights the importance of selecting appropriately challenging texts to facilitate vocabulary growth.

Overall, the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Vocabulary Development was *Very High*, with a Mean of 4.31 and an SD of 0.67. These results indicate a strong foundation in vocabulary development within the remediation program, with evidence of effective practices such as explicit instruction and exposure to rich reading materials.

Enhancing one's vocabulary is crucial for comprehending written texts and improving general literacy. Efficient reading remediation programs frequently include direct vocabulary education to improve students' word comprehension and knowledge.

Explicit vocabulary training refers to teaching particular terms and their meanings using clear explanations, examination of the surrounding context, and strategies for learning new words (Beck et al., 2013). This method facilitates the augmentation of pupils' lexicon and enhances their understanding of written materials.

The research conclusion indicates that the reading remediation program assessed in the study had a strong level of implementation regarding vocabulary development. The indicator with the highest mean score, "Effective reading remediation programs often incorporate explicit vocabulary instruction," suggests that the program effectively integrated explicit vocabulary instruction into its curriculum. This discovery is consistent with research that supports the utilization of direct instruction to improve the process of acquiring vocabulary (Baumann & Kame'enui, 2004; Stahl & Nagy, 2006).

Conversely, *Teachers can facilitate vocabulary growth by selecting texts* with the lowest average score, emphasizing the significance of choosing suitably demanding texts to promote vocabulary development. Studies indicate that offering learners diverse and extensive reading materials can expose them to a broader spectrum of language and enhance their vocabulary acquisition (Graves, 2006; Nagy & Herman, 1987).

Teachers' selection of intriguing and correctly leveled texts is crucial in providing pupils with opportunities to encounter new vocabulary and enhance their comprehension. Fountas and Pinnell's work provides practical guidelines for teachers to select appropriate books for independent reading. It emphasizes the significance of considering students' reading levels, interests, and the importance of providing a variety of texts to support vocabulary acquisition and comprehension (Fountas and Pinnell, 2016). The study of Hiebert (2012) provides

insights into the role of text complexity in reading instruction. It discusses the importance of matching texts to students' reading abilities and the benefits of gradually increasing the complexity of texts to support vocabulary development and comprehension skills.

Table 10 shows the level of implementation of the reading remediation program regarding Reading Comprehension Strategies.

**Table 10** *Level of Implementation of the Reading Remediation Program in terms of Reading Comprehension Strategies.*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Another important aspect of effective reading remediation is providing students with ample guided practice.	4.45	0.61	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers can also provide modeling and think-aloud, demonstrating how to use the reading comprehension strategies effectively. By verbalizing their thoughts while reading, teachers show students how to approach different texts, make predictions, ask questions, and monitor comprehension.	4.35	0.67	Very Highly Implemented
The effectiveness of teachers' reading remediation strategies can significantly impact students' reading comprehension skills.	4.32	0.69	Very Highly Implemented
Reading Comprehension Strategies help students actively engage with the text, make sense of their reading, and monitor their understanding.	4.32	0.76	Very Highly Implemented
Effective reading remediation programs often teach specific reading comprehension strategies, such as predicting, summarizing, making connections, clarifying, and questioning.	4.25	0.71	Very Highly Implemented
Overall	4.34	0.59	Very Highly Implemented
<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	
5	4.20-5.00	<i>Very Highly Implemented</i>	
4	3.40-4.19	<i>Highly Implemented</i>	
3	2.60-3.39	<i>Moderately Implemented</i>	
2	1.80-2.59	<i>Less Implemented</i>	
1	1.00-1.79	<i>Not Implemented</i>	

In Table 10, the reading remediation program's implementation level regarding Reading Comprehension Strategies is assessed across several indicators, each with a mean score and standard deviation (SD). The indicator with the highest mean score is *Another important aspect of effective reading remediation is providing students with ample guided practice*, with a mean of 4.45 and an SD of 0.61, indicating *Very Highly Implemented*. Conversely, the indicator with the lowest mean score is *Effective reading remediation programs often focus*

on teaching specific reading comprehension strategies, with a mean of 4.25 and an SD of 0.71, also classified as *Very Highly Implemented*.

The high mean scores across all indicators suggest a robust implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Reading Comprehension Strategies. On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest mean score emphasizes the focus on teaching specific reading comprehension strategies within effective remediation programs.

In general, the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Reading Comprehension Strategies was *High*, with a Mean of 4.34 and an SD of 0.59. These results indicate a strong foundation in reading comprehension strategy instruction within the remediation program, with evidence of effective practices such as guided practice and explicit strategy instruction.

Reading comprehension methods encompass readers' cognitive processes and skills to comprehend and derive significance from texts. Efficient reading remediation programs often prioritize the instruction of targeted reading comprehension strategies to enhance the comprehension skills of struggling readers.

The research finding indicates that the reading remediation program evaluated in the study had a strong level of implementation in terms of reading comprehension strategies. The indication with the highest mean score, "Another crucial aspect of effective reading remediation is the provision of abundant guided practice," suggests that the program included guided practice as a fundamental element of strategy instruction.

Guided practice refers to the process of assisting students in using reading comprehension skills in a systematic and scaffolded manner (Duffy et al., 2019). This discovery is consistent with research emphasizing the significance of offering students guided practice opportunities to enhance their comprehension abilities (Duke et al., 2011; Pressley, 2000).

In contrast, the indicator with the lowest average score, *Effective reading remediation programs, often prioritizes the instruction of particular reading comprehension strategies*. This implies that although the program was generally well-implemented, there is potential for enhancement in explicitly teaching and emphasizing specific reading comprehension strategies.

