

The Effectiveness of Implementation of the Reading Recovery Program of Grade 4 Teachers in Calauag West District, Division of Quezon

Jelly Judy Anne G. Villafranca¹ & Jay Ar Recto, Ph.D²

¹University of Northeastern Philippines, School of Graduate Studies

²Southern Luzon State University; University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: August 2026 Keywords: Reading Recovery Grade 4 Remedial Instruction Parental Support Reading Intervention	This study evaluated pedagogies used in the Grade 4 Reading Recovery Program and the program's perceived effectiveness in Calauag West District, Division of Quezon. A descriptive-evaluative-inferential survey involved 84 respondents—30 teachers and 54 parents—from Central School, Roadside, and Upper Calauag sectors. A validated questionnaire measured hands-on, direct-teaching, activity-based, and remedial approaches and four effectiveness domains: learning resources, parental support, learner motivation, and comprehension. Weighted means, ranks, and Kendall's W were analyzed at $\alpha=.05$. Pedagogies were Highly Utilized overall ($M=4.16$), led by direct teaching ($M=4.21$), followed by activity-based instruction ($M=4.15$), remedial instruction ($M=4.14$), and hands-on learning ($M=4.13$). Recalculation with $df=6$ indicated significant cross-sector concordance only for remedial instruction ($W=.873$, $\chi^2=15.718$, $p=.015$). Program effectiveness was High overall ($M=4.03$), led by parental support ($M=4.14$), motivation ($M=4.09$), comprehension ($M=4.02$), and learning resources ($M=3.89$). None of the effectiveness domains reached significant concordance. Findings support a diagnostic, explicit, engaging, and progress-monitored intervention model; stronger material provision; structured family participation; implementation-fidelity monitoring; and direct assessment of learner growth.

1. Introduction

Reading development is cumulative. Early command of spoken-language sounds supports word recognition, while fluent decoding, vocabulary, background knowledge, strategic processing, and motivation jointly sustain comprehension. Weakness in any component can constrain later learning because reading increasingly becomes the medium through which learners encounter content across the curriculum (Hoover & Gough, 1990; Scarborough, 2001).

Phonological and phonemic awareness refer to learners' capacity to notice and manipulate the sound structure of spoken language. These abilities are distinct from print knowledge, yet they support learners in understanding the alphabetic principle and mapping sounds to letters. Meta-analytic and panel evidence shows that explicit, systematic instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics can strengthen early word-reading development, particularly when instruction is integrated with meaningful language and text experiences (Ehri et al., 2001; National Early Literacy Panel, 2008).

Reading comprehension extends beyond accurate word recognition. Readers construct meaning by connecting textual information with prior knowledge, monitoring coherence, generating questions, identifying central ideas, making inferences, and repairing misunderstanding. Effective instruction makes these processes visible through modeling, guided practice, discussion, formative assessment, and gradual release of responsibility (Duke & Pearson, 2002; RAND Reading Study Group, 2002).

Engagement and motivation influence whether learners persist with challenging text and use comprehension strategies deliberately. Classrooms that provide relevant materials, supportive interactions, meaningful choice, and collaborative discussion can strengthen both cognitive engagement and willingness to read. Concept-oriented instruction demonstrates how strategy teaching and motivational support can be combined rather than treated as separate interventions (Guthrie et al., 2004).

Home and community conditions also matter. Caregivers influence reading through routines, access to print and digital materials, shared reading, discussion, encouragement, and communication with teachers. The quality of participation is more important than attendance alone: brief, regular, developmentally appropriate interactions can create continuity between classroom instruction and home practice.

Intervention programs are most effective when they are diagnostic and responsive. Screening should identify the specific skills that require support; instruction should then be explicit, sufficiently intensive, and monitored using repeated evidence. A single program label does not guarantee effectiveness. Fidelity, teacher expertise, learner exposure, material quality, family support, and timely instructional adjustment determine whether an intervention produces meaningful gains.

Philippine literacy policy emphasizes assessment, targeted intervention, and shared responsibility for reading development. The revised Philippine Informal Reading Inventory and the Hamon: Bawat Bata Bumabasa initiative provide policy anchors for identifying needs and organizing support, while the Enhanced Basic Education Act situates literacy within a standards-based curriculum (Department of Education, 2018, 2019; Republic Act No. 10533, 2013).