Effective reading remediation programs concentrate on teaching specific reading comprehension strategies, which aim to enhance student's ability to comprehend and interpret written information more effectively. These strategies may involve finding key concepts, drawing conclusions, condensing information, or examining the organization of a text.

Although the program is generally well-implemented, the low average score for this indication indicates that there is room for improvement in how the program emphasizes and teaches these specific reading comprehension methods. Research provides evidence for directly teaching comprehension strategies, such as activating prior information, forming predictions, and summarizing, to enhance students' comprehension skills (Duke & Pearson, 2002; National et al., 2000).

Table 11 presents the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Fluency-Building Exercises.

**Table 11** *Level of Implementation of the Reading Remediation Program in terms of Fluency-Building Exercises.*

Indicator		Mean	SD	Interpretation
The teacher involves having students read a text multiple times to increase their reading speed and accuracy. As students read a passage repeatedly, they become more familiar with the text, which helps them read it with greater fluency.		4.37	0.64	Very Highly Implemented
Using audio recordings of fluent reading can be beneficial for struggling readers. Students listen to the audio while following along with the text, helping them develop a sense of pacing, phrasing, and expression.		4.35	0.66	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers can pair learners with a more fluent reader or provide a supportive and interactive reading experience. The fluent reader can model fluency while the struggling reader reads along, receiving guidance and support as needed.		4.30	0.72	Very Highly Implemented
The teacher and learners read a text together in unison. This exercise helps students develop fluency by allowing them to follow the teacher's lead and match their pace, intonation, and expression.		4.28	0.73	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers model fluent reading by reading aloud to students, demonstrating proper speed, intonation, and expression.		4.27	0.71	Very Highly Implemented
Overall		4.31	0.59	Very Highly Implemented
Scale	Range	Indicator		
5	4.20-5.00	Very Highly Implemented		
4	3.40-4.19	Highly Implemented		
3	2.60-3.39	Moderately Implemented		
2	1.80-2.59	Less Implemented		
1	1.00-1.79	Not Implemented		

Table 11 presents the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Fluency-Building Exercises is evaluated across several indicators, each with a mean score and standard deviation (SD). The indicator with the highest mean score is *teacher involves*

having students read a text multiple times, with a mean of 4.37 and an SD of 0.64), indicating *Very Highly Implemented*. Conversely, the indicator with the lowest mean score is *Teachers model fluent reading by reading aloud to students*, with a mean of 4.27 and an SD of 0.71, also classified as *Very Highly Implemented*.

The high mean scores across all indicators suggest a robust implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Fluency-Building Exercises. On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest mean score emphasizes the practice of teachers modeling fluent reading by reading aloud to students.

The level of implementation of the reading remediation program in Fluency-Building Exercises was *Very High*, with a Mean of 4.31 and an SD of 59. These results indicate a strong foundation in fluency-building exercises within the remediation program, with evidence of effective practices such as repeated readings and modeling fluent reading.

Fluency-building exercises are educational tasks designed to enhance pupils' reading fluency, including the capacity to read with precision, fluidity, and emotional expression. Efficient reading remediation programs frequently integrate targeted methods and activities to assist struggling readers in enhancing their fluency abilities.

The research finding indicates that the reading remediation program assessed in the study had a strong degree of implementation in terms of activities aimed at improving fluency. The indication with the highest mean score, *the teacher involves having students read a text multiple times*, suggests that the program utilized the practice of repeated readings as a fundamental method to enhance fluency. Repeated readings refer to having students read the same text many times to improve their reading speed and accuracy (Samuels, 1979). This discovery is consistent with research that advocates for using repeated readings as a successful approach to enhancing reading fluency (Rasinski, 2011; Therrien, 2004).

In contrast, the indication with the lowest average score, *Teachers model fluent reading by reading aloud to students*, emphasizes the significance of teachers exhibiting fluent reading skills by reading aloud to their students. The indication underscores the importance of teachers showcasing their proficient reading abilities by engaging in oral reading sessions with their students.

Nevertheless, the below-average score for this indication suggests room for improvement in how teachers apply this practice. It implies that teachers may need to regularly or effectively demonstrate fluent reading to their pupils during read-aloud exercises.

Modeling fluent reading enables students to observe and comprehend the auditory and visual aspects of proficient reading, aiding in the cultivation of their reading skills, including

prosody and expression (Rasinski, 2003). Studies indicate that when teachers explicitly demonstrate fluent reading, it can positively affect students' reading fluency (Fawson, 2006; Rasinski & Padak, 2000). Modeling fluent reading by teachers has significant benefits for students' reading skills, including prosody and expression. When students observe and comprehend the auditory and visual aspects of fluent reading through modeling, they gain a clearer understanding of what proficient reading sounds and looks like.

Table 12 shows the level of implementation of the reading remediation program regarding Guided Reading.

**Table 12** *Level of Implementation of the Reading Remediation Program in terms of Guided Reading.*

<b>Indicator</b>		<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Teachers perform guided reading, allowing them to work with small groups of students at similar reading levels. This enables teachers to provide targeted instruction that aligns with students' needs.		4.46	0.60	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers' guided reading encourages active student engagement in the reading process. Students can participate in discussions, ask questions, make predictions, and share their thoughts about the text.		4.35	0.70	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers perform guided reading, providing direct instruction and support to students. They guide students through the reading process, offer assistance with decoding unfamiliar words, and facilitate discussions to deepen comprehension.		4.34	0.71	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers perform guided reading, which involves selecting texts that are appropriately challenging for the specific group of students.		4.31	0.71	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers' guided reading helps students develop skills that can be transferred to independent reading. As students gain confidence, fluency, and comprehension strategies through guided reading, they are better equipped to apply these skills when reading on their own.		4.31	0.68	Very Highly Implemented
Overall		4.35	0.60	Very Highly Implemented
<b>Scale</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Indicator</b>		
5	4.20-5.00	<i>Very Highly Implemented</i>		
4	3.40-4.19	<i>Highly Implemented</i>		
3	2.60-3.39	<i>Moderately Implemented</i>		
2	1.80-2.59	<i>Less Implemented</i>		
1	1.00-1.79	<i>Not Implemented</i>		

Table 12 shows the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Guided Reading, which is assessed across several indicators, each with a mean score and standard deviation (SD). The indicator with the highest mean score is *Teachers perform a guided reading, which allows working with small groups of students*, with a mean of 4.46 and an SD of 0.60, indicating *Very Highly Implemented*.

Conversely, the indicator with the lowest mean score is *Teachers perform guided reading, providing direct instruction and support to students*. With a mean of 4.34 and an SD of 0.71, it is also classified as *Very Highly Implemented*. The high mean scores across all indicators suggest a robust implementation of the reading remediation program in Guided Reading. On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest mean score highlights the practice of providing direct instruction and support to students during guided reading sessions.

Overall, the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in Guided Reading was *Very High*, with a Mean of 4.35 and an SD of 0.60. These results indicate a strong foundation in guided reading practices within the remediation program, with evidence of effective strategies such as small group instruction and active student engagement.

The reading level is defined as the way to determine a student's reading skills (We Are Teachers). Furthermore, it states that reading level is a way to measure the child's reading comprehension and fluency, using a variety of factors like phenomenon awareness, decoding, vocabulary, etc. Teachers use reading levels to understand what students know and need to work on.

Moreover, according to the study conducted by Cabardo (2015), learning materials given to learners depend on their reading level in order to provide the appropriate material for them to grasp effectively.

Guided reading is an instructional method in which teachers collaborate closely with a small group of students with comparable reading abilities.

The research indicates that the reading rehabilitation program assessed in the study had a strong level of implementation in terms of guided reading. The indication with the highest mean score, *Teachers implement guided reading sessions that facilitate instruction with small cohorts of students*, suggests that the program successfully employed small group instruction as a crucial element of guided reading.

Small group instruction enables teachers to customize their teaching to meet students' specific requirements and offer more personalized assistance (Fountas & Pinnell, 2017). This discovery is consistent with research that advocates for using small group instruction in

guided reading to enhance students' reading abilities (Dorn & Soffos, 2005; Fountas & Pinnell, 1996).

In contrast, the indication with the lowest average score, *Teachers perform guided reading, where they provide direct instruction and support to students*, emphasizes the significance of teachers delivering clear instruction and assistance to students during guided reading sessions. Guided reading sessions entail teachers directing students to employ suitable reading strategies, delivering comments, and enabling discussions to enhance students' understanding (Fountas & Pinnell, 2017).

Studies indicate that successful guided reading education involves the direct instruction of reading skills and the active involvement of students in relevant discussions (Dowhower, 1989; Fountas & Pinnell, 1996).

Table 13 presents the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Reading Aloud.

**Table 13** *Level of Implementation of the Reading Remediation Program in terms of Reading Aloud*

Indicator		Mean	SD	Interpretation
Teachers implement reading aloud that allows learners to hear the sounds and rhythms of language, which helps develop phonemic awareness—the understanding of individual sounds within words. As they read aloud, teachers can emphasize phonics elements, such as letter-sound relationships, word patterns, and pronunciation.		4.31	0.74	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers implement reading aloud that creates a positive and enjoyable reading experience for students. When teachers read with enthusiasm and expression and engage students in the story, it can spark their interest and love for reading.		4.30	0.70	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers implement reading aloud, exposing learners to rich and varied language patterns, sentence structures, and vocabulary. By hearing fluent and expressive reading, students are exposed to various words and phrases they may not encounter in everyday conversations.		4.28	0.72	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers implement reading aloud that allows students to engage in listening comprehension. As teachers read aloud, they can model essential comprehension strategies such as making predictions, asking questions, making connections, and drawing inferences.		4.27	0.69	Very Highly Implemented
Overall		4.29	0.65	Very Highly Implemented
<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Indicator</i>		
5	4.20-5.00	Very Highly Implemented		

4	3.40-4.19	<i>Highly Implemented</i>
3	2.60-3.39	<i>Moderately Implemented</i>
2	1.80-2.59	<i>Less Implemented</i>
1	1.00-1.79	<i>Not Implemented</i>

Table 13 presents the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Reading Aloud is evaluated across several indicators, each with a mean score and standard deviation (SD). The indicator with the highest mean score is *Teachers implement reading aloud that allows learners to hear the sounds and rhythms of language*, with a mean of 4.31 and an SD of 0.74, indicating *Very Highly Implemented*.

Conversely, the indicator with the lowest mean score is *Teachers implementing reading aloud, which allows students to engage in listening comprehension*. With a mean of 4.27 and an SD of 0.69, it is also classified as *Very Highly Implemented*. The high mean scores across all indicators suggest a robust implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Reading Aloud. On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest mean score highlights the practice of providing opportunities for students to engage in listening comprehension during reading-aloud sessions.