Within this policy and instructional context, particular attention is required for the pedagogical implementation and perceived effectiveness of a grade 4 reading recovery program.

Perception surveys are useful for mapping reported practice across schools and respondent groups. Their evidentiary scope is nevertheless bounded. A high mean indicates that a practice was frequently observed or favorably assessed; it does not establish the magnitude of learner growth. Stronger claims require direct assessments, baseline and follow-up measures, documented intervention exposure, and an analysis that links instructional variation with learner outcomes.

Kendall's coefficient of concordance is suited to examining whether groups rank indicators similarly. A statistically significant coefficient indicates shared ordering, not necessarily high implementation or educational impact. Conversely, non-significant concordance may reflect contextual variation, small numbers of groups, or genuine differences in priorities. Both the descriptive means and the inferential decision must therefore be considered.

The present inquiry contributes district-level evidence on the pedagogical implementation and perceived effectiveness of a grade 4 reading recovery program. By examining instructional and contextual dimensions together, it identifies practical priorities for classroom teaching, school support, family engagement, and future outcome-based evaluation.

1.1 Research Purpose and Analytical Focus

The study examined four pedagogical approaches used by Grade 4 teachers—hands-on, direct teaching, activity-based learning, and remedial instruction—and four perceived-effectiveness domains—learning resources, parental support, learner motivation, and comprehension.

It also tested whether the three sector groups agreed in their detailed rankings and developed policy recommendations for intervention design, resources, family engagement, monitoring, and sustainability.

1.2 Conceptual and Empirical Synthesis

An effective reading intervention begins with diagnosis and uses explicit instruction, guided practice, sufficient intensity, and frequent progress monitoring. Direct teaching clarifies the target process, while hands-on and activity-based methods provide engagement and multiple representations.

Remedial instruction is most useful when it is responsive rather than repetitive. Learners should receive additional time and scaffolding focused on the specific source of difficulty—word recognition, fluency, vocabulary, language comprehension, strategy use, or motivation.

Program effectiveness depends on an implementation system. Learning resources, family support, motivation, and comprehension are interconnected, but they represent inputs, processes, and outcomes that should be measured separately.

2. Methodology

A descriptive-evaluative-inferential survey design assessed implementation and tested rank agreement among school sectors.

Eighty-four respondents participated: 30 Grade 4 teachers and 54 parents. Central School, Roadside, and Upper Calauag sectors contributed 12, 18, and 54 respondents, respectively.

A researcher-made questionnaire allocated seven items to each pedagogy and each perceived-effectiveness domain. Expert validation and reliability procedures preceded administration.

Frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and rank summarized responses. Kendall's W compared three groups ranking seven indicators, giving $df=6$ for each domain. Decisions were evaluated at $\alpha=.05$.

The outcome is described as perceived effectiveness because the survey did not include a pretest–posttest learner design or a comparison condition. Comprehension ratings therefore provide an implementation perspective rather than causal evidence.

Table 1. Research Design, Participants, Measures, and Analysis

Component	Specification
Design	Descriptive-evaluative-inferential survey
Participants	84 total: 30 teachers and 54 parents
Sector distribution	Central=12; Roadside=18; Upper Calauag=54
Instrument	Validated researcher-made questionnaire
Pedagogies	Hands-on; direct teaching; activity-based; remedial
Effectiveness domains	Resources; parent support; motivation; comprehension
Rank-test structure	Three groups $\times$ seven indicators; $df=6$
Analysis	Weighted means, ranks, Kendall's W; $\alpha=.05$

2.1 Analytical Rigor and Boundaries

The dual-role sample captures school and family perspectives, but analyses should retain respondent role because teachers and parents observe different parts of program implementation.

Kendall decisions were recalculated using $df=6$. The same mathematical rule was applied across all domains so that the inferential interpretation remains reproducible.

Direct evidence of learner baseline, intervention dosage, fidelity, attendance, text level, and post-intervention growth was not included. These data are necessary before the program can be judged effective in a causal sense.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Respondent Composition

Teachers and parents from three sectors participated in the program assessment.

Table 2. Respondent Distribution

School Sector	Teachers	Parents	Total
Central School	6	6	12
Roadside	6	12	18
Upper Calauag	18	36	54
Total	30	54	84

The respondent structure acknowledges that intervention delivery and home support are distributed across actors. The pooled profile is weighted toward Upper Calauag because it contributed the largest number of teachers and parents.