In general, the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Reading Aloud was *Very High*, with a Mean of 4.29 and an SD of 0.65. These results indicate a strong foundation in reading aloud practices within the remediation program, with evidence of effective strategies such as emphasizing phonemic awareness, creating positive reading experiences, and exposing students to rich language patterns.

The research indicates that the reading remediation program assessed in the study had a strong level of implementation in terms of reading aloud. The indicator with the highest mean score, *Teachers implement reading aloud that allows learners to hear the sounds and rhythms of language*, suggests that the program focused on the auditory elements of reading aloud, such as exposing students to the phonemic aspects and rhythmic patterns of language.

According to Schwartz (2005), children can enhance their ability to recognize and understand the sounds and patterns of language by listening to skilled and articulate reading. This discovery is consistent with research emphasizing the advantages of reading aloud in enhancing children's phonemic awareness and linguistic abilities (Bus et al., 1995).

Table 14 shows the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Multisensory Approaches.

**Table 14** *Level of Implementation of the Reading Remediation Program in terms of Multisensory Approaches.*

<b>Indicator</b>		<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Teachers' multisensory approaches can be tailored to meet students' individual needs. Teachers can assess students' strengths and areas for improvement and design instructional activities that address their specific needs.		4.32	0.69	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers implement multisensory approaches that engage multiple senses simultaneously, reinforcing connections between different brain areas and enhancing memory retention. By combining visual, auditory, and kinesthetic/tactile elements, students receive information through multiple channels, deepening their understanding and strengthening their neural pathways related to reading.		4.30	0.69	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers implement multisensory approaches that involve explicit and systematic instruction, breaking down reading skills into small, manageable steps. Teachers provide clear explanations, modeling, and guided practice, ensuring students understand the specific skills and concepts being taught.		4.27	0.71	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers implement multisensory approaches that incorporate techniques such as using manipulatives (e.g., letter tiles), hand gestures, and auditory exercises to help students understand and manipulate individual sounds within words.		4.25	0.72	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers implement multisensory approaches to leverage the power of multimodal learning to enhance memory and information retention. Students create stronger connections and associations with the material by engaging multiple senses, improving recall and long-term retention.		4.25	0.73	Very Highly Implemented
Overall		4.28	0.64	Very Highly Implemented
<b>Scale</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Indicator</b>		
5	4.20-5.00	<i>Very Highly Implemented</i>		
4	3.40-4.19	<i>Highly Implemented</i>		
3	2.60-3.39	<i>Moderately Implemented</i>		
2	1.80-2.59	<i>Less Implemented</i>		
1	1.00-1.79	<i>Not Implemented</i>		

Table 14 reveals the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Multisensory Approaches, evaluated across several indicators, each with a mean score and standard deviation (SD). The indicator with the highest mean score is *Teachers' multisensory approaches can be tailored to meet students' individual needs*, with a mean of 4.32 and an SD of 0.69, indicating very high implementation.

Conversely, the indicators with the lowest mean score are *Teachers who implement multisensory approaches that incorporate techniques such as using manipulatives* and

*Teachers who implement multisensory approaches leverage the power of multimodal learning*, both with a mean of 4.25 and an SD of 0.72 and 0.73 respectively, also classified as *Very Highly Implemented*. The high mean scores across all indicators suggest a robust implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Multisensory Approaches. On the other hand, the indicators with the lowest mean scores highlight techniques used within multisensory approaches, such as incorporating manipulatives and leveraging multimodal learning.

Overall, the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Multisensory Approaches was *Very High*, with a Mean of 4.28 and an SD of 0.64. The results indicate a strong foundation in multisensory approaches within the remediation program, with evidence of effective strategies such as tailoring instruction to individual needs and engaging multiple senses simultaneously.

The research indicates that the reading remediation program assessed in the study was implemented highly, particularly multisensory techniques. The indication with the highest mean score, *Teachers' multisensory approaches can be tailored to meet students' individual needs*, suggests that the program prioritized customization and individualization of teaching within the multisensory framework.

Customizing instruction to cater to the specific needs of each student is a crucial component of successful reading intervention (Birsh, 2011). This discovery is consistent with research indicating that customized and personalized methods of multisensory education can enhance reading results for individuals who have difficulty reading (Berninger et al., 2010).

On the other hand, for the indicators with the lowest average scores, *Teachers implement multisensory approaches that incorporate techniques such as using manipulatives*. *Teachers implement multisensory approaches that leverage the power of multimodal learning*, emphasizing particular methods employed in multisensory approaches. Utilizing manipulatives, such as letter tiles or magnetic letters, can offer a tangible and physical element to strengthen the connection between letters and their corresponding sounds and aid in constructing words (Ehri, 2014; Orton, 1928).

Multimodal learning involves using various senses to improve learning and memory (Dunn & Dunn, 1993). Studies indicate that manipulatives and multimodal learning techniques can enhance reading abilities, specifically for students with dyslexia or struggle with reading (Mather & Wendling, 2012; Reid, 2016).

Table 15 presents the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Assessments and Progress Monitoring.

**Table 15** *Level of Implementation of the Reading Remediation Program in terms of Assessments and Progress Monitoring.*

<b>Indicator</b>		<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Teachers' assessments provide valuable information for providing formative feedback to students. By analyzing assessment results, teachers can offer specific feedback on students' strengths and areas for improvement.		4.37	0.70	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers' assessments and progress monitoring data guide teachers in making informed instructional decisions. Teachers can analyze assessment data to determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies and make adjustments as needed.		4.37	0.67	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers' assessments document students' progress, which supports accountability and communication with students, parents, and other stakeholders.		4.35	0.69	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers' Assessments help them identify students' specific reading strengths and areas that require remediation. Teachers gather data on students' reading skills and comprehension abilities through various assessments, such as standardized tests, running records, fluency checks, and comprehension assessments.		4.32	0.71	Very Highly Implemented
Teachers' Assessments involve regularly assessing students' progress over time to determine if they are making expected gains in their reading skills.		4.32	0.67	Very Highly Implemented
Overall		4.35	0.61	Very Highly Implemented
<b>Scale</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Indicator</b>		
5	4.20-5.00	<i>Very Highly Implemented</i>		
4	3.40-4.19	<i>Highly Implemented</i>		
3	2.60-3.39	<i>Moderately Implemented</i>		
2	1.80-2.59	<i>Less Implemented</i>		
1	1.00-1.79	<i>Not Implemented</i>		

In Table 15, the level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Assessments and Progress Monitoring is assessed across several indicators, each with a mean score and standard deviation (SD). The indicators with the highest mean score are *Teachers' assessments provide teachers with valuable information to provide formative feedback to students*, and *Teachers' assessments and progress monitoring data guide teachers in making informed instructional decisions*, both with a mean of 4.37 and an SD of 0.70 and 0.67 respectively, indicating *Very Highly Implemented*. Conversely, the indicators with the lowest mean score are *Teachers' Assessments help them identify students' specific reading strengths and areas that require remediation*, and *Teachers' Assessments involve regularly assessing students' progress over time to determine if they are making expected gains in their reading*

*skills*, both with a mean of 4.32 and an SD of 0.71 and 0.67 respectively, also classified as *Very Highly Implemented*.

The overall level of implementation of the reading remediation program in terms of Assessments and Progress Monitoring was *Very High*, with a Mean of 4.35 and an SD of 61. These results indicate a strong foundation in assessments and progress monitoring within the remediation program, with evidence of effective practices such as providing formative feedback, guiding instructional decisions, and documenting students' progress.

Evaluations and ongoing evaluations are essential components of reading intervention programs. They assist educators in collecting data on students' reading abilities, identifying areas that necessitate remedial action, and monitoring students' advancement over time. Through assessments and progress monitoring, educators can make well-informed educational choices and offer focused assistance to pupils.

Your research finding indicates that the reading remediation program assessed and monitored development at a very high level. The indicators with the highest mean scores, *Teachers' assessments, provide teachers with valuable information to provide formative feedback to students; teachers' assessments and progress monitoring data guide teachers in making informed instructional decisions*, suggesting that the program successfully utilized assessments to offer feedback and inform instructional practices.

Formative feedback assists students with comprehending their strengths and areas for enhancement, while instructional guidance empowers teachers to customize their teaching methods to meet the individual requirements of students (Black & Wiliam, 2009).

In contrast, for the indicators with the lowest average scores, *Teachers' assessments help them identify students' specific reading strengths and areas that require remediation*, and *Teachers' assessments involve regularly assessing students' progress over time to determine if they are making expected gains in their reading skills*, emphasize the significance of assessments in pinpointing particular strengths and areas for improvement, as well as tracking students' progress over time.

Studies indicate that successful reading tests should thoroughly evaluate students' reading skills, encompassing decoding, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary (Good et al., 2001). Regular progress monitoring enables teachers to assess the efficacy of their education and make necessary modifications (Shinn, 2002).

The following section presents and discusses the learners' oral reading level and reading skills after the reading remediation.

Table 16 shows the learners' reading level and skills after the reading remediation.

**Table 16 Reading Level and Reading Skill of the Learners after the Reading Remediation was Performed.**

Rating	f	%	Reading Level
4	46	32.4	Independent
3	96	67.6	Instructional
2	0	0	Frustration
1	0	0	Non-Reader
Total	142	100.0	

Table 16 illustrates learners' reading levels and skills after implementing reading remediation. The majority of learners, constituting 67.6%, are categorized as having an instructional reading level, indicating that they can comprehend and engage with texts with some guidance and support from a teacher or facilitator. Additionally, 32.4% of learners are classified as having an independent reading level, signifying their ability to read and understand texts without significant assistance, indicating progress in their reading skills. Notably, no learners are categorized under the frustration or non-reader levels. This suggests that the reading remediation program has effectively supported learners in advancing their reading abilities to at least an instructional level or beyond.

According to the study conducted by Quirino and Gabejan (2021), knowing each learner's reading level through observation and diagnosis is necessary before designing and implementing any reading program for them.

The succeeding section presents and discusses the significant relationship between the level of implementation of reading remediation and the learners' oral reading skills.

Table 17 presents the test of the significant relationship between the level of implementation of reading remediation and the learners' oral reading skills.

**Table 17 Test of Significant Relationship between the Level of Implementation of Reading Remediation and Reading Skills of the Learners.**

Variable	r	p-value	Interpretation
Phonics Instruction	-.450	.000	Significant
Sight Word Recognition	-.455	.000	Significant
Vocabulary Development	-.453	.000	Significant
Reading Comprehension Strategies	-.478	.000	Significant
Fluency-Building Exercises	-.463	.000	Significant
Guided Reading	-.513	.000	Significant
Reading Aloud	-.486	.000	Significant
Multisensory Approaches	-.421	.000	Significant
Assessments and Progress Monitoring	-.494	.000	Significant
Overall	-.513	.000	Significant

Table 17 presents the results of a test examining the significant relationship between the level of implementation of reading remediation and the oral reading skills of learners. Each variable, representing different aspects of the reading remediation program, shows a negative correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) ranging from -0.421 to -0.513, with  $p$ -values less than 0.001, indicating statistical significance. This negative correlation suggests that as the level of implementation of reading remediation increases, the reading level of learners improves.