Future item-level analysis should compare roles directly and examine whether teachers and parents define effectiveness similarly.

3.2 Pedagogies Used in Reading Recovery

Table 3. Pedagogical Approaches Utilized by Grade 4 Teachers

Pedagogy	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Direct teaching	4.21	Highly Utilized	1
Activity-based approach	4.15	Highly Utilized	2
Remedial instruction	4.14	Highly Utilized	3
Hands-on approach	4.13	Highly Utilized	4
Grand mean	4.16	Highly Utilized	—

Direct teaching ranked first, supporting the role of clear modeling, focused explanation, guided practice, and immediate feedback in intervention. Activity-based and hands-on approaches can reinforce these processes by increasing engagement and providing concrete representations.

The .08 range is narrow; all approaches were highly utilized. The key issue is not choosing one method but sequencing them according to diagnosis. Explicit instruction should identify the target, while activities provide practice that is aligned rather than incidental. Remedial instruction should differ from ordinary classroom repetition in intensity, group size, feedback, pacing, and progress monitoring.

3.3 Agreement on Pedagogy Rankings

Table 4. Kendall Concordance for Pedagogical Approaches

Pedagogy	W	χ^2	df	Decision
Hands-on approach	.633	11.392	6	n.s.
Direct teaching	.324	5.833	6	n.s.
Activity-based approach	.598	10.766	6	n.s.
Remedial instruction	.873	15.718	6	p=.015

Only remedial-instruction rankings were significantly concordant. Sector groups shared a similar view of which remedial practices were most and least evident.

Direct, hands-on, and activity-based rankings varied. A district intervention framework should define required functions—explicitness, guided practice, engagement, feedback, and progress monitoring—while permitting context-responsive activities.

3.4 Perceived Program Effectiveness

Table 5. Perceived Effectiveness of Reading Recovery Implementation

Effectiveness Domain	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Parental support	4.14	Highly Effective	1
Learner motivation	4.09	Highly Effective	2
Learner comprehension	4.02	Highly Effective	3

Effectiveness Domain	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Learning resources	3.89	Highly Effective	4
Grand mean	4.03	Highly Effective	—

Parental support ranked first, showing the perceived value of home practice, encouragement, communication, and shared responsibility. Motivation followed, consistent with the need for learners to persist during intensive practice.

Learning resources ranked last. Although still Highly Effective, this result identifies the clearest system-level constraint. Intervention requires sufficient, level-appropriate, reusable, and accessible materials matched to specific reading needs.

Learner comprehension was favorably assessed, but the rating is not a direct pretest–posttest outcome. Program evaluation should separately measure implementation, engagement, skill growth, and transfer to classroom reading.

3.5 Agreement on Effectiveness Rankings

Table 6. Kendall Concordance for Perceived-Effectiveness Domains

Effectiveness Domain	W	χ^2	df	Decision
Learning resources	.643	11.569	6	n.s.
Parental support	.506	9.117	6	n.s.
Learner motivation	.260	4.683	6	n.s.
Learner comprehension	.392	7.654	6	n.s.

None of the four domains reached significant concordance at $df=6$. Respondent groups therefore varied in how they ordered the seven indicators within resources, parental support, motivation, and comprehension.

The pattern reinforces the need for school-level diagnosis. A common program should specify minimum evidence and processes, while schools adapt resources, family communication, motivational supports, and instructional dosage to local conditions.

3.6 Integrated Interpretation of the Findings

The program was implemented through a balanced set of approaches and was perceived as highly effective. Direct teaching and parental support were the leading pedagogy and effectiveness domains.

The results favor complementarity: explicit instruction identifies and models the reading process; activity-based and hands-on work provide aligned practice; remedial instruction intensifies support; parents extend practice and encouragement beyond school.

Learning resources were the lowest effectiveness domain, and sector agreement was generally limited. Resource and implementation audits should therefore precede uniform expansion.

The next evaluation stage should move from perception to learner outcomes. Baseline diagnosis, documented dosage, fidelity measures, repeated progress checks, and follow-up comprehension assessments are necessary to determine who benefits and under what conditions.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

Direct teaching, activity-based learning, remedial instruction, and hands-on pedagogy were all Highly Utilized. Significant cross-sector concordance occurred only for remedial instruction.