Specifically, significant relationships are found across all aspects of the remediation program, including phonics instruction, sight word recognition, vocabulary development, reading comprehension strategies, fluency-building exercises, guided reading, reading aloud, multisensory approaches, and assessments and progress monitoring. The overall negative correlation coefficient of -0.513 underscores the strong and consistent relationship between the comprehensive implementation of the reading remediation program and enhancing learners' oral reading skills.

### **The Methodology**

This chapter presents the research design, research locale, respondents of the study, the sampling procedure, the research instrument, data gathering, scoring procedure, validation and try-out of the instrument, and statistical treatment of data.

### ***FINDINGS***

This study uncovered the following findings:

The majority of the respondents were aged 31 to 40 years old, females, Teacher 1, have completed a Baccalaureate Degree along with Master of Arts (MA) units, and have attended 1 to 2 training sessions,

The reading remediation program in terms of Phonics Instruction, Sight Word Recognition, Vocabulary Development, Reading Comprehension Strategies, Fluency-Building Exercises, Guided Reading, Reading Aloud, Reading Practice, Multisensory Approaches, and Assessments and Progress Monitoring in District III of Valencia City Division, School Year 2023-2024 were Very Highly Implemented.

The majority of learners are categorized as having an instructional reading level, indicating that they can comprehend and engage with texts with some guidance and support from a teacher or facilitator.

There was a significant relationship between the level of implementation of reading remediation in all aspects of the remediation program and the learners' oral reading skills.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The conclusions drawn in this study stem from the findings.

The study determined that the reading remediation program in District III of Valencia City Division during SY 2023-2024 was carried out by young female teachers with Master of Arts (MA) credits who had participated in 1 to 2 training sessions, demonstrating their dedication to enhancing reading instruction through professional development.

The reading remediation program administered in District III of Valencia City Division during the SY 2023-2024 showed a significant level of implementation across different components. The components encompassed in this program consist of Phonics Instruction, Sight Word Recognition, Vocabulary Development, Reading Comprehension Strategies, Fluency-Building Exercises, Guided Reading, Reading Aloud, Reading Practice, Multisensory Approaches, and Assessments and Progress Monitoring. This indicates that the program successfully integrated these essential components, contributing to its overall achievement in enhancing pupils' reading abilities.

Most learners in the study have an instructional reading level, which means they can understand and interact with texts with the help of a teacher or facilitator. These findings indicate that the reading remediation program has successfully assisted learners in enhancing their reading abilities, allowing them to comprehend and navigate texts with assistance efficiently.

The research findings demonstrate a substantial and favorable correlation between the extent of execution of the reading remedial program and learners' oral reading proficiency. The relationship between the remediation program and all its parts was noticed, emphasizing the need for thorough implementation. The results indicate that a broader and more efficient program implementation positively impacts learners' oral reading skills, highlighting the importance of a well-executed approach to reading rehabilitation.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Asogwa, B. C., Umeh, J. C., & Okwoche, V. A. (2012). The Sociological and Cultural Significance of the Argungu International Fishing and Cultural Festival in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*.  
[https://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_2\\_No\\_11\\_June\\_2012/27.pdf](https://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_11_June_2012/27.pdf)
2. Boosting Literacy Skills with Phonics: Strategies and Activities for Success - Chalkboard Publishing. <https://chalkboardpublishing.com/blog/phonics-strategies-for-succes/>

3. Cabardo, Jimmy R. (2015). Reading Proficiency Level of Students: Basis for Reading Intervention Program. SSRN Electronic Journal. 10.2139/ssrn.2712237.
4. Cabardo, Jimmy R. (2015). Reading Proficiency Level of Students: Basis for Reading Intervention Program. SSRN Electronic Journal. 10.2139/ssrn.2712237.
5. Cadiz-Gabejan, Alona Medalia & Quirino, Madelyn. (2021). Students' Reading Proficiency and Academic Performance. International Journal of English Language Studies. 3. 30-40. 10.32996/ijels.2021.3.6.4.
6. Capstone Project Preliminaries | FreebookSummary.  
<https://freebooksummary.com/capstone-project-preliminaries>
7. Citizens' Perception of Corruption and Transparency as Determinants of Public Trust in Local Government in Ukraine. <https://doi.org/10.31297/hkju.21.2.2>. (2021).
8. Customize Your Electric Motorcycle for a Personalized Ride - ManagEnergy.tv.  
<https://managenergy.tv/customize-your-electric-motorcycle-for-a-personalized-ride/>
9. Damisa Dauda Archives - :: Kogi Reports ::. <https://kogireports.com/tag/damisa-dauda/>
10. Declaration. <http://eprints.utas.edu.au/2037/3/blacklow.pdf>. (2002).
11. Esgrina, F. J. O., & Generale, R. J. G. (2023). CLICK: INTERACTIVE APP FOR READING COMPREHENSION. <https://doi.org/10.24071/ilt.v26i1.5626>
12. Fountas, F.C. and Pinnell, G. S. (2016). Selecting Books for Independent Reading: Guidelines for Teachers" by
13. GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN PROJECT LIFECYCLE AND PERFORMANCE OF KENYA YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND OPPORTUNITIES PROJECT IN KENYA. A CASE OF YOUTH GROUPS IN NAIROBI COUNTY.  
<https://iajournals.org/index.php/8-articles/1280-iajispm-v3-i7-234-247> ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN AS A PREDICTOR OF PATRONAGE OF RECREATIONAL CENTRES IN KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA | Olaosebikan | European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science.  
<https://www.oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejep/article/view/3120>
14. Global Matrix 4.0 Physical Activity Report Card Grades for Children and Adolescents: Results and Analyses From 57 Countries in: Journal of Physical Activity and Health Volume 19 Issue 11 (2022).  
<https://journals.humankinetics.com/view/journals/jpah/19/11/article-p700.xml?rskey=M3z5b5&result=2>

15. Global Matrix 4.0 Physical Activity Report Card Grades for Children and Adolescents: Results and Analyses From 57 Countries in: *Journal of Physical Activity and Health* Volume 19 Issue 11 (2022).
16. <https://journals.humankinetics.com/view/journals/jpah/19/11/article-p700.xml?rskey=M3z5b5&result=2>
17. Gomulkiewicz, S. F. (1967). Analysis Regarding Parental Knowledge of Services for the Mentally Retarded. <https://core.ac.uk/download/130509223.pdf>
18. Hall, S. F., & Ecarma, R. F. (2002). An analysis of the budget formulation and execution process in United States Naval Dental Centers and performance measure utilization in the process. <https://core.ac.uk/download/36697771.pdf>
19. Hatice Değirmenci Gündoğmuş (2018). The Difficulties Experienced by Teachers in the Process of Primary Reading and Writing Instruction and Their Solution Offers for Eliminating These Difficulties. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 6(2): 333-339, 2018 <http://www.hrpub.org> DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2018.060216
20. Hatice Değirmenci Gündoğmuş (2018). The Difficulties Experienced by Teachers in the Process of Primary Reading and Writing Instruction and Their Solution Offers for Eliminating These Difficulties. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 6(2): 333-339, 2018 <http://www.hrpub.org> DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2018.060216
21. Herrera, R. (2021, May 30). Effectiveness of the Current Remedial Reading Program: Basis for Enhancement. *Instabrightgazette*.
22. Herrera, R. (2021, May 30). Effectiveness of the Current Remedial Reading Program: Basis for Enhancement. *Instabrightgazette*.
23. Hiebert, E. H. (2012) *Text Complexity and Learning to Read: A Resource for Educators*"
24. Houston, K., Rissman, D. D., Decker, L. M., Roberts, S. M., Vaughn, G. & Lesaux, N. (2007). *The Role of Professional Development in Effective Reading Programs*" by Torgesen, J. [https://file.scirp.org/Html/78297\\_78297.htm](https://file.scirp.org/Html/78297_78297.htm)
25. Jauculan, R. (2023). Household's Perception of Garbage Collection Practices in the Municipality of Tampilisan. <https://doi.org/10.55559/sjahss.v2i05.111>
26. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education* » Submission » Kırssalda Görev Yapan Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin İlk Okuma-Yazma Öğretimine İlişkin Görüşleri. <https://www.anadiliegitimi.com/en/pub/issue/75628/1211195>
27. KCMobility Resources. <https://resources.kcmobility.org/>
28. Kozak, S. (2021). Investigating positive classroom literacy environments: Teacher knowledge, print exposure and planning for instruction.

- <https://core.ac.uk/download/483413336.pdf>
29. Kvokačka, A. (2020). Editorial. <https://core.ac.uk/download/328146243.pdf>
30. Latest Trends in Research Methodology: Navigating the Path to Robust and Innovative Studies - NanoSchool. <https://nanoschool.in/blogs/latest-trends-in-research-methodology-navigating-the-path-to-robust-and-innovative-studies/>
31. Le Cordeur, M. (n.d.). Understanding volunteering in South Africa: A mixed methods approach. <https://scholar.sun.ac.za/server/api/core/bitstreams/ccde13a3-2669-4cda-a3fa-d176736d6523/content>
32. Lorio, C. (2022). SELECTION OF OPTIMUM ACTIVE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY FOR ACID MINE DRAINAGE (AMD) USING SPHERICAL FUZZY ANALYTIC HIERARCHY PROCESS (SFAHP). <https://core.ac.uk/download/525639623.pdf>
33. Mangila, Benjamin & Adapon, Maricel. (2020). Helping Struggling Readers to Read: The Impact of the Care for the Non-Readers (CRN) Program on Filipino Pupils' Reading Proficiency. *ETERNAL (English et al.)*. 6. 195-218. 10.24252/Eternal.V62. 2020.A2.
34. Manso, A., Marques, C. G., Dias, P., Ferreira, A. P., & Morgado, F. (2015). Letrinhas: Promoting reading through mobile devices. <https://doi.org/10.1109/siie.2015.7451648>
35. MATTHEW LYNCH (2021). THE CHALLENGES TEACHERS FACE WHILE TEACHING READING. <https://www.theedadvocate.org/the-challenges-teachers-face-while-teaching-reading/>
36. Matthew Lynch (2021). THE CHALLENGES TEACHERS FACE WHILE TEACHING READING. <https://www.theedadvocate.org/the-challenges-teachers-face-while-teaching-reading/>
37. Mogbolu, N., Kifordu, A. A., & Arubayi, D. O. (2023). Fostering organizational commitment through employee participation in decision making. *Journal of Global Economics and Business*. <https://doi.org/10.58934/jgeb.v4i15.211>
38. Nkosi, T. P. (2016). Challenges faced by intermediate phase learners in reading English language in Mondlo Ward Vryheid District. <https://core.ac.uk/download/85157466.pdf>
39. Ogwu, K., Hickey, P., Okeke, O., Pimenidis, E., Kozlovski, E., & Kozlovski, E. (2022). An Integrated Online/Offline Social Network-Based Model for Crowdfunding Support in Developing Countries: The Case of Nigeria. *Sustainability*, 14(15), 9333.
40. P. Abuga, A. (2019). Competency-Based Learning Material (CBLM): An Alternative Delivery Mode for G12 TVL Track Students. <https://core.ac.uk/download/249336633.pdf>