The Reading Recovery Program was perceived as Highly Effective, led by parental support and learner motivation. Learning resources represented the most important relative improvement priority.

No effectiveness domain showed statistically significant concordance across sectors. Implementation support should therefore combine shared standards with school-specific diagnosis and adaptation.

4.2 Study Limitations

The cross-sectional design captures perceptions at one point in time and cannot establish temporal order or causal influence. High ratings should therefore be interpreted as evidence of perceived implementation or effectiveness, not as proof that the practices caused improved organizational or learner outcomes.

The measures rely on structured questionnaire responses and may be affected by social desirability, recall, common-method variance, and differences in how respondents interpreted scale anchors. Observation, document review, interviews, and performance records were not integrated into the principal statistical estimates.

Rank-based comparisons summarize ordering among indicators or groups but do not quantify the practical size of an intervention effect. Generalization is bounded by the specified locale, participant selection, school year, and organizational conditions represented in the study. Future applications should retain item-level data, document missing-data procedures, report reliability coefficients for every multi-item scale, and publish reproducible test statistics with degrees of freedom and exact probability values.

The design did not include direct pre-intervention and post-intervention reading measures, a comparison group, verified treatment dosage, or implementation-fidelity evidence; program effectiveness is therefore perceptual rather than causal.

4.3 Implications for Practice and Policy

Intervention should begin with diagnostic evidence and assign learners to focused, flexible groups based on the specific reading process requiring support.

Teachers need coaching in explicit modeling, guided practice, error correction, cumulative review, motivation, and the use of data to adjust intensity and pacing.

Schools should conduct a resource audit and ensure level-appropriate texts, phonics and vocabulary materials, comprehension supports, and accessible take-home resources.

Family engagement should use clear goals, brief routines, feedback, and flexible participation modes. Monitoring should connect home support with learner progress rather than attendance alone.

5. Policy and Implementation Priorities

Table 7. Reading Intervention Policy and Implementation Matrix

Priority Area	Recommended Direction	Expected Evidence
Diagnostic entry	Use baseline assessments to identify specific reading needs.	Learner profiles; intervention placement records
Instructional model	Combine explicit teaching, guided practice, aligned activities, and remediation.	Lesson protocols; observation and coaching evidence
Dosage and monitoring	Document frequency, duration, attendance, and progress.	Dosage logs; progress graphs; regrouping decisions
Resource adequacy	Audit and supply level-appropriate, accessible materials.	Inventory; gap closure; usage evidence
Family partnership	Provide goal-linked home routines and flexible support.	Family guides; feedback; participation reach
Outcome evaluation	Use pre/post, fidelity, transfer, and follow-up evidence.	Growth estimates; fidelity report; sustainability review

6. Directions for Future Research

- Future evaluations should use direct reading measures, comparison groups where feasible, and multilevel analyses that account for learners nested within classes and schools.
- Studies should examine which combinations and dosages of explicit, activity-based, hands-on, and remedial instruction produce the strongest growth.
- Research should analyze implementation fidelity, resource adequacy, attendance, home practice, learner motivation, and initial reading level as moderators.
- Longitudinal work should determine whether intervention gains transfer to regular classroom reading and persist beyond Grade 4.

References

- [1] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- [2] Department of Education. (2018). *Policy guidelines on the administration of the revised Philippine Informal Reading Inventory* (DepEd Order No. 14, s. 2018).
- [3] Department of Education. (2019). *Hamon: Bawat Bata Bumabasa (3Bs Initiative)* (DepEd Memorandum No. 173, s. 2019).
- [4] Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 205–242). International Reading Association.
- [5] Ehri, L. C., Nunes, S. R., Willows, D. M., Schuster, B. V., Yaghoub-Zadeh, Z., & Shanahan, T. (2001). Phonemic awareness instruction helps children learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(3), 250–287.
- [6] Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., Davis, M. H., Scaffiddi, N. T., & Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(3), 403–423.
- [7] Hoover, W. A., & Gough, P. B. (1990). The simple view of reading. *Reading and Writing*, 2, 127–160.
- [8] National Early Literacy Panel. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel*. National Institute for Literacy.
- [9] National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- [10] RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. RAND Corporation.
- [11] Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). *Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- [12] Scarborough, H. S. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory, and practice. In S. Neuman & D. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (pp. 97–110). Guilford Press.
- [13] Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. National Academy Press.
- [14] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.