41. PERCEPTION OF STUDENTS ON THE RELEVANCE OF HOME ECONOMICS IN JUNIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL - Xtra Project.  
<https://projects.xtra.net/education/perception-of-students-on-the-relevance-of-home-economics-in-junior-secondary-school-2/>
42. Phenomeno-semantic complexity: A proposal for an alternative notion of complexity as a foundation for the management of complexity in human affairs\*.  
<https://journal.emergentpublications.com/Article/f9f2dbaa-b2ca-4e97-bcf3-3d113eb177d3/newsprint>
43. Poppy, C. L. (2006). Choice and decision-making in upper secondary education: A comparative study of pupils' perspectives in England and Norway.  
<https://core.ac.uk/download/33134132.pdf>
44. Psychological First Aid of Batstate U Lemery Student Organizations – IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. <https://www.ioer-imrj.com/psychological-first-aid-of-batstate-u-lemery-student-organizations-2/>
45. Reading For Fluency Strategies -. <https://www.ashleigh-educationjourney.com/reading-for-fluency/>
46. Reading Levels Explained: A Guide for Parents and Teachers.  
[https://s18670.pcdn.co/reading-levels/?utm\\_source=rss&utm\\_medium=rss&utm\\_campaign=reading-levels/](https://s18670.pcdn.co/reading-levels/?utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=reading-levels/)
47. Reading Levels Explained: A Guide for Parents and Teachers.  
[https://s18670.pcdn.co/reading-levels/?utm\\_source=rss&utm\\_medium=rss&utm\\_campaign=reading-levels/](https://s18670.pcdn.co/reading-levels/?utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=reading-levels/)
48. Sari, Meilani & Susetyo, & Noermanzah, Noermanzah & Wardhana, Dain & Kusumaningsih, Dewi. (2020). Understanding the Level of Students' Reading Comprehension Ability. 10.31219/osf.io/mr62t.
49. Securing a Government Graduate Job in Birmingham | Huzzle.  
<https://www.huzzle.app/blog/securing-a-government-graduate-job-in-birmingham>
50. Staff, W. A. T. (2022, December 15). Reading levels explained: A guide for parents and teachers. <https://www.weareteachers.com/reading-levels/>
51. Staff, W. A. T. (2022, December 15). Reading levels explained: A guide for parents and teachers. <https://www.weareteachers.com/reading-levels/>
52. Strategic Courses Implemented by The Philippine National Police on Illegal Drugs in The Province of Capiz | Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends.  
<https://pgjsrt.com/pgjsrt/index.php/qaj/article/view/95>

53. Student Registration: Personal Information | SMU On-line.  
[https://esmis.smu.edu.ph/student\\_registration/course/mat-socstud-151/approved\\_dpa?course=esmis.courses%28151%2C%29&school=5](https://esmis.smu.edu.ph/student_registration/course/mat-socstud-151/approved_dpa?course=esmis.courses%28151%2C%29&school=5)
54. Summer Academy Registration - United Educators Association of Texas.  
<https://www.ueatexas.com/summer-academy-registration/>
55. The Intricate Connection Between Teachers and Curriculum Development - Best Education Magazine in World. <https://www.swiftnlifteducation.com/education-technology/connection-between-teachers-and-curriculum/>
56. The Power of Place-Based Learning Experiences on Student Engagement, Writing Achievement, and Community Perception.  
<https://summit.plymouth.edu/handle/20.500.12774/446>
57. The Study of Retention and Leadership: A Process Model of Turnover.  
<https://doi.org/10.22371/05.1986.007>. (1986).
58. Tomelden, E. A. (2019). Effectiveness of remedial reading to non-readers in the intermediate level at Lomboy Elementary School [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Pangasinan State University.
59. Tomelden, E. A. (2019). Effectiveness of remedial reading to non-readers in the intermediate level at Lomboy Elementary School [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Pangasinan State University.
60. Vol. 9, No. 5; May 2019 (Abstract 14). <http://www.ijhssnet.com/journal/index/4365>
61. Warrington, L. J. V. (2007). Allan Wilkie in Australia: The work of a Shakespearean actor-manager. <https://core.ac.uk/download/12747134.pdf>
62. Ways Reading Tutors Can Help Children Master Reading Early.  
<https://prepacademytutors.com/reading-tutors-can-help-children-master-reading-early/>
63. What are the 10 most common uses of a computer? – Exploring Infinite Innovations in the Digital World. <https://www.mustardseed.co.jp/what-are-the-10-most-common-uses-of-a-computer/>
64. What Reading Level is Pride and Prejudice? – MyReadingWorld.  
<https://myreadingworld.com/what-reading-level-is-pride-and-prejudice/>
65. **Wood, K.** (2020). First-Grade Teachers' Perspectives on Children's Oral Reading Fluency and Automaticity. <https://core.ac.uk/download/346461987.pdf>
66. Work-life balance among seafarers of international cruises – Consortia Academia.  
<https://consortiacademia.org/10-5861-ijrsm-2021-7704/>